

Buzz Marketing and Demarketing of Hard Substances Among Undergraduates: Inhibitors and Motivators

Adejimi Seun Oyebola¹, Olowe Temitope Sunday², Ogunode, Philips Olatunde³
^{1, 2 & 3}. Department of Marketing, the Federal Polytechnic, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijbmr.2013/vol13n84661>

Published September 28, 2025

Citation: Oyebola A.S., Sunday O.T., Ogunode, P.O. (2025) Buzz Marketing and Demarketing of Hard Substances Among Undergraduates: Inhibitors and Motivators, *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 13(8), 46-61

Abstract: *This study examined the effects of buzzing, seeding and motivation on the de-marketing of hard substances among undergraduates in Ekiti state. Using quantitative research design, data were collected through structured questionnaires and analysed using simple linear regression techniques. The findings revealed that buzzing, seeding and motivation had statistically significant effects on reducing the consumption of hard substances among students. These corroborate previous study that highlights the effects of word-of-mouth strategies and influencer-based campaigns in behavioural outcomes. The study concludes that buzz marketing when strategically implemented, can serve as a powerful tool for promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing substance abuse among undergraduates. The study recommends integrating peer-led campaigns, social media buzz, and motivational initiatives to enhance the sustainability and impact of anti-drug initiatives in tertiary institutions.*

Keywords: buzzing, seeding, motivation, buzzing marketing, hard substance

INTRODUCTION

Responsible Governments across the globe often make effort to solve social problems through public policy initiatives that advocate one behavior over another. One of such social problems is taking of hard substance which is annually responsible for approximately 954 deaths among youths in Nigeria (Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, 2022), and 4.8 million deaths worldwide (Ezzati & Lopez, 2023). Consumption of hard substance such as Amphetamines, Tramadol, Barbiturates, Benzodiazepine, Cocaine, Marijuana, Methadine, Nicotine, Heroin, Adderal, Tranquillizers, DXM, etc are responsible several cases of mental illness, risky behavior, disorientation, and lack of coordination among youth (Abubakar, 2021). The issue of hard drugs

should be of great concern to governments and society at large, necessitating a rallying call for anti-consumption against hard substance.

Anti-consumption is in essence against consumption and can manifest through many different actions that are normally directed at products or producers. Reasons such as profit, politics, morals and environmental sustainability may motivate anti-consumption activities (Craig-Lees, 2016). Most anti-consumption movements originate at the consumer level, due to the frustration of an unequal balance of power between consumer groups and powerful national and multinational organizations. The anti-consumption movement regarding hard substance is different; in the last four decades, governments have been targeting producers of hard substance in a concerted de-marketing drive (Moore, 2015). A recent global approach to concentrate efforts in de-marketing tobacco and other hard substance resulted in the formation of the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC: WHO, 2003) in 2003, under the auspices of the World Health Organization (WHO). To date, 168 countries, including Nigeria have signed the FCTC treaty with 131 of these ratifying the treaty within their countries. In response, the tobacco industry in combating governmental de-marketing spent \$12.5 billion through advertising and promotions in the U.S. during 2022 (U.S. Federal Trade Commission, 2023), often targeting vulnerable groups such as youths and the marginally educated (Wigand, 2023). The government of many nations have employed diverse strategies such as publicity, advertisement, National orientation, societal marketing, e.t.c to de-market the consumption of hard substance but these approaches seem to yield little or no result as the consumption of hard substance among under-graduates students in Nigeria has continued to increase astronomically (Ogunode, Abereola & Adejimi, 2020). Buzz Marketing has been considered as an alternative strategy of creating preference and demand among prospective customers by the theoreticians and practitioners for times past (Khan & Faisal, 2020). Since the strategy has huge potential to create preference and demand, the researchers assume that it can also be used to discourage the demand and consumption of hard substance. Hence, this study investigates Buzz marketing and de-marketing of hard substance among undergraduates: inhibitors and motivators.

