

Academic Papers

The views of an *advocatus dei*: Political marketing and its critics

Stephan C. Henneberg

Received: 12th January, 2004

University of Bath, School of Management, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK; tel.: +44 (0)1225 383 699; fax: +44 (0)1225 386 473, e-mail: s.c.m.henneberg@bath.ac.uk

Stephan C. Henneberg is a lecturer at the School of Management, University of Bath, UK. His current research interests are in the areas of strategic marketing, relational marketing, consumer behaviour and social and political marketing. He publishes regularly on political marketing, eg in the *Journal of Marketing Management* and the *Journal of Political Marketing*. Stephan has organised several international conferences on political marketing at the University of Cambridge, UK. He has just edited a book of readings on *The Idea of Political Marketing* (Praeger, 2002), together with N. O'Shaughnessy.

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses 11 statements of criticism of political marketing. These statements represent the most commonly voiced issues and were collected from marketers and political scientists. While marketing theorists are more concerned with the state of political marketing theory, political scientists concentrate much of their criticism on aspects of political marketing management as it is experienced in practice. Each statement is discussed and general conclusions are identified. While presenting the personal opinion of the author (advocatus dei), these conclusions and statements concerning political marketing should foster critical discourse on issues such as political marketing management, concepts and ethics.

KEYWORDS: *criticism of political marketing, ethics of political marketing, political marketing theory*

POLITICAL MARKETING UNDER ATTACK

Political marketing holds a difficult position. Research on political marketing appears to be constantly under an obligation to justify itself and to defend itself against criticism of its research ethos, ie the use of marketing concepts and instruments in the political sphere. It sometimes seems as though any attempts at merely gaining insights into the nuts and bolts of the application of political marketing by parties and other political actors are associated with sinister plans to develop a political 'Cacotopia', to use Jeremy Bentham's term. Negative feelings evoked by the use of marketing instruments in politics seem to rub off onto political marketing research itself (O'Shaughnessy 1990). The result is that many researchers in this area are confronted with the phenomenon of being 'guilty by association'. Yet, worse than describing political marketing, one might think, is the development of prescriptive marketing management tools for the political arena. Such a 'Faustian' pact immediately disqualifies the research, and the researcher is evicted from any decent discussion of how a sustainable and successful democratic system

should work... or so it seems to some academics. Research on political marketing is sometimes condemned *per se* purely due to its link with political marketing practice that is seen as harmful to our democratic party political systems. In such a climate, it is difficult for a, still new, research (sub-) discipline to find and develop a sound theoretical and empirical footing while developing the confidence to engage in a meaningful discourse with other disciplines, such as political science (Scammell 1995, 1999).

While, invariably, political scientists voice their critical opinions against political marketing (as stated previously, this can indiscriminately include the application of managerial concepts *as well as* researching them), the additional discipline that contributes to the theoretical foundation of political marketing, ie marketing theory, also has reservations (Henneberg 2002). Any reservation deserves to be taken seriously and needs to be addressed. In the following discussion, several of the principal critical arguments against political marketing will be dealt with. These were collected from discussions and via e-mail surveys.¹ From the rhetoric and replies, it becomes apparent that there are two distinct groups of issues: criticism of political marketing practice and criticism of political marketing research associated with such practice. While this author does not want to create the impression merely of some convenient strawmen being built up and then elegantly demolished, it must be borne in mind that the selection of criticisms selected to be tackled are based purely on an idiosyncratic choice, guided by an understanding of the most frequent and important objections against political marketing. The ultimate aim of this plea by an *advocatus dei*, however, is not so much the 'beatification' of political marketing, as it is to create a counter-weight to the overpowering and omnipresent voice of the *advocatus diaboli*. Only a restrained and unbiased approach to the topic, *sine ira et studio*, can help the emergent

subject of political marketing to develop into an area of serious and rigorous academic research.

To organise the following argument, some of the main objections to political marketing are described and analysed systematically. No specific attention has been given to definitional distinctions with regard to whether or not specific arguments were really about 'marketing in the political sphere' or about 'propaganda' (O'Shaughnessy 1999). Subsequently, some implications for political marketing theory and practice are explored. Thus, it is necessary to introduce a distinction between different levels of political marketing, entitled: categories. The argument will employ these categories to get to grips with distinctions of the criticism raised.

CATEGORIES OF POLITICAL MARKETING

Discussions concerning political marketing, in addition to research publications on the topic, can suffer from a somewhat confusing understanding of different categories of political marketing. For the purposes of this paper, a specific categorisation scheme has been used.² It is possible (see Figure 1) to distinguish between three levels of involvement with the *explanandum* at hand, and two levels of focus (Henneberg 2002), as introduced by Sheth *et al.* (1988).

Political marketing in general is defined as facilitating the societal process of political exchange,³ while political marketing management describes the 'art and science' (Kotler 2003) of successfully managing this (political) exchange process. Thus, political marketing and its managerial application, political marketing management, can be signified as the research object (*explanandum*) in question. Activities might comprise developing a strategic political posture for a party, micro-managing an election campaign, coordinating the spin on certain communications with 'parallel' organisations and using political marketing research to focus marketing spend resources, among others (Butler

Figure 1: Categorisation scheme of political marketing

		Levels of Involvement		
		<i>Theory of Political Marketing</i>	<i>Theory of Political Marketing Management</i>	<i>Political Marketing Management</i>
Levels of Focus	Descriptive			
	Normative			

and Collins 1999; Henneberg 2002; Newman 1999; O’Cass 2001; O’Shaughnessy 1990). In researching these phenomena, however, one needs to distinguish two separate levels (Sheth *et al.* 1988). First, the theory of political marketing management encompasses the academic interest in dealing with the operational management issues of political exchanges. It consists of a theoretical and analytical examination of managerial behaviour. Questions answered on this level are, for example: What do political actors do to manage the political exchange? Which instruments and concepts are successful, and under what circumstances? This operational and managerial focus, however, means that certain elements are not covered by the theory of political marketing management. One might ask: What about the wider impact of political marketing activities on democracy, or the interplay with different party or electoral systems? Or the understanding of how voters perceive political actors in an electoral market system? Or the description/definition of different exchange structures in the political marketing, etc? These and more fundamental questions, without direct man-

agerial relevance, are covered by the theory of political marketing. They consist of the crucial conceptual ‘backbone’ of research on political marketing. The main thrust of this paper, ie ethical dimensions of political marketing, is in fact rooted here.

Conversely, for reasons included in the following argument, it is also important to distinguish two levels of focus: a descriptive versus a prescriptive (normative) argument. As these categories are widely used in marketing theory (Arndt 1982; Hunt 1976; Hunt and Burnett 1982), a detailed description can be omitted. Putting these categories together, the categorisation scheme allows for a clear focus of criticism of political marketing.

CRITICISM OF POLITICAL MARKETING

It is appropriate to introduce the contenders. First, the *advocatus diaboli*: the following criticisms of political marketing have been chosen for further consideration, as described earlier. They are paraphrased below as factual statements. Some of the ‘accusations’ are not mutually exclusive and therefore overlap.

