

The research register for this journal is available at  
[http://www.mcbup.com/research\\_registers](http://www.mcbup.com/research_registers)



The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at  
<http://www.emerald-library.com/ft>

# Public policy marketing: marketing exchange in the public sector

Hans Buurma

*Buurma BV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Public policy  
marketing

1287

Received September  
1999

Revised April 2000

**Keywords** *Marketing, Public finance, Policy management, Public sector*

**Abstract** *Customer-oriented governments may use marketing tools to match their policy "products" with citizens' requirements. However, these tools are not based on exchanges since governments, apart from cost recovery, do not demand any reciprocation for their products. The concept of public policy marketing could enable governments to "sell" their policies to citizens, based on non-commercial marketing exchanges specific to the context of public administration. Then, social behaviour should be considered citizens' reciprocation contributing to social effects the government has aimed for. Thus public policy marketing, though not yet tested in practise, can be expected to improve the implementation of those governmental policies in which citizen conduct is critical to success.*

## Introduction

In the 1990s, the public sector in various European countries (Kickert, 1997) has come to recognise citizens as customers and has started to apply marketing tools and strategic marketing planning (Cousins, 1990), in order to "sell" its policy to the citizenry.

Public organisations utilise four types of marketing, which differ from each other in the objectives underlying them. First, the concept of "marketisation" shifts public-sector activities to the commercial marketing in the private sector by subjecting products and services to the competitive forces of the commercial marketplace. The aim is to bring down the price level and to bring the standard of quality more into line with customer demands (Chapman and Cowdell, 1998). Second, both public organisations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) may primarily use marketing for promoting their self-interest such as making a living or securing a future. For instance, Burton (1999) suggests that public organisations use stakeholder marketing, to secure their continued existence by support from the market and society. Third, marketing may be helpful in promoting the area under the responsibility of the public organisation, such as city marketing (Kriekaard, 1994). Finally, there is the application of marketing instruments for the key political objective, i.e. the realisation of social effects, which the new concept of public policy marketing likewise seeks to realise. Examples of the current use of marketing instruments are customer orientation (Rosenthal, 1995; Algemene Rekenkamer, 1997; Enckevort and Derksen, 1998; Chapman and Cowdell, 1998), market surveys through city panels to assess citizens' needs (Severijnen and Ter Braak, 1992), communicative governance (Damoiseaux, 1991) and social marketing to promote certain social objectives (Kotler and Roberto, 1989 and others).

European Journal of Marketing,  
Vol. 35 No. 11/12, 2001, pp. 1287-1300.  
© MCB University Press. 0309-0566

University of Reading, Reading, UK, and former Director to the Institute of Food Research (UK),

**Elena Delgado-Ballester**

Elena Delgado-Ballester is Assistant Professor of Marketing at the University of Murcia, Spain. She lectures in Marketing and Advertising at the Department of Marketing at Faculty of Economía y Empresa. She has had conference papers in the Annual Conference at the European Marketing Academy. Her research interests are focused on brand loyalty and brand equity.

**José Luis Munuera-Alemán**

José Luis Munuera-Alemán is Professor and Chairman of the Marketing Department at the University of Murcia, Spain. He has been a visiting professor at Pennsylvania State University (USA). Currently he is Spain National Coordinator of the European Marketing Academy (EMAC). His work has been published in a number of Spanish journals and in the *Journal of Business Research*. He has also had conference papers in the Annual Conference at the European Marketing Academy.

**Amparo Cervera**

Amparo Cervera is a Lecturer in Marketing, in the Faculty of Economy of Valencia Department of Business Administration at the University of Valencia, Spain.

**Alejandro Molla**

Alejandro Molla is a Professor in Marketing, in the Faculty of Economics and Business of Albacete, Department of Economics and Business at the University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain.

**Manuel Sánchez**

Manuel Sánchez is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Almería Spain in the Faculty of Economics and Business of Almería, Department of Business Management.

**Hans Buurma**

Hans Buurma is a management consultant who specialised in the introduction of business-like management in the Dutch public sector in the 1980s and 1990s. Based on consulting and training projects, he developed the public marketing concept discussed in this article and published a dissertation on this subject.