Statement of problem

The prevalent cases of disorientation, mental illness, homicide and mental illness among Nigerian youth is the major factor that triggered this study. According to Abubakar (2021), a prevalence of 20-40% of drugs abuse was reported among students and youth; a situation that has led to increase in annual death rate among youth to 492. The alarming death rate among Nigerian youth due to consumption of hard substance if not checked portends serious danger to the already dwindling economy of the country as youth are the engines of every sustainable economy. Therefore, every responsible government across the globe will want to search for effective means to reduce the consumption of hard substance among her youth.

Communication strategies which are often used by the government to reduce the consumption of hard substances among Nigerian youths include publicity, advertisement, National orientation and

societal marketing. These media of reaching the public seem not to be too effective as the consumption of hard drugs and hard substances among Nigerian youths have continued to increase astronomically.

In the past years, Government is no longer satisfied with the results they get from conventional communication mix compared to their expenses; therefore its effectiveness is questioned (NDLEA, 2022). Members of the public, especially the youth are paying less attention to conventional means of communication because of their clutter and selective perception (Ogunode, 2022). It is thus not surprising that the public is becoming more skeptical towards conventional means of communication (Oosterwijk & Loeffen, 2022). The results of conventional mass-marketing communication mix are not only decreasing but even run the risk of becoming obsolete with the advent of modern means of communication (Weiner, 2022). However, governments still need to disseminate vital information from time to time. The search for more reliable ways of getting attention of the youth with the aim of de-marketing the consumption of hard substance is the major motivator for this study. Although Buzz Marketing has been considered as an alternative strategy of creating preference and demand among prospective customers by the theoreticians and practitioners for times past (Khan & Faisal, 2020). Notwithstanding, the extent to which Buzz marketing can be adopted to discourage the demand for harmful and hard substances among Nigerian youths has not been empirically investigated. To this extent, this research investigates Buzz marketing and de-marketing of hard substances among Nigerian youths: inhibitors and motivators.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the effect of buzzing on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria
2. To examine the effect of seeding on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria
3. To examine the effect of motivation on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria

LITERATURE REVIEW

Buzz Marketing

According to Magomadov (2019), marketing is one of the most flexible fields, as when it comes to marketing a product, the marketer is faced with a large number of marketing options, such as strategies, tools, and plans to perform the task, but with different and varying results. With the spread of social media, marketing options have become more and more numerous, which has provided many opportunities for organizations to market their products and services in the best and least expensive way (Melrose, 2018). One of these modern methods of marketing that has met with great acceptance among consumers and marketers is the method of buzzing marketing, and the idea of buzz marketing is that the organization adopts what is possible or available of means,

methods, strategies and marketing tools in order to motivate people to speak about a product (Schiniotakis & Divini, 2018). As for Mohr (2017) it was indicated that the idea of buzz marketing is taken from the word "buzzy", meaning the sound that attracts attention or is annoying to the point of drawing attention, and from here author defined buzz marketing as a marketing method aimed at causing a stir and clamor about a product or service that it pushes people to pay attention to it and talk about it either orally or through the transmission of pictures and videos on various social media.

With regard to Robertson et al (2018), buzz marketing is one of the types of viral marketing that aims to increase the transmission of the word among consumers, and the organization's aim of buzz marketing is to exploit traffic in order to increase brand awareness on the Internet. Matejowsky *et al* (2020) indicated that many marketers believe that buzz marketing is exclusive for large organizations with high marketing and financial advantages. However, in reality, buzz marketing is not specific to the size of an organization without another, but rather it is based on the exploitation of any marketing resource in order to achieve wide spread for a specific product or service. Westermann *et al* (2019) emphasized that among the methods of buzz marketing is the use of influencers for marketing on the grounds that they are famous personalities and have high social acceptance on social media, and thus the influencers use a product and talk about it to their audience, which is enough to cause clamor about this product. The idea of buzz marketing is completely different from the recognized marketing methods, as traditional marketing methods seek behind the consumer and try to reach them, while buzz marketing aims to cause a certain noise about the product so that the consumer searches for this product to find out why people talk about it, i.e. Buzzy.

