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Government managers can greatly increase their chances of developing successful marketing strategies by understanding key differences between private sector and public sector marketing.

Democratic governments exist to serve their citizens. Businesses exist to make profits. And yet it is business that searches obsessively for new ways to please the American people. Most American governments are customer-blind, while McDonald's and Frito-Lay are customer-driven. This may be the ultimate indictment of bureaucratic government.1

Marketing has been a key practice in business for many years and, indeed, has its roots there. While marketing remains a major management function in business, it is also now used widely, with varying degrees of success, in other types of organizations including governments, non-profit organizations, political parties and even religious organizations. However, most of the literature on developing successful marketing strategies applies to the private sector. It is often frustrating for public sector managers to try to apply marketing ideas developed in business directly to government when they are ever cognizant of the fact that government is not business.

An examination of the differences between public and private sector marketing is vital because we are witnessing an unprecedented increase in the use of marketing in governments. The Public Service of Canada is in the midst of fundamental transitions stemming, in part, from the government’s commitment to reducing the deficit. As a result, many government units are adopting marketing approaches to help meet two major challenges: the challenge of meeting mandates and satisfying client needs in the face of significantly diminishing resources, and the challenge of meeting specified revenue targets.

Adopting a marketing approach suited to the government environment offers special challenges. Government personnel may have little or no marketing background, and there is a dearth of literature dealing specifically with public sector marketing. As a result, government officials are often left to adapt conventional business-oriented marketing theory to their particular needs. But government marketing is different in fundamental ways, and it is critical to identify and understand these differences if marketing is to be used successfully in the public sector.

An examination of the differences between public and private sector marketing is vital because we are witnessing an unprecedented increase in the use of marketing in governments. The Public Service of Canada is in the midst of fundamental transitions stemming, in part, from the government’s commitment to reducing the deficit. As a result, many government units are adopting marketing approaches to help meet two major challenges: the challenge of meeting mandates and satisfying client needs in the face of significantly diminishing resources, and the challenge of meeting specified revenue targets.
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This article is intended to provide an overview of some of the key differences. The ideas presented here were developed from researching marketing in the federal government in three major ways:

- reviewing the academic and practitioner literature for insights about marketing in the public and private sectors;
- interviewing managers in a variety of government units about public sector marketing; and
- conducting case studies of marketing projects in the Canadian federal government over the past three years.

While this article is not intended to serve as an introduction to marketing fundamentals, it will begin with a definition of marketing, then describe the major types of marketing practiced in government departments. This is followed by a discussion of seven fundamental differences between public sector and private sector marketing, and how these differences affect the development of successful marketing strategies in the public realm.

**What is marketing?**

According to the American Marketing Association, one of the world’s largest associations of professional marketers, “Marketing is the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods, and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives.”

This definition takes into account that marketing is a managerial process involving “planning and executing” and that there are four main areas of marketing activities, sometimes known as the “4 Ps.” These are the conception of a product, followed by its pricing, promotion and distribution. Moreover, marketing can pertain to any offering (ideas, goods and services) and, lastly, the goal of marketing is to create satisfactory exchanges among willing parties.

The core notions of marketing, therefore, are satisfaction and exchange. When a business adopts the marketing approach, it strives to create exchanges with targeted consumers so that both the business and its customers reach their goals (e.g., satisfaction for the consumer and contribution to profits for the firm).

Government organizations can engage in marketing according to this definition. When a government department develops a “product” – be it a physical product such as an ocean chart, an idea such as “don’t start smoking,” or the provision of a service such as the upkeep of a national park for visitors – and then prices, promotes and distributes it to a targeted audience to promote an exchange, marketing is taking place.

**Types of marketing in government**

One of the greatest obstacles to using marketing effectively in government is a lack of understanding of the different types of marketing in which governments can engage. Although books often portray public sector marketing as a monolith, the research reveals that marketing in government is quite diverse. A typology of four different branches of marketing shows the major forms of marketing that occur in government organizations.