**Simon Ulrik Kragh**

Simon Ulrik Kragh is Associate Professor at Copenhagen Business School, Department of Intercultural Communication and Management, where he teaches and does research in intercultural marketing. Among his research

Although, by definition, the essence of marketing is “to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives” (American Marketing Association, 1985), the public sector merely recognises exchanges when customers provide a financial reciprocation as is the case with covering costs (Mol, 1993) or setting commercial prices for public services of economic value (Titman, 1995). Some do acknowledge that there is an exchange between general taxation and the complete package of public facilities. Such an exchange has a redistributive nature (Pandya and Dholakia, 1992), but it certainly cannot be considered a marketing exchange (Koster, 1991). Still, according to Walsh (1994), governments may have good reasons for deploying marketing tools since they know little about citizens as recipients and users of public services:

“The psychology of the citizen may not be that of the consumer of goods in the market and the consumption decision may differ radically from the decisions that we make about participation in the public realm.” Moreover, the role of the state cannot be compared to that of an enterprise: “The role of the state, then, is ultimately to govern, not to produce or distribute services”. That is why marketing in the public sector has not yet reached the status of a full instrument: “Marketing is still, essentially, peripheral to the management of public services. There are two reasons for this: first, the development of marketing is still at an early stage; second, marketing has not developed in a fashion that is specific to the context of government.”

For a marketing concept actually to be suitable for public policy, such as public policy marketing discussed in this article, it must be based on an exchange between government and citizens, meeting both the criteria for a marketing exchange and the features of political governance. This concept deviates in many respects from the usual competition-based commercial marketing. Developed in a Dutch context, it may be useful in other European contexts as well. Public policy marketing is defined as: “The sum total of planning and executing processes the government applies to cause marketing exchanges with social actors enabling both parties to reach their objectives, by developing and offering acceptable policy instruments and by demanding specific types of social behaviour and other reciprocations from social actors” (Buurma, 2000).

Guided by the following five questions, I will discuss whether the concept of public policy marketing meets the criteria of marketing and public administration and whether it serves its social purpose:

- (1) What are the characteristics of the marketing exchange of public policy?
- (2) Do exchange processes in public policy meet the criteria for marketing exchanges?
- (3) What public-administrative requirements apply to this concept?
- (4) What public policy marketing tools are available?
- (5) Does this concept offer opportunities for improving social effectiveness?

### **Characteristics of the marketing exchange of public policy**

The exchange between government and citizens makes sense if it contributes to the government’s organisational objectives and the individual objectives citizens have set. The government’s main objective is to realise social effects in

each policy domain, such as security and reducing traffic jams. Most effects are realised by concerted action with citizens. The government supplies public facilities, rules of the game and other policy instruments that help influence the social behaviour of its citizens. Examples in the realm of traffic are the road system, all its corresponding services and the traffic rules. It is the social behaviour of citizens that actually causes the social effects. Therefore, a key aspect is the social behaviour to be influenced: deviating social behaviour will cause deviating effects. Traffic safety, for example, requires a safe and disciplined road user behaviour.

The social behaviour of citizens should not be treated in isolation, as it is part of their daily functioning in society, such as road transportation, relaxing in recreation areas or talking on their cellular phones. If citizens wish to do such things lawfully, our democratic system requires them to obey the rules and fulfil the conditions set by the government. Moreover, they need facilities to be supplied by the public sector, for example the road system, the recreation areas and the air frequencies for mobile connections. The legitimate social functioning is the individual objective of citizens and other social actors who are the government's customers. They need the services, facilities and aid provided by the government enabling their functioning; governmental consent, rules and regulations to legitimise their functioning.

*Exchange with few individually known customers*

Although in present government marketing the exchange element is lacking, Dutch Public Administration literature describes some examples of exchanges between government and citizens, yet without discussing the marketing aspect. Hoekema (1994) touches upon exchanges in case of governance by negotiation and Stout (1994) typifies the resulting covenant between social actors and the government as "an agreement between two or more parties, at least one of which is a public actor, involving an exchange between the government and the target group concerned". That group consists of a limited number of actors individually known to the government, usually legal entities enabling negotiations as well as a personal relationship. Examples of this kind of exchange include the environmental permitting of a production business and a covenant concluded with farmers to address agrarian nature conservation. Figure 1 typifies the exchange process in both policy examples, with the help of

Policy	Exchange subjects	Exchange objects (values)	Exchange	Objectives
Environment & economy	Enterprise	Compliance with the terms of the permit, payment of dues		Profitable and environmentally sound production
	Regional authority	Environmental permit for production		Restriction on nuisance and emissions, preservation of employment, permitting cost recovery
Nature conservation	Farmers	On-site agrarian nature conservation		Good agrarian entrepreneurship
	MAFF (Ministry of Agriculture)	Subsidy and specification of nature conservation terms		Quality of nature (natural values)

**Figure 1.**  
Exchange processes involving few individually known customers

several key concepts from Koster's exchange model: the parties engaging in exchange (exchange subjects), the values to be exchanged (exchange objects) and the objectives each party seeks to reach by receiving the value from the other party.