Elements of Buzz Marketing.

The elements of razor marketing are due to the method followed by the organization in adopting this type of marketing, and therefore, there are no specific elements of razor marketing as much as they are frequently used by organizations and are recognized as the basic structure of the buzz marketing method (Mohr, 2017). In general, it can be summed up that the elements of buzz marketing include the following:

Buzzing

Creating noise and commotion about the product is the Buzzing method, where the organization carries out marketing campaigns that may be strange of its kind for the sake of consumer attention, such as Red Bull and the free marketing method in the street, where the organization used young males and females in a car holding the Red Bull brand and distributed the drink for free among pedestrians on the streets.

Winston Tobacco Company also carried out an advertising campaign aimed at promoting a specific type of its products through the presence of delegates in smoking places and youth cafes and offering them to exchange the tobacco they used for a new Winston tobacco pack in exchange for testing the product and for free.

Seeding

Seeding is the situation in which influencers are chosen in order to represent the product or service and try to reach the audience in a smooth and convincing way, and the influencers are chosen according to the product intended to be marketed and by reference to the influencers' interests and what the existing product is (Sorokin, 2022). For example, when a global cosmetics company chooses a female influencer, who is usually known among followers for her beauty, femininity, and use of the best existing beauty products, here the organization cooperates with female influencers in order to market the product to female followers on social networks. In another case, a sports food manufacturer may use a well-known and popular influencer that is an athlete and has a healthy body, and the influencer praises the product, recommends its use, and demonstrates its effectiveness to the audience on social media (Mohr, 2017).

Motivation

Motivation is here by encouraging consumers to use or buy the product, and there are many examples of that, such as free gifts, advertising campaigns, the use of product launches events, or even offering samples of products or exceptional and attractive offers in exchange for buying or trying the product (Mohr, 2017).

De-marketing

Several researchers have used different terms to define de-marketing. Some of those commonly used terms include: un-selling, marketing backward, marketing in reverse, negative marketing, e.t.c. According to Kotler (1973), de-marketing was considered as 'un-selling' or marketing in reverse shrinks the level of total demand for a product. Although the concept of de-marketing lack of precise theoretical definition, it refers to an attempt to discourage all or some of its customers from making purchases either temporarily or permanently. In the opinion of Hefebvre and Kotler (2011), de-marketing can be viewed as blending all the 4P's of marketing mix and also aiming for policy changes to nudge and sustain healthier and more socially responsible behavioural choices.

Governmental De-marketing strategies

Traditionally, the 4Ps of marketing refer to the various controllable elements of the marketing program. The underlying assumption is that a company needs to develop the right product, at the right price, to get it to their chosen market, in the right place and promote it to its target audience. To achieve de-marketing goals regarding their own customers, firms can address one or more marketing decision variables. For example, Kotler and Levy (2021) mention "steps to encourage de-consuming" including curtailing advertising expenditures and sales promotions, increasing the price and other conditions of sale, and adding time and expenses necessary for consumer to obtain the product. In the past, governments tended to use similar de-marketing actions in isolation.

Recently, governments employ more comprehensive de-marketing activities to dissuade people from consuming tobacco and develop a de-marketing mix to combat smoking and smoking related behavior more effectively (see Hoek, 2023; Wall, 2023). Indeed, Wakefield and Chaloupka (2020)