**Type A: Marketing of products and services**

It may be surprising to some that the first type of marketing governments engage in is the marketing of products and services, e.g., the marketing of paper and electronic charts by the Canadian Hydrographic Service (CHS), or the marketing of statistical information by Statistics Canada. It is important to note that the marketing of products and services by government is similar to such marketing in the private sector, as the CHS experience illustrates. CHS is responsible for charting Canada’s oceans and waterways, and legislation requires commercial and recreational mariners operating in unfamiliar waterways to carry official CHS charts. To meet this legislative requirement, CHS markets paper and electronic charts to commercial mariners, recreational boaters and others who make use of Canada’s oceans and waterways. CHS charts Canadian waterways; designs, develops and then produces a range of products (including paper and electronic charts,
atlases, tide tables, etc.); distributes these products via a system of distributors throughout Canada; and prices and promotes them in various ways (boat shows, advertising) to bring them to the attention of consumers. Recently, CHS adopted a marketing approach to help it better meet the needs of the Canadian mariner community and achieve its revenue targets. It has formalized its marketing in a number of ways, including:

- forming a marketing committee to lead its cross-Canada marketing initiatives;
- conducting marketing education, training and research; and
- developing a formal marketing strategy to guide future decision making.

**Type B: Social marketing**

Social marketing – marketing that attempts to change the behaviours and attitudes of targeted groups – is the second type of marketing commonly practised by government organizations. For instance, when Parks Canada develops a marketing campaign encouraging visitors to its parks to take more responsibility for their personal safety while hiking, mountain climbing or canoeing, it is engaging in social marketing. Similarly, when Health Canada develops an advertising campaign intended to persuade young Canadians not to start smoking, it is engaging in social marketing.

Although the private sector also engages in social marketing (e.g., don’t drink and drive, or don’t drink while pregnant), such campaigns play a minor role compared to the traditional marketing of goods and services.

**Type C: Policy marketing**

The third type of marketing that governments engage in might best be called “policy marketing.” This typically occurs when governments launch marketing programs to convince specific sectors of society to accept their policies. For instance, when the government attempts to convince the public of the benefits of the Free Trade Agreement or changes to the Canada Pension Plan, it is engaging in policy marketing. Policy marketing by governments is most similar to “advocacy advertising” by private companies, i.e., companies advocating their virtues as good corporate citizens.

**Type D: Demarketing or Don’t-use-our-programs marketing**

Demarketing campaigns are launched by governments to advise and/or persuade targeted groups not to use government programs that have been available to them in the past. In recent years, demarketing campaigns have been developed in tandem with downsizing efforts. For example, many departments that previously provided funding to community-based organizations have experienced significant decreases in such funds. In response to this development, departments have had to notify these organizations of their lost revenue and some have provided marketing training to staff of the affected organizations to assist them in establishing alternative funding bases. In the private sector, rather little demarketing occurs, since businesses engage primarily in promoting the consumption of goods and services.

**How is marketing different in the public sector?**

In attempting to assess what is different about public sector marketing, both academic and practitioner literature was reviewed. A striking feature of these writings is the paucity of academic work focussing on marketing’s role in government. Moreover, the little research that does exist is now dated. At the same time, there are a large number of practitioner and consulting reports describing various marketing ventures. While these are useful for identifying the wide variety of government marketing projects that have been undertaken, they are simply descriptive and have not been examined from the eye of the researcher looking for commonalities and differences between private sector and government marketing. By building on insights gained from assessing existing literature, interviewing federal government managers and conducting case studies of government marketing projects, the remainder of this paper will
present seven important differences between marketing in government and the private sector. Lastly, it will identify a set of criteria for developing successful marketing strategies in the government environment.

**The key difference: resistance**

The most important difference between marketing in the private and public sectors flows from the fundamental question, “Should government be marketing at all?” While issues related to this question surface regularly in marketing discussions in the public sector, it is safe to say that the matter rarely arises in the private sector.

The picture that emerges of the role of marketing across a range of Canadian federal government departments is paradoxical. On the one hand, marketing is seen as offering an exciting means for solving difficult problems; on the other hand, it is viewed as a business tool inappropriate for use by government. This ambivalence exists within management teams and, not uncommonly, within individuals on teams.

The view that government is not business and that it is inappropriate to run government like business competes with the view that government needs to be more responsive to the needs of the public and that marketing may help governments accomplish this goal. As well, the shifting of government to more of a managerial, business-like approach through the adoption of marketing and other managerial technology has been argued as absolutely necessary by some. At the very least, managers in units now utilizing marketing strongly support government achieving a balance. They argue that government is definitely not a business, but is an institution charged primarily with serving the public interest and that, in many cases, it can do this more effectively by employing a marketing approach. However, the research was unequivocal in the view that the environment in government is very different from that of business, and that marketing must be adapted to a public service context.

