

Bridging Two Schools of Thought: Applications of Public Relations Theory to Political Marketing

Introduction

The use of public relations strategies and tactics are ubiquitous in many areas of political communication, from government news management strategies to candidate or party campaigning and partisan get-out-the vote efforts. In essence, every organized effort to influence public opinion or specific target groups, directly or through the media, involves the use of public relations strategies and tactics.

This is especially evident when considering political campaigning in general and the emerging field of political marketing in particular. Despite the growing influence of public relations, however, little application of public relations theory and research has been integrated into the study of political campaigning and political marketing processes.

That is especially true when it comes to political marketing, a field that builds on a merger between "marketing" and "politics". As such, it is concerned with the application of marketing techniques, strategies and concepts to politics in a broad sense (Henneberg, 2002; O' Cass, 1996; Lees-Marshment, 2001), even though most observers tend to discuss political marketing as related only to political campaigning. Some even seem to conceive of political marketing as the final or the last stage in the evolution or professionalization of political campaigning (Farrell, 1996; Plasser & Plasser, 2002; Farrell & Webb, 2002; Norris, 2000).

Even though it is misleading to conceive of political marketing as an integral part or derivative of the professionalization of political campaigning (Strömbäck, 2005), it is nevertheless clear that any deeper understanding of political marketing must include theories regarding political communication as well as public relations. In a sense, then, political marketing can be viewed as a theory and an academic field in need of theories about political communication in general and public relations in particular.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to bridge two schools of thought and to identify some of the major conceptual perspectives from public relations theory that can be used to better understand and analyze the dynamics of political marketing processes. Specifically, the key perspectives include relationship theory, contingency theory, situational theory of publics and agenda-building theory.

The paper consists of six sections. In the first section, we will synthesize previous research and theory regarding political marketing, with the purpose of defining the dynamics and interrelationships that characterize political marketing. This section will underline the importance of understanding political marketing as a) processes built upon the wants and needs of selected people and groups in society, and b) as exchange processes between a political organization and its different "markets," "arenas," or "publics." In the following four sections, we will review relationship theory, contingency theory, situational theory of publics

and agenda building theory respectively, and analyze their applicability to political marketing. Finally, we will discuss the implications for future research and draw some conclusions.

The essence of political marketing

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the literature about political marketing has grown considerably (Newman, 1994, 1999; Maarek, 1995; Lees-Marshment, 2001; O'Shaughnessy & Henneberg eds., 2002; Wring, 2005; Ormrod, 2004). The first handbook of political marketing was published in 1999 (Newman ed.), and in 2002 the *Journal of Political Marketing* was launched.

However, despite or perhaps due to the fact that political marketing as an academic field has grown so fast, the literature offers several different definitions of political marketing. All agree that political marketing means the application of marketing principles to politics, but whereas some see political marketing as the highest stage in the evolution of political campaigning (Farrell, 1996; Plasser & Plasser, 2002; Farrell & Webb, 2002; Norris, 2000), others see political marketing rather as a distinct form of organizational philosophy.

From a marketing perspective, "the marketing concept holds that the needs of consumers are of primary concern and should be identified, and attempts made to satisfy the identified needs" (O'Cass, 1996, p. 38). Thus, "a market orientation refers to the organization-wide generation of market intelligence, dissemination of the intelligence across departments, and organization-wide responsiveness to it" (Jaworski & Kohli, 1993, p. 53). Accordingly, and in the context of political marketing, Newman (1999, p. xiii) writes that

Political marketing is the application of marketing principles and procedures in political campaigns by various individuals and organizations. The procedures involved include the analysis, development, execution, and management of strategic campaigns by candidates, political parties, governments, lobbyists and interest groups that seek to drive public opinion, advance their own ideologies, win elections, and pass legislation and referenda in response to the needs and wants of selected people and groups in a society.

What is notable in the definitions of marketing in general and political marketing in particular is that marketing essentially is about identifying, responding to and satisfying the needs and wants of selected groups and people in society. Thus, it is not only about political campaigns. Rather, political marketing and market-orientation is about the relationship between political organizations and their voters, key constituencies, target groups and stakeholders. As noted by Lees-Marshment (2004, p. 6), political marketing "is concerned with how political organizations such as political parties understand the demands of those they serve or seek support from, determine their behaviour in response to public wants, and communicate them. It is not, as is often commonly thought, simply about election campaigns, even if marketing

tools such as direct mail, polling and targeting are used in campaigns.” As the kind of campaign an organization runs is a function of the organization, it follows logically that only market-oriented organizations can run market-oriented campaigns.

Thus, there is an important distinction between using marketing techniques on the one hand, and being market-oriented on the other. All kinds of organizations can make use of marketing techniques, but that does not indicate that they are market-oriented. Only political organizations that attempt to discover the wants and needs of their targeted groups and to satisfy those wants and needs can properly be characterized as being market-oriented (cf. Slater & Narver, 1998; Lees-Marshment, 2001; Strömbäck & Nord, 2005; O’Cass, 1996; Lafferty & Hult, 2001; Henneberg & Eghbalian, 2002).