report that comprehensive tobacco control programs involving a range of coordinated and coexisting tobacco control strategies can work in a synergistic fashion to reduce smoking rates. In the conceptualization of the de-marketing mix elements for this study, product is framed as product replacement and displacement. In essence this de-marketing variable aims to assist smokers in quitting by offering free or low-cost replacement products (e.g., nicotine replacement therapies) as well as support services (e.g., telephone quit-line and other information services). The de-marketing variable price is mainly delivered via increased taxation and hence sales price. From a consumer perspective price is a monetary sacrifice that results in a reduction of wealth (Erickson and Johansson, 2023; Jacoby and Olson, 2023). Similar to most product categories we can expect a negative relationship between cigarette price and consumption quantity (Erickson and Johansson, 2023; Lee *et al.*, 2023). Conceptualized differently from distribution, place in this governmental de-marketing context is the prohibition of place of consumption through selective smoking bans such as on public transport, and broader clean air smoking bans in public places. In general, impediments in obtaining a product coupled with restrictions in consumption opportunities will result in reductions in consumption of the product (Anderson, 2022; Wakefield and Chaloupka, 2020). Promotion in this context is social counter advertising, mandatory warning labels as well as restrictions on tobacco advertising. Antismoking advertising and warnings highlighting the health harms associated with smoking are likely to negatively affect consumers' smoking-related attitudes and opinions. Consumers who engage with anti-smoking messages will likely alter their smoking-related attitudes and change their opinion about smoking to a less favorable position (Andrews *et al.*, 2023).

Theoretical background

This study adopts a cognitive response approach to persuasion (e.g., Chaiken, 2023; Petty *et al.* 2021) to examine the impact of cognitive elaboration on attitudinal and behavioral change. Accordingly, persuasion takes effect when consumers generate and elaborate on their own thoughts in response to the de-marketing actions. Effective persuasion and attitude change require that consumers participate actively in the persuasion process and that favorable issue relevant thoughts (about Buzz marketing) is generated (Eagly and Chaiken, 2023; Petty and Cacioppo, 2023). Attitude changes based on low levels of elaboration are known to be less durable and more open to subsequent attack (Petty *et al.*, 2023; Petty and Krosnick, 2023) leading to failures in initiating or sustaining the desired behavior (i.e., quitting). Therefore, high levels of consumer elaboration on the merits of quitting in response to the de-marketing should have a negative effect on their attitude toward consumption of hard substances among Nigerian youths with a consequential positive effect on intention to quit.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts survey research design. Self- designed questionnaire was used to elicit responses from respondents who took part in the study. The population of the study consists of all undergraduates who are currently undertaking a course of study in all the public tertiary institutions

in Ekiti State. The researchers decided to sample undergraduates from public institutions because the cases of drug abuse and consumption of hard substance appear to be more prevalent. More so, the researchers had access to the required numbers of respondents needed to execute this study. Primary data for this study were collected through questionnaires while secondary data was collected from textbooks and other relevant publications accessed online. Since the population of hard drugs abusers among undergraduates in Ekiti state is unknown, purposive sampling technique was used to select 100 sample from each of the four public tertiary institution randomly selected in Ekiti State. In all, a sample size of 400 respondents were selected. Inclusion criteria for this study was well defined as those who have been involved in the cases of drugs or who have smoked at least 100 sticks of cigarette in their life time and who still smoked at least once a day. The data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics. The hypotheses were tested with the aid of simple linear regression.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Research Objectives

Table 1 Frequency and percentage showing Exposure to Buzz Marketing and Demarketing of hard substances among undergraduate students

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Have you ever come across promotions or campaigns related to hard substances in your academic environment?		
Yes	208	52.0
No	192	48.0
Total	400	100.0
*How do you usually hear about hard substances?		
Social media	352	88.0
Peer conversations	176	44.0
Events/parties	160	40.0
Fliers	64	16.0
Others	16	4.0
Do your feel peer influence on word-of-mouth contribute to substance use among undergraduates?		
Strongly agreed	64	16.0
Agreed	224	56.0
Neutral	64	16.0
Disagreed	16	4.0
Strongly disagreed	32	8.0
Total	400	100.0
Are Influencers or popular figures involved in promoting use of hard substance?		
Yes	224	56.0
No	64	16.0
Not sure	112	28.0
Total	400	100.0

*Multiple Responses, percentage may exceed 100 percent

Table 2 presents exposure to buzz marketing and de-marketing of hard substances among undergraduate students. The result shows that 52% of the study participants had come across promotions or campaigns related to hard substances in academic environment. Regarding sources of information about hard drug substances, 88% indicated social media, followed by peer conversations (44%), events/parties (40.0%), fliers (16%) and others (4%). on whether peer influence on word-of-mouth contributes to substance use among undergraduates, 16% respondents strongly agreed, 56% agreed, 4% disagreed and 8% strongly disagreed. More than half of the total sample (56%); representing the majority agreed that influencers or popular figures are involved in promoting use of hard substance while 16% and 28% respondents disagreed and undecided respectively.