Many in government identify marketing with cost recovery or revenue generation. It should be noted that there is nothing inherent in the philosophy, tools or techniques to force the role of marketing into either of these camps. It is true that marketing can assist in generating revenue within government, but it can also be a useful paradigm for improving relationships with clients and the publics with whom government departments deal. The marketing approach does not necessarily assume a revenue-generation or profit motive.

Because many managers hold this view, the first two of the four main arguments advanced here in opposition to the adoption of marketing are, in fact, arguments opposing cost recovery.

- The first such argument is that free access to public information and goods is part of the Canadian tradition and essential to citizens in a democratic society. Countering this argument is the view that government ought to be able to generate revenue through the sale of information and products that are expensive to produce and maintain and not of equal utility to most Canadians. Taxpayer subsidies to commercial organizations that obtain information for free are eliminated or reduced, and revenues are provided to reduce taxes and enhance databases. An extension of this view is the argument that the ongoing provision of information is expensive and the full costs of providing information to satisfy proprietary interests of individuals should not be borne (i.e., subsidized) by taxpayers at large. Where appropriate, external user fees and charges should be applied for providing information and related services.

- A second frequently cited argument against marketing (cost recovery) is that a resource obtained through the expenditure of public funds has already been paid for by Canadian taxpayers. Many citizens who object to paying additional fees express the view that the resource should be available for use by taxpayers at no additional charge. The counter argument is that because a resource is obtained through tax monies, it does not mean it is available to any taxpayer at no charge. For instance, most people would not think of walking into a government office to use the computer or fax machine simply because it was paid for with tax monies. However, front-line government personnel are often faced with countering such arguments.

- A third argument related to the appropriateness of public sector marketing concerns the effect of legislation on marketing-strategy development. Government
often has an explicit competence or unique selling proposition given it by law. For example, CHS has the distinct competence that its charts are mandated by law to be used on Canadian waters where charts are necessary. Since marketing is viewed as promoting “voluntary” exchanges, the power of legislation may be seen as precluding a useful role for marketing. The counter-argument is that even under such legislation, a marketing approach offers a means for improving relationships with relevant public groups and/or clients.

The fourth argument heard in opposition to the use of marketing in the public sector is the notion widely accepted inside and outside government, i.e., that governments should not be in competition with the private sector. This issue is most often raised in cases where government is marketing goods and services. For example, when Parks Canada markets parks and historic sites, it is in competition with other forms of recreation offered by the private sector. Similarly, even though CHS is mandated to provide charts, atlases, tide tables, etc., to the mariner community, the private sector also produces versions of these products to appeal to the recreational market. In designing marketing programs, government units are constantly exploring appropriate strategies for co-existing and competing with private sector enterprises.

Implications for marketing strategy development

Foremost in developing a marketing strategy in the public sector, one can expect resistance to the notion of applying marketing in government units, even when the application of marketing is viewed positively. This resistance will vary from the mild (where marketing will be viewed simultaneously with suspicion and hope), to the extreme (where it will be considered wholly inappropriate). In the face of such resistance, it is essential to develop the strong support of several key senior managers to counteract this resistance over time, and to acknowledge the ways in which marketing in the public sector differs from that in the private sector. A frank acknowledgement of how marketing will work differently is absolutely essential for reassuring all that the adoption of marketing does not mean that government is a business, but that this technology can work in the public sector environment. Lastly, those charged with implementing a marketing strategy need to provide training to key decision makers so that they understand the philosophy and tools of marketing. Such training will help dispel many marketing myths and promote an understanding of the relevant implementation issues in the public sector.

It is also critically important to specify the relationship between marketing and revenue generation. While marketing can be a useful tool for developing revenue-generation strategies, it also has other uses. In fact, a marketing approach may be more valuable for other goals of a unit such as improving relationships with groups and individuals with whom the unit interacts, serving clients better, encouraging healthier lifestyles and/or behaviours, etc.

Lack of institutionalization: variability in the adoption of marketing within the public service

Because many in government continue to debate the appropriateness of public sector marketing, it comes as little surprise that marketing does not occupy the same sort of institutionalized position as it does in business. For example, there are relatively few positions with the word marketing in the job title. Moreover, research revealed no clear marketing function as part of the way many government units are organized. In the private sector, marketing is a clear career path with positions ranging from entry level to senior vice-presidential levels. In the public sector, individuals are not typically hired because they have strong marketing skills, and there is no established marketing career path.