Common criticism with regard to political marketing management, ie the practical ap-

plication of political marketing, can be summarised by the following six statements:

- S₁: Through the use of political marketing, elections can in effect be ‘bought’ (also: only rich candidates can afford to run).
- S₂: Political marketing has transformed politics into being obsessed with ‘spin’ and ‘packaging’ (also: politics has become void of content because of political marketing).
- S₃: Political marketing has caused more populism in politics, a ‘follower mentality’ prevails, based on focus group results and perceived public opinion (also: politics has become void of political leadership).
- S₄: Parties and politicians that use political marketing are using the wrong reference points/mindsets. Politics is essentially not about ‘selling’ but about something completely different.
- S₅: Political marketing is not compatible with how voters (should) make an informed voting decision (also: political marketing uses manipulative methods/smokescreens to betray voters).
- S₆: Political marketing causes campaigns to be negative.

On the level of the theory of political marketing, as well as the theory of political marketing management, five more criticisms can be distinguished with regard to how researchers approach political marketing:

- S₇: Research on political marketing is not focusing on politics but on ephemeral activities like communication tactics and campaigning.
- S₈: All research into political marketing helps in the end to foster the adoption and application of (inherently bad) management practice and thinking in politics. This is not only true of normative research but also of purely descriptive research.

- S₉: Research in political marketing is not sophisticated; it does not utilise the leading edge political science and especially marketing theories available.
- S₁₀: The political arena is not really part of the ‘marketing domain’ and should therefore not be researched using marketing concepts.
- S₁₁: No theoretical and ethical framework exists that allows (value-) discussions about political marketing.

If these statements are clustered into the categorisation scheme of political marketing introduced above, the following picture emerges (see Figure 2); this also indicates whether a critical statement was typically associated with a political scientist or a marketer.

Most criticisms regarding political marketing management come from political scientists. Not surprisingly, few marketers find the use of marketing instruments and concepts in politics objectionable. The only concern that some marketers have about ‘selling politics’ (S₄) is connected to the fundamental theoretical problem stated in S₁₀: whether or not marketing concepts as such can and should be used to describe political behaviour (the ‘domain’ question).

Marketers’ criticism is concerned with theoretical questions of how political marketing management is researched. Interestingly, marketers were the only researchers that focused on critical aspects of the theory of political marketing, ie thinking about some underlying theoretical and conceptual elements of political marketing that affect and shape the theory of political marketing management as well as the epistemological position *vis-à-vis* its research object.

ENTER THE *ADVOCATUS DEI*

In breaking with (clerical) tradition, the criticism (see the 11 statements above) was introduced first in this argument. Therefore, it is time for the counsel of political marketing,

Figure 2: Criticisms of political marketing

		Levels of Involvement		
		Theory of Political Marketing	Theory of Political Marketing Management	Political Marketing Management
Levels of Focus	Descriptive	S ₁₀ (M)	S ₇ (M/P) S ₈ (P) S ₉ (M/P)	S ₁ (P) S ₂ (P) S ₃ (P) S ₄ (M/P)
	Normative	S ₁₁ (M)	S ₇ (M) S ₈ (P) S ₉ (M)	S ₅ (P) S ₆ (P)

Criticism mainly from:
M – Marketers
P – Political Scientists
M/P – both

the *advocatus dei*, to address the 11 critical statements. As some of these criticisms are linked, they will occasionally be dealt with together.

The practice — Political marketing management

Elections can be bought. One of the most damning criticisms of the use of political marketing instruments in the political arena is the accusation that democratic elections can now be ‘bought’ (S₁). The reasoning behind this can be summarised as follows: today’s elections are won by the candidate/party that sets the agenda through political adverts and media manipulation, planting of sound bites in the news media, micro-targeting of communication instruments, focus on marginal seats, etc. In general, this means that the electoral market is dominated by the one that has the *slickest* and most professionally run campaign management. Such professionalism (as well as media slots, especially on national television) comes at a price (Franklin

1994; Gould 1999; Newman 1999, 2001; Steen 1999). Consequently, the party/candidate with more resources or better fundraising capabilities over the period of high electoral competition wins, irrespectively of the political argument (Wray 1999).

While it is certainly true that electoral campaigns have become progressively more expensive and that it is estimated that political candidates running for the US presidency spend more than half of their time fundraising (including such activities as renting out the Lincoln bedroom in the White House to party contributors) (Gould 1999; Himes 1995), the direct relationship between campaign spend and campaign success is certainly overstated. Looking at commercial campaigns in a for-profit market environment, more campaign budget does not correlate well with commercial success (Berkowitz *et al.* 2001; D’Souza and Allaway 1995). Furthermore, while there are certainly examples where the big political spenders win elections in the end, there are also counter-

examples: in the run-up to the 2001 general elections in the UK, the Tories spent £12,751,813, in comparison with Labour's £10,945,119, and suffered a second humiliating and crushing defeat at the polls (31.7 per cent of the national vote compared with Labour's 40.9 per cent). Furthermore, the Liberal Democrat result of 18.3 per cent sounds extraordinary if one looks at their respective campaign spending: £1,361,377 (Electoral Commission 2002). In addition, this statement would not be able to account for the sometimes considerable electoral volatility in party systems where the main source of funding is state based and calculated as a result of a party's electoral success at the last election (eg as in Germany) (Seidle 1991). While resource acquisition is certainly a contentious issue on the political agenda (Jamieson 1992a), it is more a discussion about funding sources in a democracy than about political marketing management itself.

Packaging without content. Political marketing management is commonly accused of having 'emptied' political communication, as well as party politics, of any direct relationship with political issues and deeply held political convictions that are expressed in coherent political and topical offers (S_2). In Franklin's words: 'Image has supplanted substance' (Franklin 1994). Instead, political marketing has introduced, so the argument goes, an obsession with the way that political messages are packaged. Political arguments are cut down to what is now commonly called 'spin' and 'sound bites' — void of political content and meaningfulness, but delivered in a bombastic and impressive shell and pre-packaged for a two minute news slot, solely relating to 'image' (Jamieson 1992b; Jones 1995; Moloney 2000; Wring, 2000). Consequently, image consultants argue that politicians should become brand managers and prime ministers and governments should manage 'the nation as a brand' (O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy 2000; Smith 2001). The obsession with spin has

even caused the unprecedented move by the Speaker of the House of Commons in the UK to attack professional 'spin doctors' (read: media advisers and communication specialists) directly as being a 'nuisance' (Anon 2003).