Within the context of political parties – and the same logic applies to other organizations – market-oriented parties can be distinguished from sales- or product-oriented parties (cf. Henneberg, 2002; Henneberg & Eghbalian, 2002; Lees-Marshment, 2001, 2004; Strömbäck, 2005; Nord & Strömbäck, 2003; Wring, 2005). In somewhat simplified terms, the defining characteristic of a *product-oriented party* is that it argues for its own ideas and policies. It assumes that those ideas are superior and that voters will realize this and accordingly vote for it. If such a party does not succeed in an election, it tends to believe that the voters just do not realize that the party’s ideas are the best ones, and it thus refuses to change policies. A *sales-oriented party* is similar to a product-oriented party in that it believes in its own ideas and policies. However, it realizes that those ideas and policies must be ”sold” to the public, and therefore it makes use of marketing techniques to communicate more effectively with its target groups. A sales-oriented party does not change its behavior or policies to give people what they want, but tries to make people want what the party offers. Thus, if the party does not succeed in an election, it attempts to make better use of market intelligence and other marketing techniques, that is, it attempts to become more professionalized in its campaigning.

A *market-oriented party*, in contrast, uses market intelligence to identify voter needs and demands, and design its policies, images and behaviour to *respond* to those wants and needs and to provide voter satisfaction. Thus, it does not attempt to change what people want, but to give people what they want. If a market-oriented party fails in an election, it uses market intelligence to redesign the product, so that it becomes more suited to the wants and needs of targeted groups.

Since political marketing is about identifying, responding to and satisfying the needs and wants of selected groups and people in a society, such an organization logically needs to a) identify its target groups, b) view the relationship with the target groups as dynamic and as a constantly evolving exchange process, c) use the marketing tools that are available, and d) keep track of its most important competitors and their behaviours.

Moreover, a market-oriented organization must also realize that their target groups are located in different arenas or markets. Regarding political parties, they are active on at least four different arenas, each accompanied by its primary actors and its strategic party goals (Sjöblom, 1968; Nord, 1997; Nord & Strömbäck, 2003; Strömbäck, 2005). The four basic arenas are the *parliamentary arena*, the *electoral arena*, the *internal arena* and the *media arena*. The primary actors on the parliamentary arena are the members of parliament from different parties, and the strategic goal is to maximize the parliamentary influence. On the electoral arena, the primary actors are the voters, and the strategic goal is to maximize voter support. The strategic goal for the internal arena is to maximize internal cohesion, and the primary actors are the members and the activists of the party. Finally, on the media arena, the strategic goal is to maximize positive publicity. The primary actors are journalists, editors and gatekeepers within the media (see further Strömbäck, 2005). One can also, as do Kotler and Kotler (1999), speak of five different markets that candidates face in organizing political campaigns: the media, voters, contributors, party organization, and, finally, interest groups, issue activists and organized constituencies.

Whether one prefers to speak of different markets or different arenas, or focus on candidate- or party-centered political systems, matters less in this context than the fact that the multiplicity of arenas or markets creates strategic dilemmas for the organizations. If, or rather when, the wants and needs of different target groups on different arenas are not compatible, how shall the organization act? Which target groups should it give priority? Which wants and needs should it try to satisfy? Are there ways to meet some wants and needs of some target groups without alienate other target groups and their wants and needs?

These questions do not have any universal answers. Instead, they are a reminder that political marketing processes should be viewed as dynamic and constantly evolving exchange processes between an organization and its target groups or publics. They also point to the fact that there is always room for the exercise of leadership, and that being market-oriented does not necessarily mean that the organizations slavishly follow the opinions of any pre-determined group of people. As emphasized by Slater and Narver (1998) in the context of business management, being ‘customer-led’ is not the same as being ‘market-oriented’. People do not have only expressed but also latent wants and needs, and according to Slater and Narver (p. 1002),

The first, being ‘customer-led’, is a short-term philosophy in which organizations respond to customers’ expressed wants. The second, being ‘market-oriented’, represents a long-term commitment to understanding customer needs – both expressed and latent – and to developing innovative solutions that produce superior customer value.

At times, market intelligence might reveal that both expressed and latent needs can be addressed simultaneously, but at other times, they may be contradictory. The same logic applies to political marketing and the needs and wants of voters, key constituencies, stakeholders and members. That leaves plenty of room for political leadership, and it is also a reminder of the importance of long-term perspectives and strategies.

To sum up: political marketing is an exchange process by which political organizations choose to build their actions and their products upon the needs and wants among chosen target groups, in a manner seeking to balance the strategic goals on several different arenas or markets. In the case of political parties, the product consists of four core components: policy commitments, party image, leadership image and a mindset of voter-centredness (cf. Wring, 2005; O’Cass, 1996; Lees-Marshment, 2004). Among others, their target groups include their members, key constituencies in the electorate, interest groups, donors and the media.

In case of political organizations other than parties, the electoral arena is obviously not important, since such organizations are not seeking electoral support in the elections. In such cases, the electoral arena might be substituted by an *opinion arena*, since all political organizations need to find support in the court of public opinion. The strategic goal would then be to maximize support in the public opinion, and the primary actors on that opinion arena would be members of the citizenry.

From this backdrop, it is clear that political marketing and public relations are closely related, and that political marketing *as a professional practice* hardly can do without making use of public relations strategies and techniques. Thus, *as an academic field of research*, political marketing would benefit from an integration of public relations theory and research. Four public relations theories—relationship theory, contingency theory, situational theory of publics and agenda-building theory – should be of particular interest to scholars and practitioners in political marketing.