The activities of parties engaged in the exchange process can be divided into three chronological stages, namely supply and demand; exchange of products and reciprocation; and realisation of objectives. Thus, the process in the example of an environmental permit can be described as follows:

- (1) *Supply and demand.* The acting public body (supplier) makes it known to the market that a certain policy has become effective. In case of the environmental and economic policies the regional government informs the business community about the need for an environmental permit in order to contain nuisance and emissions while preserving employment (supplier's objective: social effects). One of the enterprises approached (customer) applies for such a permit (product mix) in order to produce in a profitable and environmentally sound way (customer's objective). The regional authority negotiates the nature and terms of the permit with its customer, such that it suits the characteristics of the enterprise and compliance is practicable (matching supply and demand). Both parties take into consideration whether the exchange, i.e. the value the other party supplies, enables them to reach their own objectives.
- (2) *Exchange of product and reciprocation.* The permit is supplied after the regional authority has established that the customer has taken the necessary measures against nuisance and emissions (demanding reciprocation from the customer). The customer, in addition, pays his dues and the authority checks whether the payment has taken place in time (readdressing the customer). After the exchange the regional authority inspects if the customer is still meeting the conditions (again demanding reciprocation from the customer), or it takes action when neighbours lodge complaints.
- (3) *Realisation of objectives.* After implementing the permit, the customer establishes whether production within the terms of the permit is environmentally sound and has remained profitable. The regional authority can also work out if this exchange has contributed to its objectives concerning the environment, employment, and cost-effectiveness. Moreover, on the basis of monitoring and impact assessments the regional authority can evaluate afterwards to which extent the entire market has contributed to the desired environmental and economic effects.

The exchange process described in the second example, the covenant addressing agrarian nature conservation, nearly matches the process in the case of the environmental permit. Key differences are that covenants are

non-mandatory and that farmers receive a grant as a product with strict conditions attached to it, as a kind of price tag.

*Exchange process in general terms*

In general terms (Figure 2) the exchange process for a public policy includes the government’s set of policy instruments as a “product mix” and the desired social conduct of citizens as reciprocation. The citizens’ objective for the exchange would be their legitimate social functioning resulting from the product mix value and the government’s objective would be to realise social effects in the concerning policy domain resulting from the reciprocation value.

*Exchange with a multitude of customers*

The question is, then, whether the same exchange process can be a model for other situations involving much greater numbers of customers. I will identify two categories: customers that are known individually to the government and anonymous customers.

In exchange processes involving a multitude of individually known customers the government gets in touch with each customer, but due to their massive number it is unfeasible to negotiate a deal with every single customer. Examples are rent subsidies (contact established through applications and the administrative check on the information submitted), private construction permits (contact through applications and roving inspection teams) and the use of pesticides in agriculture and horticulture (contact through inspection of pesticide users). Figure 3 highlights

Policy	Exchange subjects	Step a. Supply and demand of exchange objects (values)	Step b. Exchange	Step c. Realisation of objectives
Governmental policy	Citizen(s) (customer)	Social behaviour according to public policy and the law (reciprocation)		Legitimate social functioning
	Government (supplier)	Set of public policy instruments (product mix)		Social effect(s)

Figure 2. Public policy exchange process in general terms

Policy	Exchange subjects	Step a. Supply and demand of exchange objects (values)	Step b. Exchange	Step c. Realisation of objectives
Rent subsidy	Tenants	Correct information and use		A good quality residence
	DHSS (Dept of Housing), municipalities	Subsidy and stipulations		Balance in public housing
Private Construction Permits	House-owners	Compliance with the permit; payment of dues		Lawful reconstruction
	Municipality	Permission to reconstruct; protection against illegitimate third party objections		Quality of housing stock; legitimacy in public housing and permit cost recovery
Law on pesticides	Farmers, market gardeners and wage sprayers	Compliance with the law in stock and use of pesticides		Quality of the harvest, legitimate entrepreneurship
	MAFF	Permission to use certain means, enforcement and sanctions		Combating health and environmental risks; agricultural economy