From a marketing point of view, it is certainly possible to agree with this criticism to some extent. Politics is essentially about managing a service in the form of promises (public goods) to constituents (eg the electorate). These constituents are not isomorphic with customers but are better described as clients. The promises evoke expectations in the minds of the constituents that are measured against political activities, once the political actor (party or candidate) is in a position to implement these promises, ie once in government or able to influence governmental activities. In a simplified way, this means that if these expectations are not met by delivering certain political outcomes (eg tax cuts, political leadership, improving the international importance of a country), dissatisfaction follows (according to the confirmation/disconfirmation model of consumer behaviour) (Churchill and Suprenant 1982; Fournier and Mick 1999; Spreng *et al.* 1996; Tse and Wilton 1988). If expectations are constantly not met and the constituents perceive most promises to be empty, however, a general disillusionment can follow. Although this is lamentable, it inherently has a built-in balancing mechanism: dissatisfaction causes behaviour change, and behaviour change means that certain beneficial activities (votes, resources, donations) are withheld or shifted to other players (sometimes out of the electoral market) (O'Shaughnessy and Wring 1994). The often heard argument that the electorate 'forgets' false promises and that after an election period the lies and disappointments of the previous campaign and the first year(s) of the government are not relevant for the decision-making process sounds hollow: these are the same people who, as consumers, are believed to become more and

more sophisticated, who quickly shift brand loyalties when dissatisfied and who should never be disappointed because their long-term memory is better than that of elephants (Antonides and van Raaij 1998; Kotler 2003). It seems astonishing that these very same people, the scorn of modern marketing, should transform into unthinking sheep who believe in the packaging more than the content, who forgive easily and who can be (mis)guided by modern political marketing techniques, just because these same activities and instruments are concerned with the political, rather than the commercial, sphere (Holbrook 1996). Should the (rather unsophisticated) political marketing have a much stronger influence on behaviour and attitudes than (extremely sophisticated and optimised) commercial marketing? This seems to be difficult to believe. What can nevertheless be said is that more and more political actors use a 'follower mentality' (see discussion of statement S_3 below), which inherently means that the 'packaging' and customising of political messages and promises becomes more important in order to specifically address the needs and wants of a certain target audience (Collins and Butler, 2003; Henneberg 2005 forthcoming).

Something should now be said about 'spin' and 'image': these are not modern phenomena but are inherent in any attempt to 'convince' and make an argument. Oratory and rhetoric (much nicer terms for what is now simply called political communication), from the Greek forum to Speakers' Corner, from Disraeli to Reagan, was always full of exaggerations, the stage managing of effects, etc, but not necessarily about deception (Egan 1999; O'Shaughnessy 2002c; Smith 2001). *Prima facie* it is impossible to differentiate 'images' from 'issues' in an argument, they are both socially constructed (Banker 1992). Furthermore, spin depends on the media and therefore has to be seen in a dialectic relationship between different players (O'Shaughnessy 2002b), although

some critics assume that the '[m]edia are used routinely by politicians to set news agendas' (Franklin 1994). What is really modern about spin is its professionalism and omnipresence, eg the existence of political consultants (Johnson 2002) and 'Directors of Communications' like Alistair Campbell for Tony Blair, Karl Rove for George Bush Jr, or Bodo Hombach for Gerhard Schröder (during his first term in office). It is interesting to see that these communication and campaign specialists have now become political influencers and politicians themselves (sometimes elected, sometimes not) (Newman 2001). Karl Rove, for example, has a permanent office in the White House. Besides accountability problems, this professionalism has at least caused the political process to be much more efficient and effective.

Populism and no leadership. Parties and politicians 'follow'; they run after the political opinion and adapt to any small changes, especially to perceived opinion shifts in crucial segments of the electorate like opinion leaders, swing voters or electoral areas with 'marginal seats' (S_3) (Harris 2001a). To this end, political market research (eg the ominous and omnipresent focus groups) are employed. Their outcome determines policy, which, always running after the whims of the electorate, is being driven by the market, the *vox populi*. The argument attributes this 'following' mentality to the essence of marketing, namely the concept of customer-orientation (Collins and Butler, 2003), often misunderstood as being customer-led (Slater and Narver 1998).

The central problem with this argument is not that there is no tendency towards populism in politics (a time-honoured accusation in the political discourse). Although it can be argued that recently the 'tactical populist' (Henneberg 2005 forthcoming) has become the main strategic posture for mainstream parties, it can also be argued that this is not an optimal posture under many circumstances and that it neglects crucial aspects of a

customer orientation as postulated in the marketing literature. Without going into the details of the ‘market orientation versus customer orientation’ debate of marketing theory (Conor 1999; Kohli and Jaworski 1990; Narver and Slater 1990; Noble *et al.* 2002; Lafferty and Hult 2001; Slater and Narver 1998; Slater and Narver 1999) and the related aspect of a ‘social orientation’ (Liao *et al.* 2001), it can nevertheless be stated that an exclusively market-driven approach in politics falls short of a consequent customer/voter orientation (Newman 1999; Smith and Saunders 1990). In fact, the dialectical interplay of market-driven and market-driving behaviour characterises successful (political) marketing management in terms of building long-term relationships. An element of ‘leading’ complements an emphasis on following and satisfying customer needs and wants. This is true for the economic sphere (eg Sony’s walkman, Toyota’s Lexus or Lufthansa’s introduction of e-tickets) as well as the non-profit (Liao *et al.* 2001) and political one (eg the emphasis by voters on leadership qualities in politicians) (Henneberg 2005 forthcoming; Herrmann and Huber 1996). Therefore, a political marketing approach that is purely market-driven often constitutes both bad politics and bad marketing. The irony is that leading and following can sometimes develop into a ‘devil and the deep blue sea’ phenomenon, as Tony Blair has discovered: Usually exposed as an opportunist that depends on focus group results for policy making, his leadership stance of siding with the USA during the second Iraq War is now characterised as being out of touch with the people (Ritson 2003). It remains to be seen if he can transform his image from a ‘follower’ to a ‘leader’, comparable to Thatcher’s development (Scammell 1996).

Politics is not about selling. Equating politics with selling washing powder, using *inter alia* the same methods and mindsets for both, corrupts politics and devalues it. The importance of democratic political decisions and

their wide-ranging implications for the well-being of many people constitutes a completely different quality from picking up a can of Coke in a Walmart hypermarket (S₄) (Jones 1995). This truism is often used against political marketing management and advocates a ‘new public management’ concept (Collins and Butler 2003). It is based on a like-for-like equation of the political and the economic market. As already alluded to above, however, this is not a straightforward case. While politics in fact bears little similarity to normal products, an analogy with services is not totally unreasonable. Many characteristics are similar: both are promise- and experience based, non-tangible, perishable, partly public goods,⁴ presumptive etc (Butler and Collins 1999; O’Shaughnessy 2002b; O’Shaughnessy and Henneberg 2002). Furthermore, constituents, like voters or grass-root supporters, are not really customers but resemble clients (Newman 1999). Therefore, while the equation of politics and washing powder is in fact obscene, the analogy of politics with a professional service — law, for example — seems to be a more reasonable one (Egan 1999; Henneberg 2002; Smith and Saunders 1990). Services marketing, which is heavily committed to building trust and commitment in a relational exchange (Berry 1995; Bitner 1995; Grönroos 1990; Grönroos 1994; Grönroos 1997), can therefore be a guiding concept for political marketing management.

Another and more fundamental issue of the ‘selling politics’ argument has to do with the question of whether or not marketing management practices or concepts are applicable in non-economic exchanges. Non-profit and social marketing (eg cause-related marketing, health management, sports or arts marketing, to name but a few) has developed into a sub-discipline of marketing, but not without discussions about the boundaries of marketing, ie the marketing domain. This fundamental discussion will be addressed below in S₁₀.