Relationship Theory

Relationship theory in public relations offers insight into the relationship between organizations and their public as first advocated by Ferguson (1984). Prior approaches to evaluating success in public relations consisted primarily of measuring the short-term, immediate results of a public relations program (outputs) or assessing the impact the program had on a target audience (outcomes) and dealt primarily with one-way models of public relations. Relationship theory acknowledges a two-way model of public relations (Ferguson, 1984; Dozier, Grunig, & Grunig, 1995; Huang, 1999; Ledingham, 2001). This relationship approach is vital to the concept of political marketing on multiple levels. Relationship theory clearly has the potential to help understand the how political efforts can work to identify, respond to and satisfy the needs of target groups. In addition, further relationship theory

research has stressed the quality of the relationships between an organization and its publics as an indication of public relations effectiveness (Dozier, Grunig, & Grunig, 1995; Huang, 1999).

Sallot, Lyon, Acosta-Alzuru, and Jones (2003) extended Ferguson's (1984) research indicating the need for more research in the area of relationship theory. Ledingham (2001) has further developed the relationship perspective by suggesting a theory of relationship management that states "effectively managing organization-public relationships around *common interests* and *shared goals*, over time, results in mutual understanding and benefit for interacting organizations and publics [emphasis added]" (p. 190). Ledingham believed that relationship management could serve as a useful framework for organizing both academic and applied endeavors in public relations. This connects to efforts in the application of political marketing to understanding the relationship between political organizations, voters, donors, volunteers and other key constituencies.

Ferguson (1984) proposed several dichotomous dimensions that would help categorize relationships, including: dynamic/static, open/closed, and satisfactory/unsatisfactory. She also indicated that there are numerous other variables that would be useful in describing relationships, including the degree to which each party feels it has control over the relationship, the amount of power possessed by each party in the relationship, perception of shared goals, as well as understanding, agreement and consensus.

Additional studies have sought to explicate the relationship concept through identification of relational dimensions. Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (1997) stressed a need for a common definition of the term relationship in order to facilitate the identification of descriptive dimensions. In their opinion what exactly is meant by relationship would hinder scholars from measuring the actual relationship between an organization and its publics and instead continue to focus on indirect means of measurement that would only allow inferences about the relationship to be made. Thus Broom et al. stated:

The formation of relationships occurs when parties have perceptions and expectations of each other, when one or both parties need resources from the other, when one or both parties perceive mutual threats from an uncertain environment, and when there is either a legal or voluntary necessity to associate...Relationships are the dynamic results of the exchanges and reciprocity that manifest themselves as the relationships develop and evolve, but they can be described at a given point in time (p. 95).

Public relations researchers have further explicated the defining dimensions of relationships within the literature in order to facilitate measurement of the construct. Ledingham and Bruning (1998) utilized Wood's (1995) relational dimensions of trust, openness, involvement, investment and commitment, concluding that a organization-public relationship positively

evaluated using these variables illustrates the value of a quality relationship to an organization's bottom-line and can be used to illustrate the effectiveness of public relations. These are all points which can be viewed as relevant to the framework of political marketing.

More specifically, Ledingham (2001) used the Bruning-Ledingham Relationship Scale to assess the public's perceptions of relationship quality between community leaders and citizens in a suburb of a major Midwest metropolitan center. Initially developed in Bruning and Ledingham (1999), in this context the scale provided additional support for the relational perspective and offered several observations for managing organization-public relationships, including the need for identifying common points of interest between organizations and publics.

Other studies have focused on likely relational dimensions such as openness, trust, involvement, investment, and commitment (Ledingham, Bruning, Thomlison, & Lesko, 1997). Hon and Grunig (1999) developed quantitative measurement scales for assessing six proposed dimensions of an organization-public relationship: control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationships, and communal relationships. These scales have proven to be "good measures of perceptions of relationships, strong enough to be used in evaluating relationships" (p. 5). Incorporating such measures to the study and practice of political campaigning and political marketing can be a significant contribution to our understanding of the process.

Contingency Theory

The contingency theory of accommodation in public relations posits that the practice of public relations moves on a continuum from total advocacy for an organization or client to total accommodation of a public (Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, & Mitrook, 1997; Cameron, 1997; Cancel, Mitrook & Cameron, 1999; Cameron, Cropp & Reber, 2001; Reber, Cropp & Cameron, 2003). Between the two extremes are a range of different degrees of advocacy and accommodation. The different degrees of advocacy and accommodation in the continuum represent many different roles that an organization will assume at any given time when dealing with an individual public (Cameron, 1997). This continuum differs from Grunig & Hunt's (1984) exclusive categorization found in the four models of communication in which public relations is practiced (p. 285). Cancel et al. (1999) argue that the contingency theory of accommodation works to capture the complexity and multiplicity of the public relations environment thus serving as "an alternative to the normative theory of excellence in public relations based on the two-way symmetrical model" (p. 31). In doing so a matrix of variables has been identified that might affect an organization's stance toward a specific public.

Contingency theory conceptually integrates with the view that political marketing processes are dynamic and constantly evolving exchange processes between an organization and its target groups or publics. Contingency does this in part by using a matrix of variables

including variables affecting public relations practice and organizational factors (i.e. top management, public relations department, organizational culture, etc.). Therefore contingency theory offers knowledge and understanding of the value of accommodating or advocating publics when an organization is faced with conflict.

Contingency theory studies 86 factors or variables (Cancel et al., 1999). These factors include both external and internal variables. These variables affect where an organization positions itself on the continuum when faced with different publics during a conflict. Contingency theory does not assess the outcome of the situation, but rather the decisions leading to the stance of the organization toward a particular public (Cancel et al., 1999). In addition, contingency theory works to sort out clusters of activity and techniques that may serve as models from the strategic position taken by an organization (Reber, Cropp, & Cameron, 2003). This works to further understand the potential combination of techniques that may be used in a given situation leading to movement along the continuum from advocacy to accommodation.