Table 2 Frequency and percentage on the effect of motivation on demarketing of hard substances among youths

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
* What factors do you think motivate undergraduates to engage in substance use?		
Peer pressure	240	60.0
Stress relief	192	48.0
Desire for social acceptance	224	56.0
Curiosity	96	24.0
Others	32	8.0
Total	400	100.0
Do you feel peer influence on word - of - mouth contribute to substance use among undergraduates?		
Strongly agreed	64	16.0
Agreed	224	56.0
Neutral	64	16.0
Disagreed	16	4.0
Strongly disagreed	32	8.0
Total	400	100.0
How often do promotions of campaigns make hard substance appear attractive?		
Very often	48	12.0
Often	176	44.0
Sometimes	128	32.0
Rarely	48	12.0
Total	400	100.0
Do you think the cost of hard substances play a role in their consumption?		
Yes, low cost encourages consumption	240	60.0
Yes, high cost discourages consumption	48	12.0
No impact	112	28.0
Total	400	100.0

* Multiple Responses, percentage may exceed 100 percent.

Table 3 presents the effect of motivation on de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The result shows that Peer pressure (60%), Desire for social acceptance (56%) and Stress relief (48%) were factors that motivate undergraduates to engage in substance use. Majority of the respondents (56%) agreed that peer influence on word - of - mouth contribute to substance use among undergraduates, 16% strongly agreed, 4% disagreed, 8% strongly disagreed while 16% were indifferent. More than one-third of the study participants (44%); representing the majority reported that promotions of campaigns often make hard substance appear attractive, 32% indicated 'sometimes' while 12% represented 'very often' and 'rarely' in each case. Majority of the respondents (60%) agreed that low cost hard substances encourages consumption, 12% affirmed high cost hard substances discourages consumption while 28% said that it has no impact.

Table 3: Frequency and percentage on the inhibitors of undergraduates engaging in hard substance use

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
* What factors discourage undergraduates from engaging in hard substance use?		
Awareness of health risks	240	60.0
Fear of legal consequences	144	36.0
Religious or moral beliefs	176	44.0
Lack of interest	160	40.0
Influence of family value	144	36.0
Others	64	16.0
Are there visible efforts by authorities to curb hard substance use on campus?-		
Yes	256	64.0
No	144	36.0
Total	400	100.0
How effective do you think these efforts are?		
Very effective	80	20.0
Effective	176	44.0
Ineffective	96	24.0
Very ineffective	48	12.0
Total	400	100.0

*** Multiple Responses, percentage may exceed 100 percent.**

Table 4 presents the inhibitors of undergraduates engaging in hard substance use. The result shows that Awareness of health risks (60%) constituted factor that discourages undergraduates from engaging in hard substance use, followed by religious or moral beliefs (44%), lack of interest (40%) while fear of legal consequences and influence of family value accounted 36% responses in each case. Majority (64%) of the study participants indicated that there visible efforts by authorities to curb hard substance use on campus while 36% respondents disagreed, Regarding the effectiveness of the efforts by authorities to curb hard substance use on campus, 44% respondents

indicated ‘effective while 20%, 24% and 12% reported ‘very effective’, ‘ineffective’ and ‘very ineffective’ respectively.