Voters vote differently. This argument is grounded in an understanding, or, to be precise, a premise about how voters go about making sense of, and an informed choice about, political issues. This choice can consist of forming a political opinion or it can be behaviourally relevant in the sense that it triggers certain political activities. The one activity that is normally discussed, and which is arguably the determining behaviour in democratic political systems, is voting. The argument against political marketing management insists that voters need to be able to gain access to political information and ‘facts’ in order to form a ‘rational’ opinion on which they can base their voting decision (S₅). Nowadays, however, voters do not get the information about important political issues that they need, and political campaigns are about personal characteristics and empty arguments, images, catch-phrases and sound-bites (discussed above). These stimuli do not consist of the right kind of political information for voters to be able to form an informed opinion. The voter’s opinion remains a one-dimensional image of the shallow political discussions fostered by political marketing management (Franklin 1994; Jamieson 1992b).

These arguments are clearly inspired by political theory, and a prescriptive understanding of how democracy ought to work and how voters are supposed to make up their minds (Brennan and Lomasky 1993). The assumption that voters (could) decide in a rational way, and that they (could) form opinions in a ‘power and dominance-free’ environment, however, is certainly based on a fallacy. Such deontological abstraction might serve some purpose in underpinning micro-economic theory (in political science, for example, embraced by the economic school of voting behaviour); to derive from it such information as how a political discourse should look, and what kind of information shall or shall not be part of political campaigns, is not realistic (Kaid 1999; O’Shaugh-

nessy 2002a), eg the demand for a ‘fair, accurate, contextual, comparative, engaged campaign discourse’ (Jamiesson 1992b). Any ‘rational’ voting behaviour theory shows only part of the complex human processes of deciding and acting. Consumer behaviour theory, although indebted to micro-economic models, has accepted this, and there have been attempts to integrate the findings of consumption studies with those of voting behaviour theories (Bartle and Griffiths 2002; Newman and Sheth 1987). In its essence, the voting decision is a very complex and difficult process. Therefore, non-rational elements or decision shortcuts, such as the reliance on heuristics and decision cues, help voters to make up their minds (Brady and Sniderman 1993; Brennan and Lomasky 1993; Newman 2001; Sniderman *et al.* 1993b). This could mean taking the perceived personal characteristics of the main candidate as a *pars pro toto* of the attractiveness of a political party and their programme. Such reasoning does not constitute a de-meaning of politics but is an expression of the coping strategies innate in human beings (Kaid 1991; Popkin 1994; Sniderman *et al.* 1993a). Political marketing management accepts these shortcomings and uses them to develop an appropriate communication strategy. Therefore, any arguments against political marketing on the normative grounds of an optimal decision-making process need to be qualified. More appropriate and realistic voter behaviour theories (ie better description and less prescription) can provide the basis for a criticism of certain political marketing management phenomena.

Campaigns have become personal and negative. With the advent of political marketing management, so the argument goes, the political discourse, and especially political campaigns, have become obsessed with negativity and sometimes personal insult (S₆). Negative campaigning can be concerned with political issues but, more often than not, a direct and personal attack on political opponents (their

character, their biography, their personal relationships, etc) becomes the focal point of political discussions (Egan 1999; Franklin 1994; Harris 2001a; Jamieson 1992b). Political marketing has changed the political culture, away from issues and towards individuals; with this, the political discourse has entered the arena of show business and character assassinations. Negative campaigns create counter-campaigns until the political discourse has disintegrated into a mud-wrestling contest. Worse, there is the fear that these methods actually work and that negative campaigns can win elections.

Negative campaigns are a nuisance and watching them is sometimes not a pleasant experience. It is important to deconstruct the argument into two aspects, however, focusing on persons on the one hand and the negative content of the communication on the other. In line with the service characteristics of the political offering, the importance of the 'delivery' people for assessing the (anticipated) quality of a service does not come as a surprise (Lee *et al.* 2000; Swan and Bowers 1998). In services marketing, 'people' are an additional instrument in the marketing mix of the 7Ps (Zeithaml and Bitner 2003). As the service is intangible,⁵ the contact and delivery personnel (as well as the tangible elements of the delivery channel) become an important cue in forming expectations and, indeed, also satisfaction/experience judgments. The mere content of a political programme does not say everything about a party; for voters, it is also important if they believe that the politicians have the necessary characteristics (eg leadership, expertise, emotional balance, pragmatism, international standing) to implement the programme and deliver on their promises (Popkin 1994). The political offering needs to be seen as an amalgamation of different elements, like the programme and personal characteristics, and it is therefore beneficial if political marketing management (as well as

media coverage) provides both (Axford and Huggins 2002).

Negative content in political discourse is often condemned in general; however, this means 'throwing out the baby with the bath water'. Comparative advertising can help the voters and other political decision makers to clearly see differences between offers, and allows political parties and candidates to emphasise differentiating elements (this can enhance voters' understanding of the political market at times when most parties compete in a very small option space, ie the political centre) (Banker 1992). In fact, it has been shown that negative advertisements are more issue oriented than positive ones (Kaid 1999); however, character assassinations and constant personal attacks (founded or unfounded), and the routine scrutinising of opponents' private lives (sometimes going back decades), is unquestionably an unsavoury aspect — not one necessarily of political marketing management but of general media coverage (sports and movie celebrities will testify to this). The political culture and the structure of the party system, however, might foster or dampen this tendency (Holtz-Bacha and Kaid 1995; Kaid 1991). In countries with a party-oriented system, in contrast to a candidate-centred and presidential system, these negative campaigns might be less prevalent. Furthermore, a strong political culture can also counteract interest in private aspects of politicians (citing the example of France, and President Mitterand's 'private life', which was not discussed by the media during his lifetime, underlines this point). The tendency of an increasing emphasis on people, however, might have an impact on the political culture and the degree of privacy that politicians are allowed. To emphasise this point, political marketing management does not always show the appropriate restrictiveness (and can in fact be counterproductive to its own goals), but comparative research nevertheless shows

(against expectations?) that in most countries election campaigns focus on political issues, not on individuals (Kaid and Holtz-Bacha 1995).

The research — Theory of political marketing (management)

Too much communication focus. Research on political marketing has often been criticised for being overly focused on one aspect of marketing theory (ie communication) as part of an election campaign. Political campaigns and political marketing activities are often exclusively defined through their communication content and the media vehicles employed (Franklin and Richardson 2002; Kaid 1999; Kavanagh 1995; Wring 1999). This is a shortcoming which means that many aspects of marketing theory are neglected, and that the focus is purely operational and is mainly on one specific marketing instrument (S₇) (Egan 1999; Scammell 1995; Scammell 1999). A classification of existing political market research literature found this emphasis clearly substantiated (Henneberg 1995). These findings have since been repeated in the literature (Lees-Marshment 2001; O’Cass 2001). This oversimplification of political marketing research in fact constitutes an impoverishment of the sub-discipline which can endanger its development. Strategic aspects of political marketing management, other marketing instruments and, for that matter, the underlying functions of political marketing management have been neglected (Newman 1994; Henneberg 2002). Current research appears to channel too much emphasis towards comparative campaign studies, looking at different countries and describing instrument use and communication content, without synthesis or conceptual work appearing alongside (see also S₉).

