

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**The Tail Wagging the Dog: To What Extent is Marketing Strategy
Sacrificed for Creativity?**

El-Murad, J. and Oliveira, T.

This is an electronic version of a paper presented at the *2015 AMS World Marketing Congress - Academy of Marketing Science*, Bari, Italy 21 to 25 Jul 2015.

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

THE TAIL WAGGING THE DOG: TO WHAT EXTENT IS MARKETING STRATEGY SACRIFICED FOR CREATIVITY?

Jaafar El-Murad, University of Westminster, UK, muradj@wmin.ac.uk
Tracey Oliveira, Argus Advisory Group, UK, tracey.oliveira@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the extent to which marketing managers sacrifice strategy for creativity when choosing advertising campaigns. A survey conducted with marketing managers investigated the criteria they apply when choosing between advertising creative suggestions, and the factors that they believe determine advertising campaign success. Criteria for evaluating advertising campaigns were assigned to the three scales of strategy, artistry, and originality with 'artistry' and 'originality' together comprising the 'creativity' component. Success factors related to product uniqueness, competition, the agency-client relationship, media selection, the nature of the market, financial and managerial resources, marketing objectives, message and creativity, and market research: 36 items for the 9 factors. The study confirmed that although marketing managers consider both strategy and creativity important when evaluating advertising campaign suggestions, they value appropriateness over originality. They believe their past successful campaigns were primarily the result of good strategy rather than of superior creativity, and do not admit to having been persuaded to abandon strategy by an agency's winning creative idea. Whilst younger, more educated but less experienced marketing managers are more influenced by superior creative ideas, more experienced marketing managers are less prone to be swayed by these and are more inclined to adhere to agreed strategy.

KEYWORDS: Advertising, Creativity, Marketing strategy, Marketing

INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about how creativity can be nurtured (eg Anderson, 1992; Cummings & Oldham, 1997; Nickerson, 1999) or inhibited (eg Amabile, 1997, 1998): in her provocatively entitled 1998 paper "How to kill creativity", Amabile listed six different categories of managerial practice that can adversely affect it. It can be counter-productive to reward it (Amabile, 1997) or to seek to direct it (El-Murad, 2003). Advertising creatives are frequently of the view that interference from clients, their own account executives, and especially copy testing all work

against the creative process. Koslow, Sasser and Riordan (2006) examined the often considerable impact clients can have on the creativity of their agencies. The involvement of senior management, for example, can inhibit the process because it creates a climate of fear, but on the other hand access to such managers can enhance creativity if it means there is a possibility of changing strategic direction. The current paper addresses this very topic, but explores it from the opposite perspective: given the time and trouble invested in strategic marketing planning, usually based on extensive situation analysis and marketing research, to what extent is marketing strategy abandoned in the face of an apparently winning creative idea? To what extent do marketing managers compromise strategy for creativity? To what extent is advertising creativity the tail wagging the dog?

We begin with a brief restatement of the process of marketing strategy development and how this guides the production of advertising creative and campaigns. The definition and role of creativity in advertising is discussed, from both the creative team's perspective and that of the marketing managers. An examination of the effect of originality and appropriateness on the creative choices of marketing managers and finally, an investigation into the perceived factors associated with successful campaigns were completed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The process begins with the development of a marketing strategy that is intended to set the direction for all marketing activities, including advertising (Kotler and Keller, 2006). While various alternatives exist, a comprehensive definition of marketing strategy is offered by El-Ansary (2006): "the total sum of the integration of segmentation, targeting, differentiation, and positioning strategies designed to create, communicate, and deliver an offer to a target market" (p. 267).

At its cornerstone is target market and differential advantage: target market refers to where the business will compete, while differential advantage is the perceived difference that leads to a customer's preference for one company's product over another's (Doyle, 2002). Differential advantage is achieved through positioning strategy and is crucial to an overall marketing plan because it defines all the subsequent decisions for executing it (Doyle, 2002). 'Positioning,' first coined by Trout (1969), refers to the position the product holds in the mind of the consumer.

In order to implement the positioning strategy, a set of marketing decisions called the 4Ps or the marketing mix is used (McCarthy, 1960). All elements of the marketing mix - the product (including branding and packaging), the price, the distribution and finally the promotion should reflect the strategically chosen positioning strategy. As this paper is concerned with advertising creativity, we shall focus on just one element of the marketing mix - promotion - and within that, just one component - advertising.