Figure 3. Exchange processes involving a mass of individually known customers



the key concepts of these three mass exchange processes. Although the actual details vary in each situation, the exchange process is made up of the same three steps as in the examples in Figure 1. The product cannot be tailored to each individual customer, but market surveys (or negotiations with market representatives) can be helpful in developing a number of alternatives that, as advocated by van de Peppel (1995), are in line with the characteristics of citizens in the respective target groups. In marketing terms: custom-made ready-to-wear for each market segment. In commercial marketing such large-scale exchange processes are quite normal; in the case of public policy the market volume does not need to stand in the way of the exchange, either. In each case the government can evaluate to what degree it has realised its objectives on the basis of inspections and impact measurements.

In some exchange processes involving a mass of anonymous customers the customers may indeed be anonymous from the government's perspective, but nevertheless easily approachable as a market. Figure 4, for example, characterises urban public services and household refuse collection. The exchange processes in the examples follow the three stages outlined earlier in this article, each with its own specific characteristics. The government does not meet with its customers personally, which after all, is not a necessary prerequisite for the exchange processes to come about. The local authority can clearly distinguish and inform the market within each community. Customer needs can be measured in market surveys. Negotiations can take place with market representatives in workshops and other meetings, as well as with individual customers making enquiries or lodging complaints and voicing objections. That information enables the government to offer facilities and corresponding rules; the exchange has started as soon as potential customers have accepted the offer and started to use the facilities. It is possible to demand a reciprocation from customers by means of communication and roving

Policy	Exchange subjects	Step a. Supply and demand of exchange objects (values)	Step b. Exchange	Step c. Realisation of objectives
Urban public service	Neighbourhood inhabitants	Correct use, no pollution or damage		Living in a neighbourhood
	Municipal authority	Public facilities and services		Well-functioning municipality
Household Refuse Collection & Environment Policy	Neighbourhood inhabitants	Offering refuse according to the regulations; refuse separation		Domestic hygiene, easy use of litter boxes
	Borough/ Municipality	Refuse transport and litter boxes; terms of refuse disposal		Hygiene in the municipality and sorting types of rubbish
Traffic Policy	Road users	Compliance, safe and social behaviour		Personal mobility
	Traffic Managers	Traffic facilities & regulation		Traffic safety, reduction of emissions
Public Recreation in woods	Holidaymakers	Correct use of woods and paths		Relaxation, enjoyment of nature
	Dutch Forestry Commission	Access to and paths in woods; user regulation		Public health, awareness of natural values

**Figure 4.**  
Exchange processes involving a mass of anonymous customers

inspections, which also provide the government with information regarding the extent to which it has realised its objectives.

In other cases, such as in traffic and the use of public recreational areas (cf. Figure 3), customers as an anonymous mass are less approachable. In such situations an exchange appears to be hardly feasible. Still the mass marketing practised by supermarkets and Disneyland teach us that it is possible. These commercial mass products attract great numbers of paying customers. The range of products is kept marketable by conducting regular market surveys, thus being alert as to what offers should be made. The difference between commercial mass production and the massive use of public facilities lies mainly in the nature of and demand for reciprocation: citizens need traffic facilities and recreation areas just as much as they need food and leisure. The availability of such public facilities, however, does not suggest that there is question of an exchange. They appear to be “free goods” because the government does not demand a social reciprocation. If the government did so, there would be a marketing process, also following the three stages mentioned earlier. In these cases the customers will start the exchange process by making use of the facilities concerned. The specifics of the steps to be followed will be differing all the time, as the case of traffic policy regarding highways will show:

- (1) *Supply and demand.* The government provides a network of highways with the associated facilities, traffic rules (product mix) and enforcement (demanding a reciprocation from customers). It calls on car drivers by way of information and billboards to display social, safe and disciplined driving behaviour (the reciprocation) for the sake of traffic safety and restricting emissions (sought effects). The drivers need the road network and the rules help them to move safely (customers' objective).
- (2) *The exchange of product and reciprocation.* The (hypothetical!) exchange process starts as soon as car drivers hit the highway. Some of them display calculating behaviour, which can be looked upon as resistance to reciprocation, such as aggressive driving behaviour and speed offences on trajectories that lack adequate monitoring.
- (3) *Realisation of objectives.* At his destination, the customer could establish that his/her objective has been attained although he/she will seldom do so in practice. Measurements allow the government to check whether in a certain period the target level of traffic safety and emissions reduction have in fact been realised. Monitoring, if any, can illustrate the causal relationship between the rule of the road, quality of enforcement, actual behaviour and actual effects.