Variability in the adoption of marketing in government exists in three main areas:

Experience with marketing. Public sector experience with marketing technology and practices falls on a broad continuum. There are a few government organizations with long histories of practicing marketing. One strong example is the Partnerships and Marketing Division of Health Canada. At the other end of the spectrum are the organizations that have no real
experience with marketing and are skeptical about its role and value. In the middle of this continuum are the government organizations with newly developed marketing programs (e.g., CHS).

Knowledge of marketing. Government organizations vary in their knowledge of marketing:

Different institutions took to marketing at different rates . . . They confuse marketing with either hard selling or advertising, and therefore, don’t show an aptitude for it.7

The research conducted in the Canadian federal government supports this observation, revealing variable marketing knowledge. Those in units with strong histories of marketing are knowledgeable, but the most commonly held view is that marketing equals advertising and promotion.

Budgets for Marketing. While marketing budgets are the norm in the private sector, it is unusual to see marketing as a line item in the public sector. Managers often use monies from other budgets to finance their marketing programs. However, the existence of marketing budgets in the public sector is increasing as marketing becomes part of the norm for managing effectively.

Implications for marketing strategy development

For a government unit with no marketing experience or knowledge, but with an interest in using marketing to further its goals and objectives, it is essential to first develop a basic understanding of marketing and how it can help the unit. The next step is an analysis of previous marketing efforts. Often activities have been undertaken that are in fact components of a marketing program, but they have been implemented as discrete, uncoordinated efforts. Unfortunately, this approach does not work: progress is not made and personnel become discouraged. A marketing plan must be developed, and leadership for marketing must be assumed by in-house senior managers. Outside consultants can help with initial marketing and training, but it then becomes essential for the organization to take responsibility for leading the adoption of marketing in-house.

Differences in marketing objectives: evaluating marketing programs

If one accepts that marketing can be both appropriate and productive for government, one has to accept that there are fundamental differences in marketing objectives between the private and public sectors. The traditional objective of business marketers is to increase sales and profitability levels in competitive markets, an objective that is seldom paramount in the public sector, where multiple goals and objectives are more common. A government unit may evaluate its marketing success against a goal hierarchy that could include meeting the mandate, influencing attitudes and behaviours of Canadians, revenue generation, or others.

The research shows that public service managers experience considerable problems in managing and juggling multiple organizational objectives when developing a marketing strategy. These multiple objectives make both the development and evaluation of the strategy difficult. For instance, against what objectives does management evaluate marketing programs? Which objectives should a marketing campaign be designed to meet? In the private sector, the profit motive provides both a consistent objective that guides decisions and a criterion for evaluating results. However, most public sector organizations are expected to provide equitable, effective and efficient services that are responsive to the preferences of their clientele, elected and appointed officials, and the general public.

Implications for marketing strategy development

The most successful public sector marketing programs were ones with carefully defined objectives and with mechanisms to measure the success of the program. These are well-accepted practices in the private sector and ones that appear to lead to greater success in the public sector, as well. However, because there may be multiple goals and objectives in the public sector, setting program objectives in government requires more balancing among competing objectives. For instance, objectives may simultaneously include obtaining senior management recognition of a
unit’s programs and its work, serving clients more effectively, contributing to revenue-generation targets and others. Establishing priorities among the objectives is also essential for each marketing program.

Once priorities are set, budgets must be established, with mechanisms for evaluating the benefits achieved against the objectives. For example, evaluating the utility of marketing CHS charts at boat shows can be accomplished by assessing the costs of the show(s) against the key achievements identified in the objectives set for the boat show marketing campaign. If this is done consistently for all marketing programs, decision makers learn over time what works best in achieving particular objectives for that unit.

Notably, the research revealed major weaknesses across government in specifying objectives and evaluating marketing programs against those objectives. Compared to the private sector, few marketing-campaign evaluations were carried out.