There are many definitions of advertising; we will use the one by Kotler and Keller (2006): "advertising is any paid form of non-personal presentation and promotion of ideas, goods, or services by an identified sponsor" (p. 568). Some of its main benefits are development of a long-term product image, generation of quick sales, and the ability to reach geographically disseminated customers (ibid). Marketing managers view advertising as a means of achieving specific objectives (such as to create awareness or to increase sales) that follow from their marketing strategy (Hirschman, 1989). These specific advertising objectives, usually communicated by client to agency in the form of a creative brief, serve as criteria when deciding between alternative creative ideas and plans (Doyle, 1996). In other words, advertising

objectives not only set guidelines for the advertising agency, but also help the marketing manager to make consistent decisions on advertising direction and creative when presented with suggestions. Once objectives have been set, the marketing manager can decide on the advertising budget (factors to consider when setting this include stage in the product life cycle, market share and consumer base, competition and clutter, advertising frequency, and product substitutability (Kotler and Keller, 2006)), and the agency team can move on to the next step, which is to develop the 'message' and to start working on creative ideas. This requires both a messaging strategy, what an ad says about a brand, and a creative strategy, how the ad communicates the brand claims (Kotler and Keller, 2006). Again, this must all be consistent with the marketing strategy, and in particular, with the positioning. The creative strategy is where the creative brief comes into play as the main communication "contract" between client and agency. Duckworth (1997) considered the creative brief the second 'leg of the relay race' of developing marketing communications, linking strategic development to creative output. It should contain the information necessary to inspire agency creatives to develop ideas (Pickton and Broderick, 2005), and it should set clear boundaries about what must and must not be said or shown. The message or creative must meet two criteria: first, it must create attention and second, it should elicit a desired behavioural response without being misconstrued or dismissed Doyle (2002). The 'desired behavioural response' is defined by the advertising objectives, which were derived from the positioning strategy and overall marketing strategy. Every element of the creative must be consistent with the marketing strategy, from the type and tempo of music used to the appearance of the actors and the timbre of their voices.

But first, the creative must draw the attention of the targeted audience. This is achieved by superior creativity (El-Murad and West, 2003), and "involves the agency creatives searching for new and often untried ways of presenting and conveying advertisers' messages" (ibid, p. 658).

In the last several years considerable literature on the definition, measurement, and enrichment of advertising creativity has emerged (eg Koslow et al., 2003; El-Murad and West, 2004; Belch and Belch, 2013, p.397). There is "normative importance placed upon creativity by both agencies and clients alike" (Hill et al., 2007, p. 10). Advertisers view creativity as one of the key expectations from agencies (Koslow et al., 2003). In terms of a formal definition of creativity, many include an aspect of problem solving (eg Simonton, 1999, Sternberg and Davidson, 1995). Bell (1992) felt that advertising creativity differs from other types of creativity in that it needs to solve problems, and is controlled by factors such as marketing objectives and competition. There is consensus that creativity involves both originality and appropriateness (Amabile, 1996, Kasof, 1995). Originality refers to the 'newness' or 'novelty' aspect of creativity. Sternberg and Lubart (1999) pointed out that originality alone is not enough. There must also be a 'useful' or 'value' component, which is referred to by some as appropriateness. Koslow et al. (2003) argue that "if creativity is both an original and appropriate solution to a problem, then for high agreement on what is creative, judges have to agree on what is original and appropriate" (p. 98). Originality is less subjective than appropriateness and people are much more accurate at judging it (Runco and Charles, 1993). If something is new or different, then it can be perceived as original, but appropriateness is relative to a person's frame of reference or set of norms (Koslow et al., 2003). In advertising, the perception of appropriateness varies depending on the role of the person judging it (Koslow et al., 2003). Consumers and creatives view appropriateness differently. For the former it is about being meaningful (Haberland and Dacin, 1992), which is often not the same as what the creatives think the consumers will find meaningful (Kover, 1995). Even the various roles within an advertising agency view appropriateness differently (Hirschman,1989).

For the account executive, the focus was on meeting the client's communication objectives, such as brand awareness or creating favourable attitudes. In other words, an appropriate advertisement is one that concurs with the marketing strategy. Those with creative roles within the agency, such as copy writer or art director, viewed appropriateness as something that showcases their creative aptitude and communicates their aesthetic values. Rothenburg (1994) found that account executives viewed strategy as what is appropriate, media personnel associated 'appropriate' with media strategy that provided maximum impact, and researchers thought it meant advertising that was based on research and had been consumer tested. The one common thread between all three was the view that appropriate advertising should persuade the consumer to buy or otherwise be 'on-strategy'. The account executives play the balancing role of dealing with both the creatives and the client, often becoming anxious or frustrated when the proposed ad copy strays too far from the strategy given by the client. Creatives are often stereotyped by account executives as viewing emotion as more appropriate (Kover and Goldberg, 1995), but even amongst the creative team there are differences in perception of appropriateness (Young, 2000).