Earlier contingency theory work (Cancel et al. 1997; Cameron, 1997; Cancel, Mitrook & Cameron, 1999; Cameron, Cropp & Reber, 2001) found the advocacy/accommodation continuum to be a valid representation of the subjects and their organization's interactions with external publics. Accommodation with external publics depends on how close (or far) an organization's predisposing variables are from pure accommodation on the continuum. Predisposing variables are defined as variables "which have their greatest influence on an organization by helping to shape the organization's predisposition towards relations with external publics" (Cancel et al., 1999, p. 177).

Also involved in the process are situational variables (i.e., variables that are "specific and often changing dynamics at work during particular situations involving an organization and an external public") that also "influence how an organization shifts its stance towards an external public as the situation plays out" (Cancel et al., 1999, p. 177)).

Further contingency theory research has worked on grouping variables from the original matrix into proscriptive variables that "limit, prevent, preclude or prohibit any degree of accommodation by an organization of a given public at a given time" (Cameron, Cropp & Reber, 2001, p. 247). These proscriptive variables add parsimony to the theory by establishing rules affecting a stance toward a public at a particular time (Reber, Cropp, & Cameron, 2003).

The six proscriptive variables suggested by Cameron et al. (2001) are: (1) moral conviction (where public relations practitioners act in the best interest of all parties); (2) multiple publics (when two publics are opposed on the issue and one public wants the organization to accommodate on its demands); (3) regulatory constraints (when two organizations may not be allowed to engage in collaboration or dialogue because of state or federal laws); (4) management pressure (when management does not allow public relations practitioners accommodate their publics because doing so would strain organizational

resources); (5) jurisdictional issues (turf battles between departments within an organization may preclude accommodative or adversarial stance toward departments); and (6) legal constraints (when accommodation may be legally prohibited under anti-trust laws).

In addition, Reber and Cameron (2003) found support for public relations practitioners affirming the notion of bridge building as a primary goal for public relations. Within this context they focused on five theoretical constructs: external threats; external public characteristics; organizational characteristics; public relations department characteristics; and dominant coalition characteristics. Both the six proscriptive variables and the more recent five theoretical constructs of contingency theory within the context of political marketing, may help to understand said process within a crisis environment.

Situational Theory of Publics

Grunig's situational theory of publics offers a critical conceptual perspective for predicting the communication behavior of target publics (Grunig, & Hunt, 1984; Grunig, 1989). The essence of the theory is that by effectively anticipating the communication behavior of members in stakeholder groups, public relations professionals can segment target publics and be strategic in their choices of how to best communicate with them. The application to political marketing, of course, lies in identifying strategies for how best to communicate with and receive feedback from voters, donors, volunteers, parties, activists, and other key constituencies (i.e. market intelligence). This can be used for a variety of goals, such as crisis communication, voter mobilization, and fund raising.

The three principal independent variables in the theory are problem recognition, constraint recognition, and involvement (Aldoory, 2001; Grunig, 1988; Roser & Thompson, 1995). The first variable deals with the extent to which members of a target public believe an issue is a problem. The second variable concerns the extent to which members of a target public perceive there are obstacles impeding their ability to act on an issue. Finally, involvement entails how personally connected members of a target public feel towards an issue or problem.

These three independent variables are used to predict two types of communication behavior among key publics: information processing and information seeking (Grunig & Ipes, 1983; Slater, Chipman, Auld, Keefe, & Kendall, 1992). Information processing is defined as passively paying attention to messages regarding a particular issue. When paying attention, the processing of information is likely to be superficial and sporadic. Information seeking, on the other hand, involves paying careful attention to messages. It also entails actively looking for information concerning a particular issue. In short, information seekers are more likely to communicate about particular issues, as well as receive messages about them.

Based on situational theory, stakeholder groups can be classified as nonpublics, latent publics, aware publics, and active publics (Grunig, 1982). The core theoretical propositions

made in situational theory are that higher levels of problem recognition and involvement are linked with information processing. In contrast, lower levels of constraint recognition are associated with information processing. Thus, individuals most likely to actively communicate about issues are those who perceive a situation is a problem, feel they have power to do something about it, and believe it is of great personal concern to them. Beyond predicting communication behavior, situational theory also posits that information seekers are more likely to develop cognitions, opinions, and actions in response to issues discussed in messages (Hamilton, 1992).

Several studies have offered support for the basic expectations outlined by situational theory (e.g., Aldoory, 2001; Cameron, 1992; Heath, Liao, & Douglas, 1995; Major, 1993; Grunig & Hunt, 1984). It also has proven compatible with other theoretical perspectives centered on communication behavior and message strategy, such as cognitive-response and protection-motivation theory (Roser & Thompson, 1995; Slater et al., 1992). The robustness of situational theory has been tested in multiple contexts, including environmental communication (e.g., Major, 1993), health communication (Grunig & Childers, 1988), and consumer respons (Slater et al. (1992). Relevant to this project, Hamilton (1992)'s study of the 1990 Kansas gubernatorial race not only found evidence supporting situational theory's predictions of communication behavior, but also noted relationships between its independent variables and the demographic traits of target public members. A similar pattern was evident in Major's (1998) analysis of public response to risk associated with earthquakes. Aldoory (2001) also emphasized the need for additional research on gender and situational theory.