How the organizations are paid

Peter Drucker has argued that the major difference between managing a public service organization and a private sector one is how the two types of organizations are paid:

Businesses (other than monopolies) are paid for satisfying the customer. They are only paid when they produce what the customer wants and what he is willing to exchange his purchasing power for. . . . Public service institutions, by contrast, are typically paid out of a budget allocation. Their revenues are allocated from a general revenue stream that is not tied to what they are doing, but is obtained by tax, levy, or tribute. . . . Being paid out of a budget allocation changes what is meant by “performance” or “results”. “Results” in the budget-based institution means a larger budget. “Performance” is the ability to maintain or to increase one’s budget. . . . This means, first, that efficiency and cost control, however much they are being preached, are not really considered virtues in the budget-based institution. 8

The orientation of management and personnel in the private sector is different from that in the public sector, somewhat as a result of how they are paid. The private sector is oriented to increasing sales or profits. Often, budgets and bonuses are tied to sales performance. The research shows that within the federal public service, this is seldom true. A government unit may be assigned a revenue target, but achievement or over-achievement of that target does not necessarily, or even usually, lead to a retention of the increased revenues by the unit. In most instances, the unit will suffer in the form of reduced operating budgets and/or staff if it does not achieve revenue targets. Managers in all units studied noted the difficulties that this policy generates.

Implications for marketing strategy development

Loss of earned revenues is seen as a significant disincentive to using marketing programs to achieve revenue targets. Developing a marketing strategy for goods and services in such an environment leads to the development of strategies designed not to exceed revenue targets. It may also potentially encourage the development of strategies in which little attention is paid to costs. To counter such problems, changes must be made to the revenue-generation approach to allow units that are meeting or exceeding targets to benefit from these achievements. If increased revenues (or portions of them) were retained by units to achieve departmental unit objectives, incentives would be in place to promote the development of more effective and efficient marketing programs.

Furthermore, few units within the federal government have marketing budgets, with the result that money for marketing has to be allocated from other sources. Marketing budgets need to be established so that money is able to compare benefits against the cost of developing and implementing the program.

Clients served and client satisfaction

The clientele of many public services is much more diverse than for private sector enterprises. As a result, expectations for services are not homogeneous. In the private sector, this heterogeneity of needs and wants is solved by pursuing strategies targeted to specific markets. In the public sector, market segmentation is also possible, but it has to be balanced against what is politically acceptable. Because of this, there are fewer situations in the public realm where
managers can apply the important marketing concept of providing different product quality levels (at corresponding prices) to meet different types of consumer needs.

Older research reported little evidence of attempts to tailor programs with specific interests – a lack of market segmentation in the public sector. Recent research, however, reveals that an increasing number of government organizations are attempting to tailor programs and products to groups with specific needs and interests – a market segmentation approach. For example, social-marketing programs designed by the Partnerships and Marketing Division in Health Canada are routinely based upon sophisticated marketing research in developing anti-smoking social-marketing campaigns targeted to specific youth markets. Similarly, Parks Canada has undertaken significant research to develop targeted marketing messages to different segments of Canadians, whose visits to national parks vary from bus tours to back-country hiking.

In many cases, however, there are legislative requirements governing the markets that must be targeted. Consequently, government organizations do not have the same freedom as private firms to choose their own targeted customers. It is also important to realize that governments have to interact with publics (distinct groups of people and/or organizations that have an actual or a potential interest in, or impact upon, an agency), other than their direct clients.

Implications for marketing strategy development

In developing a marketing strategy, it may be useful for management to recognize that two broad categories of clients exist for most government programs – direct and indirect. Direct clients are the immediate users of the service or good. Direct users can be

- voluntary – These clients have a great deal in common with private sector customers;
- entitled – Factors not directly controlled by these clients give them an automatic right to benefit from a particular program, e.g., Canada’s Old Age Security program;
- compelled users – People or organizations that are prescriptive, e.g., inmates, taxpayers, organizations in regulated industries.

Indirect clients include the people and organizations affected by the program outputs and outcomes (e.g., families of hospital patients) and those who pay for the programs (taxpayers).

In developing a marketing strategy, it is necessary to take into account the type of user for whom the strategy is being developed. The research showed that market segmentation and target marketing are most used when dealing with voluntary direct users (e.g., national park visitors, CHS chart users, youth targeted for anti-smoking messages). Since these users most closely parallel private sector consumers, tailored marketing programs are needed to meet the needs of various segments of voluntary users in order to persuade them to take part in the marketing exchange. It may also become necessary for governments to use market segmentation with certain groups of entitled users. For example, more and more entitled users of such government services as public schools and hospitals are demanding that these government services meet their own specific needs.