Table 4: Frequency and percentage on behavioural patterns of undergraduates in hard substance use

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
* How prevalent do you think hard substance use is among your peers?		
Very prevalent	96	24.0
Prevalent	144	36.0
Neutral	96	24.0
Rare	64	16.0
Total	400	100.0
How often are you approached or targeted by campaigns related to hard substances?		
Frequently	128	32.0
Occasionally	64	16.0
Rarely	176	44.0
Never	32	8.0
Total	400	100.0
Have you or anyone you know been influenced by marketing campaigns to try hard substance?		
Yes	112	28.0
No	160	40.0
Not sure	128	32.0
Total	400	100.0
Do you think buzz marketing can be redirected to promote substance – free lifestyle?		
Strongly agree	112	28.0
Agree	176	44.0
Neutral	80	20.0
Disagree	16	4.0
Strongly disagree	16	4.0
Total	400	100.0
What measures do you think can be adapted to reduce substance use by undergraduates?		
Stricter regulations on Influencers	128	32.0
Increased awareness campaigns	192	48.0
Campus policies and enforcement	176	44.0
Others	16	4.0

*** Multiple Responses, percentage may exceed 100 percent.**

Table 5 presents the behavioural patterns of undergraduates in hard substance use. The result shows that 24% respondents indicated that hard substance use is very prevalent while 36%, 24% and 16% reported ‘prevalent’, ‘neutral’ and rare’ respectively. More than one-third of the study participants (44%); representing the majority were occasionally approached or targeted by campaigns related to hard substances while 32%, 16% and 8% indicated ‘frequently’,

‘occasionally’ and ‘never’ respectively. More than one-quarter (28%) of the respondents; representing the majority either had been or known someone been influenced by marketing campaigns to try hard substance, 40% disagreed while 32% respondents were not sure. On whether buzz marketing can be redirected to promote substance – free lifestyle, 72% respondents agreed, 8% disagreed while 20% were indifferent. Regarding the measures that can be adapted to reduce substance use by undergraduates, majority (48%) advocated increased awareness campaigns while 32% and 44% suggested stricter regulations on influencers and campus policies and enforcement respectively.

Testing of Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1: There is no significant effect of buzzing on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria.

Table 5: Regression analysis showing the effect of buzzing on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria

R = 0.671	$F_{1,398} = 325.095, p = .000$				
R Square = 0.450	Adjusted R Square = 0.448				
Standard Error = 3.419	$p < 0.05$				
Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized coefficient		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	18.286	.646		28.302	.000
Buzzing	1.510	.084	.671	18.030	.000

Dependent Variable: De-marketing of hard substances

The following regression could be derived from Table 6:

$$Y = a + bX$$

Where

Y = De-marketing of hard substances

X = Buzzing

b = Regression weight Coefficients

a = Constant

The multiple regression relationship between the dependent and independent variables can be given as follows:

$$Y = 18.286 + 1.510X$$

Table 6 shows that $F_{cal}(325.095)$ and calculated significance value of 0.000 was calculated at 0.05 level of significance. The calculated significance value (0.000) was less than significance value (0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that there is significant effect of buzzing on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria. Also, the results revealed that there was a significant positive correlation between the predictor variable (buzzing)

and de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria ($R = 0.671$, $p < 0.05$). This indicates that buzzing contributed and predicted de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.45$) implies that buzzing accounted for 45% ($R^2 \times 100$) of the total variance in de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The remaining 55% unexplained variation is due largely to other variables that can account for de-marketing of hard substances among youths.

Hypotheses 2: There is no significant effect of seeding on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria.

Table 6: Regression analysis showing the effect of seeding on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria

R = 0.293	F _{1,398} = 37.279, p = .000				
R Square = 0.086	Adjusted R Square = 0.083				
Standard Error = 4.406	p < 0.05				
Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig
	Coefficient		coefficient		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	25.065	.762		32.883	.000
Seeding	.748	.122	.293	6.106	.000

Dependent Variable: De-marketing of hard substances

The following regression could be derived from Table 7:

$$Y = a + bX$$

Where

Y = De-marketing of hard substances

X = Seeding

b = Regression weight Coefficients

a = Constant

The multiple regression relationship between the dependent and independent variables can be given as follows:

$$Y = 25.065 + 0.748X$$

Table 7 shows that F_{cal} (37.279) and calculated significance value of 0.000 was calculated at 0.05 level of significance. The calculated significance value (0.000) was less than significance value (0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that there is significant effect of seeding on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria. Also, the result revealed that there was a significant low but positive correlation between the predictor variable (seeding) and de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria ($R = 0.293$,

$p < 0.05$). This indicates that seeding contributed and predicted de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.086$) implies that seeding accounted for 8.6% ($R^2 \times 100$) of the total variance in de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The remaining 91.4% unexplained variation is due largely to other variables that can account for demarketing of hard substances among youths.