Consequently, when combined with demographic data, situational theory variables can serve as vital framework for political marketing professionals in segmenting stakeholder groups for determining appropriate communication strategy. For example, this can drive decisions for selecting effective communication channels during campaigns. As Major (1998) writes:

information seeking has generally been defined as interpersonal discussion and specialized booklets or pamphlets that tend to provide more problem-specific information. In contrast, information-processing behavior is a causal process and 'often takes place randomly,' by attending to news media sources including television, newspaper, and radio (p. 493).

In sum, Grunig's situational theory of publics has important implications for the field of political marketing.

Agenda-Building Theory

In contrast to the three previous public relations perspectives, agenda-building theory has received some scholarly attention in political marketing and political communication contexts.

While traditional agenda-setting has concentrated on the transfer of object salience (e.g., issues, organizations, candidates, etc.) from the media to the public, the broader concept of agenda-building views the process of salience formation as one of mutual interdependency among policymakers, news media, and the public. From an agenda-building perspective, the primary role of political public relations is in shaping the media agenda, although it is crucial to recognize its contribution to image management, internal party communications, and government information management (McNair, 1995).¹ Political public relations efforts contribute to the media agenda through the use of information subsidies in the form of news releases, debates, press conferences, interviews, and so forth (e.g., Gandy, 1982; Turk, 1986). Of these, news releases have been the most widely scrutinized.

Kaid (1976), for instance, examined the influence of campaign news releases on media coverage of congressional elections in Michigan. Through content analysis, her findings revealed that releases played a central role in shaping news coverage. In fact, the information in news content was often run exactly as it appeared in public relations materials. In assessing the effectiveness of different message strategies, she observed that news releases including personal information and campaign announcements were covered more frequently than those mentioning issues.

In more recent research, Lancendorfer and Lee (2003) observed that the salience of issues in campaign news releases in the 2002 Michigan gubernatorial race influenced news coverage of issues during the campaign. Evatt and Bell (1994) detected similar relationships during the 1994 Texas gubernatorial election, but reported that certain candidates are more effective in impacting the media agenda than others. Thus, agenda-building offers a noteworthy perspective in understanding how political candidates and campaigns may gain strategic advantages over one another during elections, a crucial process in political marketing.

While much of the agenda-building research has focused on the relationship between political public relations efforts and news media, an understudied, but equally critical relationship, is the linkage between political public relations and public opinion (Tedesco, 2001). To date, few studies have explored such associations, but there are exceptions. Walters, Walters, and Gray (1996) compared news releases prepared by the Bush and Clinton campaigns during the 1992 presidential election with levels of perceived issue salience among voters and discovered a stronger association for Clinton's than Bush's materials. Notably, they found that the Clinton campaign was more effective by matching their public relations messages with what the public already perceived as important rather than shaping the public agenda. In a study of the 2002 Florida gubernatorial election, Kiouisis, Mitrook, Wu, and

¹ For purposes of our discussion, the focus regarding agenda-building here is on public relations, though it is important to acknowledge the volume of literature focusing on other aspects of this process.

Seltzer (2004) also observed a strong linkage between the salience of issues in news releases from the two major candidates and the public agenda. Future research exploring the influence of political public relations efforts on the public agenda is needed to enhance our understanding of the broader relationship between political campaigns and public opinion.

In addition to connections with news media and public opinion, recent research on agenda-building has also suggested that campaigns may influence one another through their public relations efforts. More specifically, Tedesco (2005a) found that the salience of issues in campaign news releases among candidates during the 2004 Democratic presidential primaries were highly associated. Similar to Evatt and Bell's (1994) observation regarding impact on the media agenda, he found that certain candidates gain an advantage in terms of defining the campaign agenda for other candidates. Not limited to primaries, evidence for intercandidate agenda-setting was also gleaned during the 2004 presidential election between the Bush and Kerry campaigns (Tedesco, 2005b). While most of the evidence showed reciprocal influence between the campaigns, at certain points in time, each candidate was able to shape the agenda of the other. A major implication of such research is that it offers an innovative approach for assessing the effectiveness of political public relations messages beyond simple media placements and public opinion impact.

Whereas the traditional focus of agenda-building research has been on the salience of issues or other "objects" (e.g., organizations, products, and so forth), the contemporary explication of second-level agenda-setting, which links the process to framing, additionally proposes that studying the salience of attributes merits further scholarly attention (McCombs, 2004; Wanta, Golan, & Lee, 2004). An attribute can be conceptualized as a property, quality, or characteristic that describes an object. The use of object here is consistent with the use of an attitude object in psychology. A growing body of research has begun examining the role of attribute salience in second-level agenda-building.

Tedesco (2001), for example, found that news releases from presidential candidates during the 2000 presidential election were not only associated with the salience of issues in media content, but the salience of attributes as well. In particular, stronger correlations between the campaign and media agendas emerged for the salience of audience strategy frames (e.g., conservative, liberal, independent, etc.) than for campaign process frames (e.g., polls, debates, speeches, etc.). Elsewhere, Kioussis et al. (2004) found evidence of public relations influence on the salience of substantive (issue position, biographical information, qualifications, personality, and integrity) and affective attributes (positive, neutral, and negative tone) in news media content and public opinion regarding political candidates. By incorporating attribute salience into models of agenda-building, future research can more precisely understand the nuances in the discourse among political campaigns, news media content, and public opinion. Such knowledge can contribute significantly to the study and practice of political marketing.