#### *Marketing of legislation?*

US authors have advocated improving the marketing of legislation (Huszagh *et al.*, 1981). They largely attribute the degree of noncompliance to inadequate



communication about an impenetrable forest of rules and regulations and advocate that the quality of legislation be adjusted to the needs of citizens.

While better legalisation will no doubt be helpful, this measure does not seem sufficient. Rules and regulations as such embody little value to customers. Their compliance, however, does require a sacrifice. In the public policy marketing exchange rules are not a product, but the specification of the reciprocation. One almost gets the impression that some legislatives in Europe assume that governments can realise social effects by limiting themselves to decreeing more and more rules and regulations. That view is outdated. An Act without a useful public product underlying it will only be operative when enforced by intensive, and therefore expensive surveillance and heavy sanctions. In the notoriously "tolerant" Netherlands, insufficient enforcement of an abundance of rules has already met with widespread evasion. Governments can realise social effects much more easily and better when they provide their citizens with valuable policy products that meet their needs. Of course, there will still be rules of the game to be complied with. The sacrifice of compliance with those rules needs to compare reasonably with the value of these products. Compliance is still necessary, but commands a greatly improved support base. That, in a sentence, is the public policy marketing exchange principle.

#### *Marketing through intermediaries*

An ever-increasing share of public policy in The Netherlands is now implemented by NGOs – subsidised foundations, interest groups, care institutions and other not-for-profit organisations that operate in a business-like fashion (Kotler and Andreasen, 1991). In The Netherlands, the trend is for the public sector to carry through the process of non-commercial privatisation of the management of public assets and other public tasks (Geelhoed, 1995). They act as independent intermediaries (ten Berge, 1994) between government and society. Their marketing exchange with clients is the final link in the government's policy implementation, realised by the intermediary under its own direction. The government limits its influence to policy- and rule-making, possibly providing means and monitoring the policy implementation by the intermediary at arm's length.

To make its influence felt, the government requires an interface with the intermediary. On the basis of the above arguments, general rules and regulations seem inadequate. The interface is better defined as an exchange, in the form of a contract, covenant or directive. This is not unlike the examples of a marketing exchange with a limited number of individually known customers introduced earlier. The difference, however, is that both in the policy product (for example a grant-in-aid or a permit) and in the desired reciprocation on the part of the intermediary (deliverables in the area of policy implementation), direct links need to be established with the social exchange the intermediary makes with its own customers. This may be termed a "complex exchange" (Bagozzi, 1975) or, alternatively, a "win-win-win-exchange".

### *Some objections to marketing by government*

Scholars of public administration have voiced objections against customer-oriented services rendered by the government, claiming that they “disregard the character of political decision-making processes” (Bekkers *et al.*, 1998). The following objections and counterarguments illustrate the tension between the business orientation of marketing and the public orientation of government:

- *The government is a monopolist* (van der Hart, 1990). Monopolists, they too, deploy marketing tools, not to beat the competition, but to promote the exchange since customers have other alternatives at their disposal or are otherwise able to withdraw from the exchange.
- *The citizen is more than just a customer* (Tjeenk Willink, 1988). It goes without saying that this argument is correct, but that does not in the least preclude the use of marketing tools. Citizens also take part in the political process by voting; some of them by participating in the policy developed by interactive governance. Although citizen participation may improve the policy, it does not, however, reap any effects. These will only result from what marketing is focusing at, that is, a certain behaviour of all citizens in a market, including those who did not participate or vote.
- *The government is more than a supplier of services* (Tjeenk Willink, 1988). Indeed, services play a minor role in public policy. The government’s supply in public policy marketing includes the full set of policy instruments, such as communication, economic incentives, regulation, facilities and even demarketing in case of state forbearance.
- *Collective goods are free goods* (Koster, 1991). The term “free goods” merely reflects the compensation side and not the sacrifice in terms of desired conduct when using those collective goods. Social behaviour is a far more essential contribution to the main government’s objective than compensation of costs.
- *Civil servants are not commercially oriented* (van der Hart, 1990). Public policy marketing is absolutely non-commercial. Still, it requires radical changes in culture, attitude and working methods of civil servants.