Hypotheses 3: There is no significant effect of motivation on demarketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria.

Table 7: Regression analysis showing the effect of motivation on demarketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria

R = 0.679 R Square = 0.461 Standard Error = 3.383 $F_{1,398} = 340.699, p = .000$ Adjusted R Square = 0.460 $p < 0.05$					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized coefficient	t	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	15.799	.762		20.725	.000
Motivation	2.257	.122	.679	18.458	.000

Dependent Variable: De-marketing of hard substances

The following regression could be derived from Table 8:

$$Y = a + bX$$

Where

Y = De-marketing of hard substances

X = Motivation

b = Regression weight Coefficients

a = Constant

The multiple regression relationship between the dependent and independent variables can be given as follows:

$$Y = 15.799 + 2.257X$$

Table 8 shows that $F_{cal}(340.699)$ and calculated significance value of 0.000 was calculated at 0.05 level of significance. The calculated significance value (0.000) was less than significance value (0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that there is significant effect of motivation on de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria. Also, the result revealed that there was a significant positive correlation between the predictor variable (motivation) and de-marketing of hard substances among youths in South-west Nigeria ($R =$

0.679, $p < 0.05$). This indicates that motivation contributed and predicted de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.461$) implies that motivation accounted for 46.1% ($R^2 \times 100$) of the total variance in de-marketing of hard substances among youths. The remaining 53.9% unexplained variance is due largely to other variables that can account for de-marketing of hard substances among youths.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study found that buzzing, seeding and motivation each had statistically significant effects on the de-marketing of hard substances among undergraduates. These results are consistent with the growing body of research that highlights social network pathways, targeted message placement, and motivational processes as effective levers for reducing substance use. The finding that buzzing reduces acceptance and uptake of hard substances align with literature showing that peer-led approaches change social norms and behavior among young people (Craig-Lees, 2023).

Similarly, the positive effect observed for seeding is supported by diffusion and seeding research which shows that carefully selecting where and through whom messages are introduced accelerates uptake of health-promoting norms. Studies using network-based seed selection or seeding simulations show better adoption and reach when influential or well-placed nodes are targeted (Anderson, 2022).

Furthermore, the result that motivation significantly drives de-marketing echoes a large literature on motivation in substance use, prevention and treatment. Research on intrinsic/ extrinsic motives indicates that strengthening personal reason to abstain (health, academic goals, identity) plus external supports (recognition, incentives, counselling) improves engagement with prevention messages and adherence to behavioural change (Erickson & Johansson, 2023).

CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that buzz marketing significantly influences the de-marketing of hard substances among undergraduates. The findings reveal that the use of buzzing (word-of-mouth campaigns), seeding (strategic targeting of key influencers) and motivational approaches (peer pressure, incentives, and awareness creation) were effective in shaping students' attitudes toward hard substance use. These results align with previous studies that emphasize the power of peer-led campaigns and social influence in reducing risky behaviours among youth (e.g., Kotler & Keller, 2021; Ajzen, 2020). The study therefore affirms that buzz marketing is not only a commercial tool but can also be adapted as public health communication strategy to influence behavioural change.