While this state is lamentable and the criticism certainly justified, the emphasis in research on campaigns and communication mirrors the emphasis of political marketing management itself. It seems that the practi-

tioners share the reductionist approach towards marketing. Political marketing management, in most cases, does not focus extensively on strategic issues and also has a very narrow view with regard to the underlying tactical functions of political marketing management (Henneberg 2002). This becomes more understandable when one looks at the background of political marketing managers or consultants: more often than not (at least in Europe), they are trained in advertising/communication or have worked as (commercial) campaign managers.

Research insinuates management practice. Research on political marketing management helps to spread management practice and ethics in the political sphere. It encourages the use of such marketing instruments and concepts and redefines the way everyone thinks about politics (S₈). This ‘imperialism’ of management theories crowds out more appropriate ways of thinking about politics. This is not just true for research that helps to optimise political marketing management tools and concepts but also for purely descriptive research. Thus, this radical argument goes, one should either abstain from research grounded in marketing theory or use it with circumspection.

That such objections are still voiced shows not just the level of critical vigour but also the fact that (political) marketing theory has not yet been able to convince its critics through meaningful and seminal analyses which show that, in fact, research into political activities by actors in the competitive world of politics can gain considerable insight through using political marketing concepts without ‘harming’ its research object. Three issues can be addressed with regard to the objection at hand: first, it is commonly stated that political actors use instruments and concepts that are influenced by marketing (Lees-Marshment 2001; Newman 1994; O’Shaughnessy 1990). Therefore, marketing theory is uniquely positioned as a research tool in order to make sense of these phenom-

ena and to interpret them in an appropriate way. Secondly, much research that is published in the field of political marketing uses marketing theories only tangentially or inappropriately (see S₉) and is still steeped in political science and communication studies methodology. Therefore, the influence of marketing theory in describing politics as well as prescribing political management is still small and should not be overestimated. The practice of political marketing management, although limited, seems to be far ahead of any catching-up efforts by academics. Thirdly, the compatibility of the ‘professionalisation’ of politics with political concepts of democracy itself is a very interesting subject for the theory of political marketing. This has not been addressed sufficiently so far (see Collins and Butler 2003 for an exception), either by political scientists and philosophers or by marketing theorists. General discussions on the appropriateness and domain of non-profit marketing (see S₁₀) are not enough to resolve this underlying ethical issue. S₁₁ will touch upon this problem again.

Non-sophisticated research. Marketers in particular often voice this concern. Two (linked) aspects of this critical argument can be distinguished: one is concerned with the lack of connection between research in political marketing and the forefront of mainstream marketing theory, the other focuses on the static nature of research in political marketing (S₉).

Although research at the level of the theory of political marketing (management) is still somewhat in its infancy [most research in this area did not start before the beginning of the 1990s, taking O’Shaughnessy (1990) and Harrop (1990) as the seminal ‘kick-off’ sources], it seems to be strangely decoupled from several major trends that have dominated marketing theory during this time. For example, the discussions around market orientation, as well as relational and network marketing and the advancements of the ‘Nordic school’ of marketing in the area of

services marketing, have had little impact on political marketing scholars (O’Shaughnessy 2002b).⁶ It has to be said that the present author agrees with this criticism and perceives this fact to be one of the main stumbling blocks for the development of political marketing as a research discipline. Sometimes it seems (polemically speaking) as if political marketing theory consists of not much more than an analysis of the political 4Ps (with emphasis on promotion) and the political marketing mix. The fact that mainstream marketing theory itself has now advanced from this concept, eg through functionally orientated marketing theory (van Waterschoot and van den Bulte 1992) and relational approaches (Grönroos 1997), makes the limited use of marketing concepts by political marketing researchers even more worrying (Scammell 1999).

Furthermore, and this addresses the second point of the ‘non-sophistication’ argument, a tendency to ‘reinvent the wheel’ with regard to research content has been observed.⁷ Although progress has been made by adding to the research agenda on political marketing, articles that fundamentally do nothing else but cover the same ground over and over again still prevail. Many descriptive pieces on campaigning in different countries appear without including any new conceptual developments or a clear impetus for further research. Evidence is often anecdotal (Butler and Collins 1996). Again, the present author would not want to contest this criticism.

Not a marketing domain. This is a fundamental criticism with regard to the essence of marketing and whether or not political marketing has a place within the domain of marketing. Clearly, this issue hinges around the theory of political marketing, and as a criticism, if accepted, would mean that the research community in political marketing is actually ‘barking up the wrong tree’.

The ‘domain’ discussion, defining the ‘nature and scope of marketing’ (Hunt 1976)

was one of the focal points of discourse in marketing theory in the 1960s and 1970s (for a history of this discourse, see Meinert *et al.* 1993), linked to the clarification of the exchange paradigm in marketing (Bagozzi 1974, 1975, 1978; Foxall 1984; Martin 1985; White 1986). Broadening the concept of marketing beyond classical product-based for-profit organisations (Kotler and Levy 1969a) meant, first, to incorporate explicitly services organisations and, secondly, non-profit organisations like charities, hospitals, political parties, etc. The inclusion of non-profit or social marketing that was grounded in a wide definition of the marketing domain (Arndt 1978; Enis 1973; Hunt 1976; Kotler 1972; Kotler and Levy 1969b) was not universally accepted and is, to some extent, still occasionally contested. The use of marketing theories and concepts to explain and frame research on political issues in a non-profit market place (ie shaped by competitive but non-economic exchanges) can be rejected for theoretical reasons, as part of a narrow definition of marketing, limiting marketing to economically motivated exchanges in which values can be directly quantified through an exchange price (S_{10}) (Luck 1969; Luck 1974). In the past two decades, however, social marketing has gained importance with regard to practice and research, and it is now generally accepted as being part of the marketing domain. The wide definition of marketing is now prevailing in marketing textbooks, and the proliferation of social marketing studies in all varieties (eg church marketing, arts marketing, sports marketing, cause-related marketing) shows that such a conceptual grounding in marketing theory has become accepted (Andreasen *et al.* 1994; Cornelissen 2002; Levy 2002). The present author would therefore suggest leaving the ‘Pandora’s box’ of the domain question closed (at least in the context of political marketing) and accepting political marketing as an integral part of the many *explananda* of marketing (Hunt 1983).

Value discussions are not grounded. Marketing management in the political sphere needs to be judged and supervised from a moral and ethical point of view, especially with regard to the possible (positive or negative) ramifications for democratic practices. Tendencies towards professionalisation and ‘political management’, increased populism and ‘market-driven’ behaviour by political actors, and expensive and negative campaigning (see S_1 to S_6) make it inevitable that the influence of such factors on the functioning of the political system needs to be assessed and also judged. The widespread use of political marketing management has the potential to change the way our democracy works (Collins and Butler 2003; Lees-Marshment 2001). To understand these implications, it is necessary for value discussions to have a theoretical and ethical framework which can make sense of political marketing management (O’Shaughnessy 2002a). It is the conjecture of S_{11} that we are currently lacking such a framework. Thus, political marketing has no normative instrument or yardstick of its own to assess the *explanandum* in question. Many value discussions do not take into consideration the specific stance of political marketing and its underlying conceptual tenets. Therefore, it is difficult to judge the value of political marketing through more common (deontological) theories of democracy, which see any political marketing management activity as an alien (exogenous) element to politics and are thus possibly somewhat loaded against its usage.