### **Meeting the criteria for the marketing exchange**

The exchange has been a “key concept” of marketing since the 1950s (Houston and Gassenheimer, 1987). Koster distinguishes between the “marketing exchange” and the exchange in disciplines outside marketing. On the basis of an amendment to his criteria I identify nine general criteria for the marketing exchange in the generic sense of the word:

- (1) *Parties involved*. At least two individualised natural or legal persons, at least one of whom has the intention to reach his objectives through marketing instruments.

- (2) *Voluntary basis and freedom.* Voluntary participation in the exchange process is the key aspect; freedom may be reasonably restricted by legitimate means.
- (3) *Mutuality.* Mutual exchange of objects.
- (4) *Objects concerned.* Should be non-identical, represent an exchange value and be supplyable as such.
- (5) *Win-win.* To each party, the values received represent more than the sacrifice and the present exchange is the most profitable.
- (6) *Communication.* At least to such an extent as to prevent aberration.
- (7) *Legitimacy.* The relationship between parties is legitimate and rests on good faith; parties concerned have the power of disposal over the values that are to be supplied.
- (8) *Rights and obligations.* Mutually applicable to both parties.
- (9) *Claims of parties.* Both parties can hold each other accountable for the delivery of values and the compliance to remaining duties; both dispose of sanctions when compliance is lacking.

Testing the exemplary cases mentioned earlier reveals that all are in accordance with criteria 3 up to 9 inclusive. With regard to the first condition it turns out that, indeed, there are always two parties involved, but that in many cases the government has no intention to apply marketing as an instrument. This condition is met when the administration of a public body decides to deploy marketing tools. The voluntary basis and freedom, the second criterion, are sometimes limited. In principle, each citizen has the possibility to renounce the use of policy instruments or of seeking an alternative; complete coercion does not occur in any of the cases pictured.

However, numerous situations do not meet these conditions, so that the exchange does not take place and public policy marketing is not or only partly applicable. Examples are: tax levies due to insufficient product value for customers, dike management for the lack of customers and internment of the detained due to the lack of their freedom.

### **Public-administrative requirements**

The public policy marketing concept is intended for organisations developing or applying public policy, including quangos. It does not apply to organisations employing marketing tools mainly to improve or guarantee their own competitive position, income or continued survival (Coops *et al.*, 1995), in which cases commercial marketing is more apt. Moreover, marketing activities are subject to the primacy of politics, the rules of administrative law and the democratic order, and to the principles of good governance. The political governing of marketing may provoke some objections, such as the capriciousness of the political policy process, a slim support base for some political objectives and a limited governing period, which interferes with

long-term strategic marketing. A condition for success is that the administration should at least commit itself to marketing as an instrument, while keeping political governing independent of market preferences. From a democratic point of view it is better to backup a politically accepted policy which is hard to sell with powerful marketing tools than to adjust it for reasons of expediency to market preferences. .

The co-ordination of co-producing public bodies is a weakness in The Netherlands, as is the lack of control on the part of enforcement agencies (Ministerie van Justitie, 1991; Commissie Bestuursrechtelijke en Privaatrechtelijke Handhaving, 1998). There is a drawback in that the media due to the public nature of government action, also publish news items that from a marketing point of view may be unhelpful; there is also an advantage, however, in that the government is always entitled to free publicity.

### **Public policy marketing tools**

All generic marketing tools are essentially useful when divested of their commercial characteristics arising from the supplier's self-interest, and when adjusted to the administrative and political requirements of government action in society. The most important tools are:

- A clear differentiation of stakeholders involved in the marketing process, and their interests. For example, suppliers, co-producers, customers, third parties having an interest in social effects, commissioners and other stakeholders.
- The marketing mix as a means to match and manage the quality levels of supply and reciprocation (Foxall, 1988).
- Need and demand patterns of citizens in their capacity as customers as a basis for the matching process.
- Market segmentation as a way of anticipating different need patterns.
- A marketing information system (Kotler, 1997) including market surveys to determine the characteristics of different market segments.
- Relations marketing and demarketing methods.
- Demanding citizens to display social behaviour in return for public services, comparable to price collection in commercial marketing. If commercial price collection is flawed, the number of dubious debtors will increase. This is no different for the public sector: insufficient enforcement of compliance results in more offences.
- Marketing organisation and strategic marketing planning.