Discussion

The emergence of political marketing as a professional field of activity can at least partly be explained by the changing relationship between political organizations and citizens in advanced postindustrial democracies. When Lazarsfeld *et al.* summarized their findings in "The People's Choice" about sixty years ago (1944/1965), they concluded that "The first thing to say is that some people *were* converted by the campaign propaganda but that they *were few indeed*" (p. 94). This was a time when, generally speaking and as compared with the present situation, people had stronger party identification, when electoral volatility and political distrust was lower, when people had more respect for authorities and when the media coverage was characterized by compliance rather than sceptical questioning of politicians and their actions and motives (cf. Dalton & Wattenberg eds., 2000; Dalton, 2002; Klingemann & Fuchs eds., 1995; Pharr & Putnam eds., 2000; Nye, Zelikow & King eds., 1997).

Since this situation is no longer, political organizations have to try harder than their predecessors to win support and trust. Accordingly, the stakes are much higher, and all political organizations need to develop strategies to respond to the changing environment and to build sustainable relationships with stakeholders and internal as well as external key constituencies.

Becoming market-oriented is one such strategy, which emphasizes the importance of market intelligence and of responsiveness to the wants and needs of stakeholders and key constituencies both internal and external. These can be found within the internal arena, the media arena, the electoral (or opinion) arena and the parliamentary arena. However, even if political marketing as an academic field of research recognizes the importance of building long-term relationships, gathering and making use of market intelligence and responding to the wants and needs of key constituencies, to name just a few examples, it suffers from a lack of a thorough understanding of modern public relations theories.

Four theories that have been discussed in this paper which should be of particular interest to scholars and practitioners in political marketing are relationship theory, situational theory of publics, contingency theory and agenda-building. For example, relationship theory emphasizes the importance of building long-term relationships around common interests and shared goals, which is necessary to any market-oriented organization that needs to be trusted in its attempts to respond to the wants and needs of target groups and key constituencies. Research on relationship theory has also developed measurements of, for example, the perceptions of relationship quality and dimensions of organization-public relation such as commitment, trust, control mutuality and satisfaction. This work could inform market-oriented political organizations such as parties in their efforts to develop and measure the quality of their relationships with key constituencies.

Similarly, contingency theory integrates with the view that political marketing processes are dynamic and constantly evolving exchange processes between an organization and its target groups, publics or key constituencies, and it offers knowledge and understanding with regards to the value of accommodating or advocating publics when conflicts are present or evolving. This is particularly true since the wants and needs can be both expressed and latent, and there may be conflicts between the wants and needs of different stakeholders within or external to the organization. In such situations there are no easy solutions; however, theory and research on contingency theory can help guide the leadership of market-oriented political organizations in their efforts to strike a balance between different wants and needs as well as different stakeholders within different arenas.

The situational theory of publics is also essential to market-oriented organizations, for example with regards to gathering and using market intelligence. In attempting to understand and differentiate between expressed and latent wants and needs, it is crucial to understand whether the stakeholder groups or key constituencies should be classified as nonpublics, latent publics, aware publics, and active publics. For example, as active and aware publics are more likely to communicate with the organizations, the expressed wants and needs of those publics may mistakenly be taken as the wants and needs of a larger population, which might lead the organization to a poor understanding of the latent wants and needs of groups that might be larger and additionally equally or more important for the organizations' long-term goals. By identifying different publics, the market-oriented organization could also turn latent publics into aware or active publics, thus building new or stronger relationships with potentially important stakeholder or target groups.

With regards to the wants and needs of target groups or key constituencies, however, it is important to recognize that they are not static. This is one reason that attempting to satisfy only the expressed wants and needs would be shortsighted. Instead, the wants and needs are dynamic, and highly susceptible to perceptions of the pseudo-environment (Lippman, 1997). Research on framing (Entman, 2004; Schnell & Callaghan eds., 2005) as well as the first and second levels of agenda-setting (McCombs, 2004; Weaver, McCombs & Shaw, 2004) has clearly shown that the media have considerable power in shaping people's perceptions of issues, events, organizations and other "objects", and these perceptions shape the wants and needs of different groups both directly and indirectly. Thus, any market-oriented organization needs to take the role and the power of the media into consideration. By doing that and being proactive in the building of media agendas, the market-oriented political organization does not have to be a victim of agendas – and the wants and needs that subsequently will be expressed – shaped by competitors. Instead, by incorporating and drawing on lessons from agenda-building theory, it can enhance its skills in actively building agendas. This, in turn, might lead people to focus their wants and needs on issues where the political organization is strong and credible.

Conclusions

As the discussion above suggests, political marketing both as a professional field of activity and an academic field of research would truly benefit from a broader and deeper understanding of modern public relations theories. This is not to say that political marketing is all about campaigning or public relations in the rather superficial way it is too often understood as outside of the field. As this paper has shown, modern public relations theories emphasize the importance of building long-term relationships between organizations and their publics. Thus, modern public relations can and should not be reduced to certain public relations activities such as staging pseudo-events or writing press releases, just as being market-oriented should not be reduced to certain marketing techniques such as polling or direct mail. Public relations is fundamentally about an organization and its relationships with different publics, just as political market-orientation is fundamentally about a political organization and its relationships with the primary actors and stakeholder groups within and outside of the organization, combined with a long-term commitment to satisfying their expressed and latent wants and needs.

In other words: Political marketing as a professional field of activity and an academic field of research would benefit from a broader and deeper understanding of modern public relations theories just because it is not only about campaigning and as both schools of thought essentially concern building and maintaining long-term relationships.