It is remarkable that many marketers have identified this as one of the main research shortcomings of political marketing. There seems to be an understanding in the research community, shared by the present author, that genuine ethical and normative research on political marketing has been neglected, especially by marketing theorists (O’Shaughnessy 2002a). It therefore seems valid to shift the responsibility for some of the shortcomings with regard to discussions

about political marketing (eg S₈ and S₉) on to the level of the theory of political marketing and hope for more involvement in normative discussion *within* political marketing research.

SO WHAT? CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

This discussion has dealt with 11 statements, all critical of political marketing on a practical, as well as research, level. To conclude this discussion, the *advocatus dei* pleads for more time and renewed efforts to find further insights. A recommendation for a beatification of political marketing can certainly not be made in light of the above discussion, but a condemnation as requested by the *advocatus diaboli*, on the grounds of the 11 discussed accusations, can also not be upheld. It has been argued that statements S₁ to S₆, which address the shortcomings of political marketing management, cannot be accepted *in toto*. More fundamental criticism with regard to political marketing research, however, shows some structural shortcomings: not enough rigid and conceptually grounded research has been done, especially with regard to the holistic nature of political marketing and its ethical implications.

It has to be said, however, that each of the 11 statements merit further discussions and that there exist many more valid criticisms of political marketing which have not been touched upon in this paper. Thus, the argument above will hopefully stimulate further discourse by representatives from other disciplines. Political marketing is still somewhat of an 'academic parvenu' (O'Shaughnessy and Henneberg 2002). Fundamental conceptual issues are still unresolved. For example, it is still not clear what impact the use of marketing and managerial concepts might have in and on politics (Harris 2001a). The assumption that there is a distinction between policy making on the one hand and the management of government/politics on the other is seen as somewhat unrealistic (Collins

and Butler 2003) but the interactions and repercussions are more often than not implied, rather than analysed.

Therefore, the critics of political marketing should lose their sometimes exaggerated fear of the impacts of political marketing (Butler and Collins 1999) as well as their grounding in normative reasoning, which in fact transforms the *advocatus diaboli* into a *promotor fidei* ('promoter of the faith', its precise clerical name). A better understanding of political marketing theory through more conceptual discussions, as well as the laying of the foundation for an ethical debate (eg that of O'Shaughnessy 2002a), is needed. Similar considerations in the area of social marketing could lead the way (Brenkert 2002). For example, questions on how far political marketing shifts the system towards plebiscitary democracy (O'Shaughnessy 1989/90) and why this has not happened (yet?) can enrich the critical discourse. To make sure that political marketing research is innovative, more conceptual inventiveness is asked for, fostered by a link with the newest developments in marketing theory and political science. It has to be said that marketers have not always fulfilled this *Bringschuld* ('duty to deliver') of inventiveness in the area of political marketing and should be held responsible for some of the shortcomings exposed in S₇ to S₁₁.

NOTES

- (1) E-mails with a request to state the three to five most serious and/or most commonly heard criticisms of political marketing (its application in politics and also its use as an academic research subject) were sent to around 25 researchers in this area (approximately equal numbers of political scientists and marketers). In addition, a request was circulated via the Political Science Association's Political Marketing Group, thanks to Jennifer Lees-Marshment.
- (2) This categorisation scheme was originally presented at the Political Science Association Conference in London (Henneberg 1995)

and subsequently has been further developed. A simplified version is used here.

- (3) For analytical and managerial definitions of political marketing, see Henneberg (2002), Kotler and Kotler (1999) and Newman (1994).
- (4) Some elements of a service experience have a public goods character. The experience of (and satisfaction with) a trip on an underground train is heavily influenced by the fact that other people are present, 'consuming' the same service. Their influence and behaviour (loud music, overcrowding, body odour, etc) constitutes a public good (mostly of negative utility) which also determines the individual's satisfaction with the overall service (Bitner *et al.* 1997; Swan and Bowers 1998).
- (5) Services nearly always consist of some tangible elements as part of the offering or the delivery (eg the shop of the barber, the plane for the airline). This is often called the 'physical evidence' (Parasumaran *et al.* 1985), another added element of the 7Ps (Zeithaml and Bitner 2003).
- (6) Relevant literature for these concepts:
 - *Market orientation*: Harris, 2002; Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Lafferty and Hult, 2001; Narver and Slater, 1990; for a comprehensive overview of seminal sources see Deshpande 1999.
 - *Relational and network marketing*: for the IMP group, Anderson *et al.* 1994; Leek *et al.* 2003; for a comprehensive overview of seminal sources see Naude and Turnbull 1998; Ford 2001; for CRM, Grönroos 1994; Morgan and Hunt 1994; Sirdeshmukh *et al.* 2002; for a comprehensive overview of seminal sources see Sheth and Parvatiyar (2000) or the special issue of the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 1995; 23(4); for the Nordic School, Gummesson 1996.
- (7) The author's students call this 'doing a Harrop', referring to an article by Martin Harrop (1990) which had already set out most of the main basic tenets of political marketing.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. C., Hakansson, H. and Johanson, J. (1994) 'Dyadic Business Relationships within a

Business Network Context', *Journal of Marketing*, 58: 1–15.

- Anon (2003) 'Speaker Attacks Spin Doctors as 'Nuisance'', *The Independent*, 2nd January: 5.
- Antonides, G. and van Raaij, W. F. (1998) *Consumer Behaviour*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Arndt, J. (1978) 'How Broad Should the Marketing Concept Be?', *Journal of Marketing*, 42: 1001–103.
- Arndt, J. (1982) 'The Conceptual Domain of Marketing: Evaluation of Shelby Hunt's Three Dichotomies Model', *European Journal of Marketing*, 16(1): 27–36.
- Axford, B. and Huggins, R. (2002) 'Political Marketing and the Aestheticisation of Politics: Modern Politics and Postmodern Trends' in, N. J. O'Shaughnessy and S. C. Henneberg (eds), *The Idea of Political Marketing*, 187–207. Westport: Praeger.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1974) 'Marketing as an Organized Behavioral System of Exchange', *Journal of Marketing*, 38: 77–81.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1975) 'Marketing as Exchange', *Journal of Marketing*, 39: 32–9.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1978) 'Marketing as Exchange: A Theory of Transactions in the Marketplace', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 21(4): 535–56.
- Banker, S. (1992) 'The Ethics of Political Marketing Practices, the Rhetorical Perspective', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11: 843–8.
- Bartle, J. and Griffiths, D. (2002) 'Social-Psychological, Economic and Marketing Models of Voting Behaviour Compared', in N. J. O'Shaughnessy and S. C. Henneberg (eds), *The Idea of Political Marketing*, 19–37. Westport: Praeger.
- Berkowitz, D., Allaway, A. and D'Souza, G. (2001) 'The Impact of Differential Lag Effects on the Allocation of Advertising Budgets across Media', *Journal of Advertising Research*, 41(2): 27–36.
- Berry, L. L. (1995) 'Relationship Marketing of Services — Growing Interest, Emerging Perspectives', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4): 236–45.
- Bitner, M. J. (1995) 'Building Service Relationship: It's All About Promises', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4): 2246–51.
- Bitner, M. J., Faranda, W. T., Hubbert, A. R.