### **Opportunities for improving social effectiveness**

The question whether or not public policy marketing improves social effectiveness may be answered hypothetically only, since there has not been any opportunity to test fully the new concept in practice, yet. The evidence of

public policy marketing being effective in real terms can only be collected through the investigation of its actual application over a period of several years. If a public body would apply this marketing concept in a well-organised way and in so doing, would address the issue of matching policy supplies with social behaviour, it can at least be said that more has been done than is the case in numerous existing government situations. That is why I rate the chances of success high, but so will be the price of introducing this concept.

*Alternative methods*

There are other methods besides the marketing approach to bring social behaviour of citizens more expressly in line with public policy. The government, for instance, could make the desired conduct a much more explicit part of their policy processes and policy instruments so that both citizens and policy executives know what to expect. The government could also promote the desired conduct much more emphatically in their information and education campaigns. They can demand citizens to contribute to the desired social effects, thus expressing that the quality of society is their business, as well. Finally, enforcement being better organised and more centred on desired conduct could bring about good results, just as monitoring behaviour and thus providing the policy process with feedback information (Pieters, 1991). The attractive feature of public policy marketing compared to these methods is that it is both more in keeping with the present horizontal relations between government and citizens and with the growing popularity of modern public management. Moreover, it improves the balance between the general interest of social effects and the individual self-interest citizens may have.

Social marketing is another alternative for promoting desired conduct with the help of a strongly developed set of promotion techniques. One could even wonder whether public policy marketing is not just a government-oriented variety of social marketing. In my opinion they are so widely different that they may be considered different concepts. The exchange in social marketing, for instance, is different because the desired conduct is considered to be part of the product instead of being a reciprocation (Kotler and Roberto, 1989). I assume that this is caused by the fact that social marketing has sprung from "social advertising" (Kotler and Zaltman, 1971), which incorporates the desired conduct into the information campaign. Thus, in social marketing the concept of a product has become very extensive. Fine (1990) not only calls policy measures and desired conduct of target adopters "products", but also includes the desired social effects. In public administration these three concepts are rightly identified as separate entities. Government can produce their own policy measures, thus influencing citizens' behaviour, but they can neither realise the (intended) behaviour nor the ensuing effects. The exchange in social marketing is also disputable. Foxall states that "social marketing [...] confuses relationships with exchanges", then calls the examples of exchanges "social communications".

## Conclusion

In response to the five questions advanced in the introduction, it can be observed that public policy marketing is based on marketing exchanges between government and citizens that should meet both the prerequisites of marketing and those of public administration. The usual marketing tools are available, provided that they are adapted to the requirements of public administration. Although practical evidence is as yet unavailable, it can be assumed hypothetically that this marketing concept will improve social effectiveness, because it brings the social behaviour of citizens required for this end much more clearly into the open. Therefore it is apt for implementing those types of policies where citizen conduct is critical to bring about social effectiveness.

## References

- Algemene Rekenkamer (1997), *Klantgerichtheid publieke dienstverlening, Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, vergaderjaar 1996-1997*, Vol. 25285 Nos 1-2, Sdu, Den Haag.
- American Marketing Association (1985), "AMA board approves new marketing definition", *Marketing News*, 1 March, p. 1.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1975), "Marketing as exchange", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 39, October, pp. 32-9.
- Bekkers, V.J.J.M., Zouridis, S. and Korsten, A.F.A. (1998), "Denken over dienstverlening", *Bestuurskunde*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 100-9.
- Burton, S. (1999) "Marketing for public organizations: new ways, new methods", *Public Management*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 373-85.
- Buurma, H. (2000), "Maatschappelijke marketing van overheidsbeleid" ("Marketing of public policy"), dissertation, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, Rotterdam.
- Chapman, D. and Cowdell, T. (1998), *New Public Sector Marketing*, Financial Times/Pitman, London.
- Commissie Bestuursrechtelijke en Privaatrechtelijke Handhaving (1998), *Handhaven op niveau*, Tjeenk Willink, Deventer.
- Coops, R.H. et al. (Eds) (1995), *Van Overheid naar Markt: theorie, praktijk en analyse*, Sdu, Den Haag.
- Cousins, L. (1990), "Marketing planning in the public and non-profit sectors", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp. 15-30.
- Damoiseaux, V. (1991), *Listen, lusten en lasten van massamediale voorlichting*, Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Fine, S.H. (1990), *Social Marketing, Promoting the Causes of Public and Nonprofit Agencies*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA.
- Foxall, G.R. (1988), "Marketing's domain", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 7-22.
- Geelhoed, L.A. (1995), "Het privatiseringsperspectief", in Coops, R.H. et al. (Eds), *Van Overheid naar Markt: theorie, praktijk en analyse*, Sdu, Den Haag.
- Hoekema, A. (1994), "Enkele inleidende vragen over onderhandelend bestuur", in Stout, H.D. and Hoekema, A.J. (Eds), *Onderhandelend bestuur*, Boekenreeks NJB, No. 16, W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink, Zwolle, pp. 1-25.
- Houston, F.S. and Gassenheimer, J.B. (1987), "Marketing and exchange", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, October, pp. 3-18.