Perhaps the biggest gap in perceptions of appropriateness is that between clients and their advertising agencies (Michell, 1984). Rothenburg (1994) saw creatives as indulgent, believing that for them appropriateness is just as linked to their artistry as it is to the client's needs, claiming at times, that the artistry prevails. On the other hand, marketing managers view appropriate advertising as a means of achieving strategic goals such as brand awareness or product positioning (Rothenburg, 1994). For them, the goal is 'effective' advertising. Creative people are quick to point out that "creativity is necessary for effectiveness and that it is what pushes the message into viewers' minds" (Kover et al., 1995, p.29). Effective advertising is vital for the attainment of marketing objectives (Gross, 1972); however, Rogers (1995) claims that senior managers deem 90% of all advertising ineffective in meeting its objectives (p. 20).

SUCCESSFUL ADVERTISING

El-Murad argues that creativity is the most important element in advertising success (El-Murad and West, 2004, p188). Both clients and agencies perceive it to be important and major expenditure is incurred to achieve it (Koslow et al, 2007). Its purpose is to gain customer attention and focus it on the brand and ultimately to persuade the customer to purchase (Flandin et al., 1992). If creative advertising is not noticed or a specified effect not achieved, then "the creative endeavour is considered to have failed" (El-Murad and West, 2004, p.190).

Four fundamental factors contribute to advertising failure: 1)The ineptitude of those charged with creating it, 2) inadequately set objectives and goals, 3)creativity applied primarily to win awards for creative excellence, and 4) lack of a comprehensive advertising work plan (Rogers, 1995). Rogers suggested that attention to objectives and advertising messages is more effective than artistry. Korgaonkar et al. (1984) listed 10 factors of successful advertising campaigns. Advertising agency executive were asked about successful and unsuccessful campaigns and the answers were compared. The ten factors related to advertising campaign success were: (1) product uniqueness, (2) product cost, (3) product type, (4) nature of the market, (5) competition, (6) agency-client relationship, (7) market research, (8) financial and managerial resources, (9) media selection, and (10) message and creativity. The same study was conducted a year later, but with executives of the advertisers as the respondents. The results of the two studies were then compared (Korgaonkar and Bellenger, 1985). The first study reported that correlates of

campaign success vary depending upon the planned outcome of the campaign, such as sales increase, favourable attitude, and brand/product awareness. When comparing both groups the results showed that successful campaigns have the following factors: they are based on market research, thorough media planning, and creative and unique messages. Only two factors were not common to the two groups: product uniqueness, and competition. Advertisers believed product uniqueness was related to a successful campaign and that the lower the competition, the higher the chance of success. Agency executives believed that higher competition meant more chance of success because it challenged them to produce the best possible work, whereas less competition meant complacency. When looking at overall campaign success, six factors stood out: competition, agency-client relationship, market research, financial and managerial resources, media selection, and message and creativity.

Whilst the definition of creativity varies, most agree that it includes originality and appropriateness (eg Amabile, 1996, Kasof, 1995). The originality factor, referring to 'newness' or 'novelty', is widely agreed upon, appropriateness less so. Marketing managers view "appropriateness" as meaning 'on strategy' whilst creatives perceive it to be about 'artistry' (Hirschman, 1989, Runco and Charles, 2003). The overall goal of both is to meet objectives, but for creatives artistry usually wins. Rogers (1995), however, maintained that attention to objectives and advertising messages is more effective than artistry.

The relationship between effectiveness and creativity and creativity's importance relative to other factors in the success of advertising campaigns is recognised (Kover et al., 1995, Korgaonkar and Bellenger, 1985). But has the drive to be creative infringed on the appropriateness factor and alignment with strategy?

It is this drive that places the greatest demands on the creative team, and it is this search for winning creative ideas that from time to time risks causing a departure from agreed strategy.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The literature review showed the importance of both marketing strategy and creativity in advertising. Advertising creativity was defined as having both appropriateness and originality. While the appropriate factor has different meanings for the creative team and the marketing manager, there still is a common element of 'newness' or originality - but originality alone is not sufficient. Creative ideas need to be tied to the advertising objectives that were developed from the overall marketing strategy.

As the ISBA stated:

"So much of the relationship between the client and the agency depends on their shared understanding of what constitutes a good idea. After all, this is what agencies all exist to do: to have ideas. And their remuneration depends on having those ideas valued by the people for whom they are created. Similarly, most advertisers know that engaging and memorable communications ideas will be more effective and more profitable to them than messages that are muddled or irrelevant." (ISBA, 2006)

It is the irrelevant messages that perhaps contribute to the failure of advertising campaigns and even perhaps why so many senior businessmen believe 90% of advertising fails. More specifically, it could be a lack of understanding by marketing managers that in order to be effective it has to be creative, which includes both an originality and appropriate element and that originality alone isn't sufficient (Sternberg and Lubart, 1999). This poses the question and the basis of this study:

To what extent do marketing managers sacrifice the appropriateness or 'on strategy' element of creativity for originality?