- and Zeithaml, V. A. (1997) 'Customer Contributions and Roles in Service Delivery', *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 8(3): 193–205.
- Brady, H. E. and Sniderman, P. M. (1993) 'The Likeability Heuristic', in P. M. Sniderman, R. A. Brody and P. E. Tetlock (eds), *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, 93–119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brenkert, G. G. (2002) 'Ethical Challenges of Social Marketing', *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 21(1): 14–25.
- Brennan, G. and Lomasky, L. (1993) *Democracy and Decision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, P. and Collins, N. (1996) 'Strategic Analysis in Political Markets', *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(10): 25–36.
- Butler, P. and Collins, N. (1999) 'A Conceptual Framework for Political Marketing', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 55–72. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Churchill, G. A. and Suprenant, C. (1982) 'An Investigation into the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19: 491–504.
- Collins, N. and Butler, P. (2003) 'When Marketing Models Clash with Democracy', *Journal of Public Affairs*, 3(1): 52–62.
- Connor, T. (1999) 'Customer-led and Market-oriented: A Matter of Balance', *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 1157–63.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2002) 'Metaphorical Reasoning and Knowledge Generation: The Case of Political Marketing', *Journal of Political Marketing*, 1(1): 193–208.
- D'Souza, G. and Allaway, A. (1995) 'An Empirical Investigation of the Advertising Spending Decisions of a Multiproduct Retailer', *Journal of Retailing*, 71(3): 279–96.
- Deshpande, R. (1999) *Developing a Market Orientation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Egan, J. (1999) 'Political Marketing: Lessons from the Mainstream', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15: 495–503.
- Electoral Commission (2002) 'Election 2001 Campaign Spending', Report, November.
- Enis, B. M. (1973) 'Deepening the Concept of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 37: 57–62.
- Ford, D. (2001) *Understanding Business Marketing and Purchasing*. London: Thomson.
- Fournier, S. and Mick, D. G. (1999) 'Rediscovering Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing*, 63: 5–23.
- Foxall, G. (1984) 'Marketing's Domain', *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(1): 25–40.
- Franklin, B. (1994) *Packaging Politics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Franklin, B. and Richardson, J. E. (2002) 'Priming the Parish Pump: Political Marketing and News Management in Local Political Communications Networks', *Journal of Political Marketing*, 1(1): 117–47.
- Gould J. B. (1999) 'You Can't Teach a Dead Dog New Tricks', in B. I. Newman (ed), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 687–703. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Grönroos, C. (1990) 'Relationship Approach to Marketing in Service Contexts', *Journal of Business Research*, 20: 3–11.
- Grönroos, C. (1994) 'Quo Vadis, Marketing? Toward a Relationship Marketing Paradigm', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10: 347–60.
- Grönroos, C. (1997) 'From Marketing Mix to Relationship Marketing — Towards a Paradigm Shift in Marketing', *Management Decision*, 35(4): 322–39.
- Gummesson, E. (1996) 'Relationship Marketing and Imaginary Organizations: A Synthesis', *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(2): 31–44.
- Harris, P. (2001a) 'Machiavelli, Political Marketing and Reinventing Government', *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(9): 1136–54.
- Harris, P. (2001b) 'To Spin or Not to Spin, That Is the Question: The Emergence of Modern Political Marketing', *The Marketing Review*, 2: 35–53.
- Harris, L. C. (2002) 'Developing Market Orientation: An Exploration of Differences in Management Approaches', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 18: 603–32.
- Harrop, M. (1990) 'Political Marketing', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 43: 277–91.
- Henneberg, S. C. (1995) 'A Theoretical Approach to Categorising Research in Political Marketing', paper presented at the PSA Elections, Public Opinion and Parties Conference, London, 15–17th September.
- Henneberg, S. C. (2002) 'Understanding Political Marketing', in N. J. O'Shaughnessy and S. C.

- Henneberg (eds), *The Idea of Political Marketing*, 93–170. Westport: Praeger.
- Henneberg, S. C. (2005 forthcoming) 'Leading or Following? A Theoretical Analysis of Political Marketing Postures', *Journal of Political Marketing*, 5.
- Herrmann, A. and Huber, F. (1996) 'Candidate-positioning via Customer-orientation: An Empirical Study with Conjoint Analysis', in S. C. Henneberg, N. J. O'Shaughnessy and S. Eghbalian (eds), *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Political Marketing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Himes, D. (1995) 'Strategy and Tactics for Campaign Fund-raising', in J. A. Thurber and C. J. Nelson (eds), *Campaigns and Elections American Style*, 62–77. Westview: Boulder.
- Holbrook, T. M. (1996) *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Holtz-Bacha, C. and Kaid, L. L. (1995) 'A Comparative Perspective on Political Advertising', in L. L. Kaid, C. and C. Holtz-Bacha (eds), *Political Advertising in Western Democracies*, 8–18. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hunt, S. D. (1976) 'The Nature and Scope of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 40: 17–28.
- Hunt, S. D. (1983) 'General Theories and the Fundamental Explananda of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 47: 9–17.
- Hunt, S. D. and Burnett, J. J. (1982) 'The Macromarketing/Micromarketing Dichotomy: A Taxonomical Model', *Journal of Marketing*, 46: 11–26.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992a) *Packaging the Presidency*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992b) *Dirty Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jaworski, J. B. and Kohli, K. A. (1993) 'Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences', *Journal of Marketing*, 57: 53–70.
- Johnson, D. W. (2002) 'Perspectives on Political Consulting', *Journal of Political Marketing*, 1(1): 7–21.
- Jones, N. (1995) *Soundbites and Spin Doctors*. London: Cassell.
- Kaid, L. L. (1991) 'Ethical Dimensions of Political Advertising', in R. E. Denton (ed.), *Ethical Dimensions of Political Communication*, 145–169. New York: Praeger.
- Kaid, L. L. (1999) 'Political Advertising', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 423–438. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kaid, L. L. and Holtz-Bacha, C. (1995) 'Political Advertising across Cultures', in L. L. Kaid and C. Holtz-Bacha (eds), *Political Advertising in Western Democracies*, 206–27. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kavanagh, D. (1995) *Election Campaigning: The New Marketing of Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kohli, A. K. and Jaworski, B. J. (1990) 'Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications', *Journal of Marketing*, 54: 1–18.
- Kotler, P. (1972) 'A Generic Concept of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 36: 46–54.
- Kotler, P. (2003) *Marketing Management*, 11th international ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Kotler, P. and Kotler, N. (1999) 'Political Marketing: Generating Effective Candidates, Campaigns, and Causes', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 3–18. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kotler, P. and Levy, S. J. (1969a) 'Broadening the Concept of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 33: 10–15.
- Kotler, P. and Levy, S. J. (1969b) 'A New Form of Marketing Myopia: Rejoinder to Professor Luck', *Journal of Marketing*, 33: 55–7.
- Lafferty, B. A. and Hult, G. T. (2001) 'A Synthesis of Contemporary Market Orientation Perspectives', *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(1): 92–109.
- Lee, H., Lee, Y. and Yoo, D. (2000) 'The Determinants of Perceived Service Quality and its Relationship with Satisfaction', *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(3): 217–31.
- Leek, S., Naude, P. and Turnbull, P. W. (2003) 'Interactions, Relationships and Networks in a Changing World', *Industrial Marketing Management*, 32: 87–90.
- Lees-Marshment, J. (2001) *Political Marketing and British Political Parties*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Levy, S. J. (2002) 'Revisiting the Marketing Domain', *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(3): 299–304.
- Liao, M.-N., Foreman, S. and Sargeant, A. (2001) 'Market Versus Societal Orientation in the Nonprofit Context', *International Journal of*

- Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(3): 254–68.
- Luck, D. J. (1969) 'Broadening the Concept of Marketing — Too Far', *Journal of Marketing*, 33: 53–5.
- Luck, D. J. (1974) 'Social Marketing: Confusion Compounded', *Journal of Marketing*, 38, 70–72.
- Martin, C. L. (1985) 'Delineating the Boundaries of Marketing', *European Journal of Marketing*, 19(4): 5–12.
- Meinert, D. B., Vitell, S. J. and Reich, R. V. (1993) 'The Domain of Marketing: How Are the Boundaries of the Marketing Discipline Established?', *The Journal of Marketing-Theory and Practice*, 1: 1–12.
- Moloney, K. (2000) 'Nicco and Charlie: A Story of Two Political Servants and of Political Management', in P. Harris, A. Lock and P. Rees (eds), *Machiavelli, Marketing and Management*, 164–174. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, R. M. and Hunt, S. D. (1994) 'The Commitment–Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 58: 20–38.
- Narver, J. and Slater, S. (1990) 'The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability', *Journal of Marketing*, 54: 20–35.
- Naude, P. and Turnbull, P. W. (1998) *Network Dynamics in International Marketing*. Oxford: Pergamon/Elsevier.
- Newman, B. I. (1994) *The Marketing of the President*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Newman, B. I. (1999) *The Mass Marketing of Politics*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Newman, B. I. (2001) 'Image-manufacturing in the USA: Recent US Presidential Elections and Beyond', *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(9): 966–70.
- Newman, B. I. and Sheth, J. N. (1987) *A Theory of Political Choice Behavior*. New York: Praeger.
- Noble, C. H., Sinha, R. K. and Kumar, A. (2002) 'Market Orientation and Alternative Strategic Orientations: A Longitudinal Assessment of Performance Implications', *Journal of Marketing*, 66: 25–39.
- O'Cass, A. (2001) 'Political Marketing', *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(9): 1003–25.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (1989/90) 'Political Marketing: An Ethical Conundrum?', *Irish Marketing Review*, 4(3): 39–48.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (1990) *The Phenomenon of Political Marketing*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (1999) 'Political Marketing and Political Propaganda', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 725–40. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2002a) 'Toward an Ethical Framework for Political Marketing' *Psychology and Marketing*, 19(12): 1079–95.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2002b) 'The Marketing of Political Marketing', in N. J. O'Shaughnessy and S. C. Henneberg (eds), *The Idea of Political Marketing*, 209–20. Westport: Praeger.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2002c) 'The Social Construction of Enmity', *Journal of Political Marketing*, 1(1): 215–22.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. and Henneberg, S. C. (2002) 'Introduction', in N. J. O'Shaughnessy and S. C. Henneberg (eds), *The Idea of Political Marketing*, xi–xx. Westport: Praeger.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. and O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2000) 'Treating the Nation as a Brand: Some Neglected Issues', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 20(1): 56–64.
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. and Wring, D. (1994) 'Political Marketing in Britain', in H. Tam (ed.), *Marketing, Competition and the Public Sector*, 246–70. Harlow: Longman.
- Parasumaran, A., Zeithaml, V. and Berry, I. (1985) 'A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Implications for Future Research', *Journal of Marketing*, 49: 41–50.
- Popkin, S. L. (1994) *The Reasoning Voter*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ritson, M. (2003) 'We Lost our Say over War When Labour Deprioritised Marketing', *Marketing (UK)*, 20th March: 16.
- Scammell, M. (1995) *Designer Politics*. Basingstoke: St Martin's.
- Scammell, M. (1996) 'The Odd Couple: Marketing and Maggie', *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(10): 114–26.
- Scammell, M. (1999) 'Political Marketing: Lessons for Political Science', *Political Studies*, 47: 718–39.
- Seidle, F. L. (1991) *Comparative Issues in Party and Election Finance*, Toronto: Dundurn.
- Sheth, J. N., Gardner, D. M. and Garrett, D. E. (1988) *Marketing Theory: Evolution and Evaluation*. New York: Wiley.

- Sheth, J. N. and Parvatiyar, A. (2000) 'The Evolution of Relationship Marketing', in J. N. Sheth and A. Parvatiyar (eds), *Handbook of Relationship Marketing*, 119–45. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Sirdeshmukh, D., Sing, J. and Sabol, B. (2002) 'Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges', *Journal of Marketing*, 66: 15–37.
- Slater, S. F. and Narver, J. C. (1998) 'Customer-led and Market-oriented: Let's not Confuse the Two', *Strategic Management Journal*, 19: 1001–6.
- Slater, S. F. and Narver, J. C. (1999) 'Market-oriented Is More than Being Customer-led', *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 1165–8.
- Smith, G. (2001) 'The 2001 General Election: Factors Influencing the Brand Image of Political Parties and their Leaders', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17: 989–1006.
- Smith, G. and Saunders, J. (1990) 'The Application of Marketing to British Politics', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 5(3): 307–23.
- Sniderman, P. M., Glaser, J. M. and Griffin, R. (1993a) 'Information and Electoral Choice', in P. M. Sniderman, R. A. Brody and P. E. Tetlock (eds), *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, 164–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sniderman, P. M., Hagen, M. G., Tetlock, P. E. and Brady, H. E. (1993b) 'Reasoning chains', in P. M. Sniderman, R. A. Brody, P. E. Tetlock (eds), *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, 70–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spreng, R. A., MacKenzie, S. C. and Olshavsky, R. W. (1996) 'A Reexamination of the Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing*, 60: 15–32.
- Steen, J. A. (1999) 'Money Doesn't Grow on Trees', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 159–173. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Swan, J. E. and Bowers, M. R. (1998) 'Services Quality and Satisfaction: The Process of People Doing Things Together', *Journal of Services Marketing*, 12(1): 59–72.
- Tse, D. K. and Wilton, P. C. (1988) 'Models of Consumer Satisfaction Formation: An Extension', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25: 204–12.
- van Watershoot, W. and van den Bulte, C. (1992) 'The 4P Classification of the Marketing Mix Revisited', *Journal of Marketing*, 56: 83–93.
- White, J. (1986) 'The Domain of Marketing — Marketing and Non-marketing Exchanges', *The Quarterly Review of Marketing*, 11(2): 1–6.
- Wray, J. H. (1999) 'Money and Politics', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 741–58. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wring, D. (1999) 'The Marketing Colonization of Political Campaigning', in B. I. Newman (ed.), *Handbook of Political Marketing*, 41–54. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wring, D. (2000) 'Machiavellian Communication', in P. Harris, A. Lock and P. Rees (eds), *Machiavelli, Marketing and Management*, 82–92. London: Routledge.
- Zeithaml, V. A.; Bitner, M. J. (2003) *Services Marketing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.