This paper is a first attempt to bridge these two schools of thought and analyze applications of public relations theory to political marketing. As such, it should be perceived as an invitation to further theoretical analysis and empirical research that integrates political marketing and public relations theories. As professional fields of activity, the importance of public relations and political marketing will likely increase; thus, as scholars, we should attempt to keep pace.

References

- Aldoory, L. (2001). Making health communications meaningful for women: Factors that influence involvement. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13, 163-185.
- Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a concept and theory of organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 9 (2), 83-98.
- Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (1999). Relationships between organizations and publics: Development of a multi-dimensional organization-public relationship scale. *Public Relations Review*, 25 (2), 157-170.
- Callaghan, K. & Schnell, F. (eds) (2005). *Framing American Politics*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.
- Cameron, G.T. (1992). Memory for investor relations messages: An informational-processing

- study of Grunig's situational theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 4, 45-60.
- Cameron, Glen T. (1997). "The Contingency Theory of Conflict Management in Public Relations," *Proceedings of the Norwegian Information Service*, Oslo, Norway.
- Cancel A.E., Cameron, G.T., Sallot, L., Mitrook, M.A. (1997). It Depends: A Contingency Theory of Accommodation in Public Relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 9, 31-63.
- Cancel A.E., Mitrook, M.A., Cameron, G.T. (1999). Testing the Contingency Theory of Accommodation in Public Relations. *Public Relations Review*, 25, 171-197.
- Dalton, R. J. (2002). *Citizen Politics. Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Third Edition. New York: Chatham House.
- Dalton, R. J. & Wattenberg, M. P. (eds) (2000). *Parties without Partisans. Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dozier, D. M., Grunig, L. A., & Grunig, J. E. (1995). *Manager's guide to excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Entman, R. M. 2004. *Projections of Power. Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Evatt, D. S., & Bell, T. (1995, August). *The political dance: A test of agenda-setting effects in the 1994 Texas gubernatorial election*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, DC.
- Farrell, D. M. (1996). Campaign Strategies and Tactics. In LeDuc, L., Niemi, R. G. & Norris, P. (eds.). *Comparing Democracies. Elections and Voting in Global Perspective*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Farrell, D. M. & Webb, P. (2000). Political Parties as Campaign Organisations. In Dalton, R. J. & Wattenberg, M. P. (eds.). *Parties without Partisans. Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, M. A. (1984, August). *Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships as a public relations paradigm*. Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Convention, Gainesville, FL.
- Gandy, O. H. (1982). *Beyond agenda setting: Information subsidies and public policy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Grunig, J. (1989). Sierra club study shows who becomes activists. *Public Relations Review*, 15, 3-24.
- Grunig, J. (1988). Communication by agricultural publics. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65, 26-38.
- Grunig, J. (1982). The message-attitude-behavior relationship: Communication behavior of organizations. *Communication Research*, 9, 163-200.
- Grunig, J., & Childers, L. (1988, July). *Reconstruction of a situational theory of communication: Internal and external concepts as identifiers of publics for AIDS*.

- Paper presented to Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Portland, OR.
- Grunig, J., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehard, & Winston.
- Grunig, J., & Ipses, D.A. (1983). The anatomy of a campaign against drunk driving. *Public Relations Review*, 9, 36-52.
- Hamilton, P.K. (1992). Grunig's situational theory: A replication, application, and extension. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 4, 123-149.
- Heath, R.L., Liao, S.H., & Douglas, W. (1995). Effects of perceived economic harms and benefits on issue involvement, use of information sources, and actions: A study of risk communication. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 7, 89-109.
- Henneberg, S. C. M. (2002). Understanding Political Marketing. In O'Shaughnessy, N. J. & Henneberg, S. C. M. (eds). *The Idea of Political Marketing*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. Gainesville, FL: Institute for Public Relations.
- Huang, Y. (1999, May). *The effects of public relations strategies on conflict management*. Paper presented at the 49th annual conference of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.
- Jaworski, B. J. & Kohli, A. K. (1993). Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Marketing* vol. 57, July 1993.
- Kaid, L. L. (1976). Newspaper treatment of a candidate's news releases. *Journalism Quarterly*, 53, 135-157.
- Kiousis, S., Mitrook, M., Wu, X., & Seltzer, T. (2004). *First- and second-level agenda-building and agenda-setting effects: Exploring the linkages among candidate news releases, media coverage, and public opinion during the 2002 Florida gubernatorial election*. Paper presented to Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Toronto, Canada.
- Klingemann, H-D. & Fuchs, D. (eds) (1995). *Citizens and the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kohli, A. K. & Jaworski, B. J. (1990). Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications. *Journal of Marketing* vol. 54, April 1990.
- Kotler, P. & Kotler, N. (1999): Political Marketing: Generating Effective Candidates, Campaigns, and Causes. In Newman, B. I. (eds): *Handbook of Political Marketing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lafferty, B. A. & Hult, G. T. M. (2001). A synthesis of contemporary market orientation perspectives. *European Journal of Marketing* vol. 36, no. 1/2.
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). *Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research*. New York: Springer.