Consideration of this type of user also suggests client satisfaction, which is determined by the gap between expectations and the quality of the product or service provided. In the private sector, developing client satisfaction involves managing both the expectations and experiences of clients to foster long-term loyalty. While client satisfaction is a basic tenet of marketing programs in the private sector, it is not inherently a component of all such public programs. For example, although the federal government’s Employment Insurance program provides invaluable assistance to its clients (entitled users), it is not intended or designed to keep clients indefinitely, or to actively seek new clients. In contrast, the government will likely want to increase satisfaction among purchasers of tide tables and users of national parks.

The management of client satisfaction in the public sector is fundamentally different due to decisions made by governments concerning the intent of programs or services and the level of service it can afford to provide to clients. Government units developing successful marketing strategies need to clarify the type(s) of clients on which they
will focus their marketing efforts, determine appropriate levels of satisfaction and develop strategies to measure satisfaction. (This legitimate focus on some specific segments of the clientele when developing marketing programs does not mean that the concerns and needs of other client groups are not important and do not require attention any longer. It simply means that particular marketing programs focus attention on specific target markets for specific time periods.)

**Developing a marketing strategy around the “4Ps”**

Many government units are much more familiar with the communications/promotion part of marketing than with the other Ps (product, pricing and place/distribution), because many have developed communications plans outside of a marketing framework. Furthermore, research has revealed that many managers and others in government think that marketing is limited to advertising and/or promotion.11

Pricing is one of the most difficult issues in public sector marketing. Although standard processes exist for private industry, setting prices is a new activity for most government organizations. As discussed above, public sector organizations confront a different set of incentives and constraints than those in the private sector. For instance, major problems may arise when the government begins charging for formerly free services. In the cost-recovery environment, this situation is very common and presents problems. Similarly, developing product, distribution and promotion strategies in government marketing programs poses special challenges due to the issues discussed elsewhere in this article, including a lack of marketing expertise in government.

**Implications for marketing strategy development**

It is important to understand that marketing is not just advertising or promotion and that pricing, product, distribution and promotion strategies are all aspects of a complete marketing strategy. Developing this understanding is best done through marketing training. Once managers understand this, strategies for all elements of the marketing mix can be approached more appropriately.

**Different administrative/decision-making environments: visibility and accountability**

Overall, the research shows that the entire administrative and decision-making environment in government differs from that of private organizations. Among the key differences is the visibility of government and its accountability to the press and the public. Largely because of governments’ responsibility for controlling the public purse, visibility has a powerful impact on the development of public-policy decisions and on the management of marketing programs. Following from this, political forces have a far greater impact on public sector organizations, and government organizations have a much more comprehensive interrelationship with the general public. All case studies showed that government managers are highly sensitive to these political forces and the visibility of programs undertaken. Moreover, such awareness was brought to bear on the development of virtually all marketing campaigns studied.

**Implications for marketing strategy development**

As has been argued throughout this paper, it is essential to develop plans with clear objectives, cost estimates and results that can be measured. The greater accountability and visibility associated with public sector decision making are, in fact, suited to the discipline and development of successful marketing programs. In addition, in order for marketing to be successful in the government environment, it is necessary to assign responsibility for the marketing initiative to a senior manager with influence in the unit’s decision-making environment. Without this high-level leadership, it is unlikely that marketing programs will be successful in the long term. This senior-level leadership already exists in the private sector, where a firm’s marketing strategy is commonly the responsibility of a marketing vice-president.
Conclusions

This article has shown that government marketing is not homogenous and that four types of marketing commonly take place in the federal public sector. Also, the article has outlined seven major differences between marketing in the public and private sectors. Because of these differences, it is not possible to simply apply the marketing approach as one would in a business; marketing must be adapted when used in the public sector. Similarly, it is not appropriate to assume that one can apply marketing thinking in exactly the same ways in public and private sector institutions. One must consider such issues as resistance to marketing as a legitimate tool, lack of marketing institutionalization, differences in objectives between the private and public sectors, differences in how organizations are paid, differences in how consumers or clients are served, differences in developing strategy around the “4 Ps,” and, lastly, a different decision-making environment. Failure to take account of these issues is likely to lead to inappropriate, ill-conceived marketing programs that do not achieve their desired objectives. On the other hand, well-designed marketing programs that take into account the characteristics of public sector organizations can greatly assist the government in more effectively serving the Canadian public and in reaching its objectives.
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