- Huszagh, S.M., Huszagh, F.W. and Buice, K.B. (1981), "The marketing of laws as an alternative to enforcement", in Mokwa, M.P. and Permut, S.E. (Eds), *Government Marketing*, Praeger, New York, NY, pp. 288-303.
- Kickert, W.J.M. (1997), "Public management in the United States and Europe", in Kickert, W.J.M. (Ed.), *Public Management and Administrative Reform in Western Europe*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 15-38.
- Koster, J.M.D. (1991), "Grondslagen van de marketingwetenschap", dissertation, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, Rotterdam.
- Kotler, P. and Andreasen, A.R. (1991), *Strategic Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Kotler, P. and Roberto, E.L. (1989), *Social Marketing*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Kotler, P. and Zaltman, G. (1971), "Social marketing: an approach to planned social change", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35, July, pp. 3-12.
- Kriekaard, J.A. (1994), "Het domein van city marketing: een bijdrage aan theorieontwikkeling", Report No. R 9407/M, Rotterdams Instituut voor Bedrijfseconomische Studies. Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, Rotterdam.
- Ministerie van Justitie (1991), "Met vaste hand: Verbetering van de kwaliteit van de rechtshandhaving", *Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, vergaderjaar 1990-1991, 22045*, No. 1-2, Sdu, Den Haag.
- Pandya, A. and Dholakia, A. (1992), "An institutional theory of exchange in marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 12, pp. 9-41.
- Pieters, R.G.M. (1991), "Changing garbage disposal patterns of consumers: motivation, ability, and performance", *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 59-76.
- Rosenthal, U. (1995), "Publiek partnerschap", *Bestuurskunde*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 115-21.
- Severijnen, P.C.A. and Braak, H.J.M. ter (1992), "Marktonderzoek bij beleidsvoorbereiding en beleidsbepaling", *Management in overheidsorganisaties*, 22 August, pp. A4125-1.
- Stout, H.D. (1994), "Het convenanten-sluitend bestuur", in Stout, H.D. and Hoekema, A.J. (Eds), *Onderhandelend bestuur*, Boekenreeks NJB, No. 16, W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink, Zwollepp, pp. 45-80.
- ten Berge, G. (1994), "Onderhandelend bestuur en bestuursrecht", in: Stout, H.D. and Hoekema, A.J. (Eds), *Onderhandelend bestuur*, Boekenreeks NJB, No. 16, W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink, Zwolle, pp. 27-43.
- Titman, L. (1995), *Marketing in the New Public Sector*, Pitman, London.
- Tjeenk Willink, H.D. (1988), "Klantgericht handelen alleen is niet genoeg", *Binnenlands Bestuur Management*, Vol. 28 No. 5, October.
- van de Peppel, R.A. (1995), "De naleving van gedragsnormen: Beleidsinstrumenten, doelgroepkenmerken en hun interactie", *Beleidswetenschap 1995/2*, pp. 146-60.
- van der Hart, H.W.C. (1990), "Government organisations and their customers in The Netherlands: strategy, tactics and operations", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp. 31-42.
- van Enckevort, I. and Derksen, W. (1998), "De responsieve gemeente", *Bestuurskunde*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 110-18.
- Walsh, K. (1994), "Marketing and public sector management", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 63-71.