- Lancendorfer, K.M., & Lee, B. (2003). *Agenda building and the media: A content analysis of the relationships between the media in the 2002 Michigan Governor's race*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City, MO.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B. & Gaudet, H. (1965). *The People's Choice. How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ledingham, J. A. (2001). Government-community relationships: extending the relational theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 27, 285-295.
- Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management in public relations: Dimensions of an organization-public relationship. *Public Relations Review*, 24 (1), 55-65.
- Ledingham, J. A., Bruning, S. D., Thomlison, T. D., & Lesko, C. (1997). The transferability of interpersonal relationship dimensions into an organizational setting. *Academy of Managerial Communications Journal*, 1, 23-43.
- Lees-Marshment, J. (2001). *Political marketing and British political parties. The party's just begun*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Lees-Marshment, J. (2004). *Political Marketing – the Key to Electoral Success or the Cause of Democratic Turmoil?* Sundsvall: Centre for Political Communication Research.
- Lippman, W. (1997). *Public Opinion*. New York: Free Press.
- Maarek, P. J. (1995): *Political Marketing and Communication*. Guildford: John Libbey.
- Major, A.M. (1998). The utility of situational theory of publics for assessing public response to disaster prediction. *Public Relations Review*, 24, 489-508.
- Major, A.M. (1993). Environmental concern and situational communication theory: Implications for communicating with environmental publics. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 5, 251-268.
- McCombs, M. (2004). *Setting the agenda: The mass media and public opinion*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- McNair, B. (1995). *An introduction to political communication*. London: Routledge.
- Newman, B. I. (1994). *The Marketing of the President. Political Marketing as Campaign Strategy*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Newman, B. I. (1999a). *The Mass Marketing of Politics. Democracy in an Age of Manufactured Images*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Newman, B. I. (1999b). Preface. In Newman, B. I. (ed.): *Handbook of Political Marketing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Newman, B. I. (ed.) (1999). *Handbook of Political Marketing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Nord, L. (1997). *Spelet om opinionen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Nord, L. & Strömbäck, J. (2003). *Valfeber och nyhetsfrossa. Politisk kommunikation i*

- valrörelsen 2002*. Stockholm: Sellin & Partner.
- Norris, P. (2000). *The Virtuos Circle – Political Communication in Postindustrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O’Cass, A. (1996). Political marketing and the marketing concept. *European Journal of Marketing* vol. 30, no 10/11.
- Ormrod, R. P. (2004). *Operationalising the Conceptual Model of Political Market Orientation*. Sundsvall: Centre for Political Communication Research.
- O’Shaughnessy, N. J. & Henneberg, S. C. M. (eds.) (2002): *The Idea of Political Marketing*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Pharr, S. J. & Putnam, R. D. (eds) (2000). *Disaffected Democracies. What’s Troubling the Trilateral Countries?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Plasser, F. & Plasser, G. (2002). *Global Political Campaigning. A Worldwide Analysis of Campaign Professionals and Their Practices*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Reber, B. H., & Cameron, G. T. (2003). Measuring contingencies: Using scales to measure public relations practitioner limits to accommodation, *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 80 (2). 431-446.
- Reber, B.H., Cropp, F., Cameron, G.T. (2003). Impossible Odds: Contributions of Legal Counsel and Public Relations Practitioners in a Hostile bid for Conrail Inc. by Norfolk Southern Corporation. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 15 (1), p. 1-25.
- Roser, C., & Thompson, M. (1995). Fear appeals and the formation of active publics. *Journal of Communication*, 45, 103-121.
- Sallot, L.M., Lyon, L. J., Acosta-Alzuru, C., & Jones, K. O. (2003). From aardvark to zebra: A new millennium analysis of theory development in public relations academic journals. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 15 (1), 27-90.
- Sjöblom, G. (1968). *Party Strategies in a Multiparty System*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Slater, M.D, Chipman, H., Auld, G., Keefe, T., & Kendall, P. (1992). Information processing and situational theory: A cognitive response analysis. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 4, 189-203.
- Slater, S. F. & Narver, J. C. (1998). Customer-Led and Market-Oriented: Let’s Not Confuse the Two. *Strategic Management Journal* 19.
- Strömbäck, J. (2005). *Professionalized Campaigning and Political Marketing: Two Sides of the Same Coin or Two Different Concepts?*. Paper presented at the 17th Nordic Conference for Media and Communication Research, Aalborg, Denmark.
- Strömbäck, J. & Nord, L. (2005). *Political Marketing: The Road to Electoral Success or to Electoral Backlash?* Paper presented at the PSA Political Marketing Group Conference ”Political Marketing and the UK Election: Reaching the political consumer”, London, UK.

- Tedesco, J. (2005a). Intercandidate agenda setting in the 2004 presidential primary. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 92-113.
- Tedesco, J. (2005b). Issue and strategy agenda setting in the 2004 presidential election: Exploring the candidate-journalist relationship. *Journalism Studies*, 6, 187-201.
- Tedesco, J. C. (2001). Issue and strategy agenda-setting in the 2000 presidential primaries. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 2048-2067.
- Turk, J. V. (1986). Information subsidies and media content. *Journalism Monographs*, 100, 1-29.
- Walters, T. N., Walters, L. M., & Gray, R. (1996). Agenda-building in the 1992 presidential campaign. *Public Relations Review*, 22, 9-24.
- Wanta, W., Golan, G., & Lee, C. (2004). Agenda setting and international news: Media influence on public perceptions of foreign nations. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 81, 2, 364-377.
- Weaver, D., McCombs, M. & Shaw, D. L. (2004). Agenda-Setting Research: Issues, Attributes, and Influences. In Kaid, L. L. (ed.). *Handbook of Political Communication Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wood, J. T. (1995). *Relational communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wring, D. (2005): *The Politics of Marketing the Labour Party*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Copyright of Conference Papers -- International Communication Association is the property of International Communication Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.