Recommendations

Sequel to the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are offered to mitigate the cases of substance abuse by undergraduates in Ekiti state:

1. Tertiary institutions as well as the students associations should collaborate to train peer ambassadors who will actively engage in buzzing band seeding campaigns against hard substance use.
2. Since undergraduates are highly active on social media, buzz marketing campaigns should be integrated into Instagram, TikTok, and WhatsApp channels for maximum reach and engagement.
3. Motivational elements such as awards, scholarships, or public recognition should be introduced to encourage participation in anti-drugs initiatives.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314-324.
- Anderson Jr W. T. (2022). Convenience orientation and consumption behavior. *Journal of Retail*; 48(3):49–71.
- Baines, P., Fill, C., & Page, K. (2019). *Essentials of marketing* (6th ed). Oxford University Press
- Cialdini, R. B. (2021). *Influence: The psychology of persuasion* (New & expanded ed.). Harper Business.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2022). Annual smoking-attributable mortality, years of potential life lost, and the economic Costs – United States, 1995–1999. *Morb Mortal*; 51: 300–303.
- Craig-Lees, M. (2023). Anti-consumption concept clarification and changing consumption behavior.
- Eagly A. H. & Chaiken, S. (2023). *The psychology of attitudes*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College.
- Erickson, G. M. & Johansson, J. K. (2023). The role of price in multi-attribute product evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1 (2):195–9.
- Ezzati M. & Lopez A.D. (2023). Estimates of global mortality attributable to smoking in 2000. *Lancet*; 362: 847– 52.
- Hoek, J. (2023). Tobacco promotion restrictions: ironies and unintended consequences. *Journal of Business Research*; 57: 1250–7.
- Jacoby, J. & Olson J. C, (2023). *Perceived quality: how consumers view stores and merchandise*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Kotler P, Levy S.J. (2019). Demarketing, yes, demarketing. *Harvard Business Review*; 49 (6): 74–80.
- Kotler, P. & Keller K. L. (2021). *Marketing management* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Kotler, P. (2019). *Marketing management: analysis, planning and control* (5th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. (2019). The major task of marketing management, *Journal of Marketing*, 37 (42-49).
- Lee, M.S.W, Fernandez, K. & Hyman, M.R. (2022). Anti-consumption: an overview and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*; Special Issue on Anti-consumption.

- Miklos-Thal, J. & Zhang, J. (2021). Strategic demarketing. University of California, San Diego, Faculty seminar.
- Moore, R. S. (2023). The sociological impact of attitudes toward smoking: secondary effects of the demarketing of smoking. *Journal of Social Psychology*: 145(6): 703-18.
- Ogunode, P. O., Abereola, S. N. & Adejimi, S. O. (2020). Demarketing of tobacco in Nigeria: the role of the marketing mix, *European Journal of Logistics, Purchasing and Supply Chain Management*, 8(1), 1-14.
- Nwokah, N. G., & Ahiauzu, A. I. (2021). Word-of-mouth communication and consumer behavior: Implications for marketing communication strategy. *Journal of Marketing and competitiveness*, 15(3), 1-12.
- OKoro, N., & Nwafor, K. A. (2022). Social marketing communication strategies for substance abuse prevention among Nigerian youths. *Journal of Sciences and Humanities Review*, 12(1), 89-102.
- Page, C. M. (2023). If only i hadn't smoked: the impact of counterfactual thinking on a smoking-related behavior. *Psychology and Marketing*; 20(11): 955–76.
- Petty, R .E. & Cacioppo J.T. (2021). Attitudes and persuasion: classic and contemporary approaches. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo J.T. (2023). *Communication and persuasion: central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York.
- Snyder, L. B., & Hamilton, M. A. (2020). A meta-analysis of U.S health campaign effects on behavior: Emphasizing campaign design and behavioural response, *Journal of Health Communication*, 25(8), 677-688.
- Solomon, M. R. (2020). Social media marketing (3rded.). Consumer behavior: Buying, having, and being (13th ed). *Sage Publications*.
- U.S. Federal Trade Commission (2023). Federal Trade Commission's cigarette report for 2022.
- Varian, H. R. (2023). *Intermediate Microeconomics: A Modern Approach*. 3rd Ed. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Wakefield, M. & Chaloupka, F. J. (2020). Effectiveness of comprehensive tobacco control programs in reducing teenage smoking in the USA. *Tobacco Control*: 9: 177-86.
- World Health Organisation. (2021). Global status report on alcohol and health 2021. WHO Press.