To answer this question, the following research hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Marketing managers value appropriateness over originality when evaluating advertising campaign suggestions.

H2: Marketing managers view past successful advertising campaigns as a result of creativity rather than strategy.

RESEARCH DESIGN

For the primary data a quantitative method consisting of a web survey was employed to assess the extent to which marketing managers sacrifice strategy for creativity. In the following section we explain the methodology employed for this study in detail, and include sections describing sample and data collection, questionnaire development, data analysis, and limitations.

Sample and Data Collection

A non-probability, convenience sampling technique was used. This method is the least expensive, most convenient, and takes the least amount of time to conduct (Malhotra and Birks, 2006). The limitations of this sampling method will be discussed later.

The sample was drawn from a list of marketing managers, advertising managers, and/or brand managers in England, obtained from a commercial company specialising in generating mailing lists. The list included marketing manager, advertising manager, and/or brand manager contacts from London, the Midlands, North, North West, and South East England. Companies ranged from small to large and covered a broad spectrum of industries. An email was sent out to the list with information, instructions, and the web survey link. The ALF directory was also utilized to obtain names and email addresses of advertisers and advertising agencies. ALF is a monthly directory containing information on the top UK advertisers, agencies, and brands (Emap Communications, 2006). Advertising agencies were also contacted via email and asked if they would forward the email with survey information, instructions, and the web survey link to their clients for participation in the survey. To encourage more participation, all respondents were offered the choice of having the results of the survey sent to them. A list of 1,450 contacts with email addresses was compiled and the email sent out. 215 of these were returned as undeliverable (around 15% of the total). When sending out emails from email address lists it is common to have about 20% returned due to issues such as the server being down, security issues or anti-spam software, and individuals who have left the company and no longer work there (Electric Marketing, 2006). Two weeks later a follow-up email was sent out to all non-respondents. After the follow-up email, 95 out of 1,235 managers responded to the survey. About half (52) responded after the initial email and the rest responded after the follow-up email. All responses were reviewed and analysed for missing data. As a rule of thumb, missing data under 10% for an individual case can generally be ignored, as long as the missing data occurs in a random manner (Hair et al., 2006). This rule of thumb was applied to this study, which brought the total number of valid cases to 87.

Questionnaire Design

A standardised questionnaire self-administered via the web was the method chosen to obtain quantitative data for this study. A web survey has several advantages: low cost, speed, social desirability, flexibility of data collection, and diversity of questions (Malhotra and Birks, 2006). The questionnaire was standardised to ensure the data were consistent and could be analysed easily and accurately. Direct, structured questions were used with a non-comparative, 5-point Likert scale utilised for the response format. Likert scales are easier for respondents and thus appropriate for web surveys (Malhotra and Birks, 2006). Questions were chosen to generate information that will efficiently support marketing decisions made by managers and to ensure that they appropriately measure the variables in the research question and hypotheses.

To make sure the hypotheses were addressed, studies were examined in the literature review that conceptualize the topic of study and that use a similar methodology (Rudestam and Newton, 1992). Two particular studies were combined and employed as the basis of this study.

Q1 addressed the first hypothesis (H1) and was developed from a study by Koslow et al. (2003) that examined the perceptions of creativity from people within advertising agencies. Their study used a survey instrument that was devised using data from a literature review, focus groups, in-depth interviews, and supported by the originality-appropriateness scheme and the Amabile model (1996). For this study, only the originality-appropriateness scheme was employed. The beginning stem/question was changed from “Compared to other advertisement/campaigns with the same media approach, this advertisement/campaign was...” (Koslow et al., 2003, p.102) to “Please indicate which of the following criteria you would use for evaluating suggestions for an advertising campaign...”

Three scales for originality, strategy, and artistry were used with four items in each. All of the items were randomly mixed so that the three scales could not easily be identified.

Q2 addressed the second hypothesis (H2) and was developed to confirm certain factors associated with successful advertising campaigns, and in particular whether success was due to strategy or creativity. It was adapted from Korgaonkar and Bellenger (1984), who had surveyed advertising agency executives and reported on the correlation of 10 factors for successful advertising campaigns. The study was repeated the following year but with executives of the advertisers and results were compared. For the current study, each factor was investigated using a series of statements and responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”. Again, the 10 factors previously used were (1) product uniqueness (2) product cost (3) product type (4) nature of the market (5) competition (6) agency-client relationship (7) market research (8) financial and managerial resources (9) media selection, and (10) message and creativity. An additional factor called ‘marketing objectives’ was added due to its relevance to strategy, to include an additional strategy variable. The statements under each factor were jumbled and in no particular order so that they were not too obvious, and so that respondents would not detect a pattern.

Finally demographic and classification questions were asked including gender, age, education, experience, job title, product category, and level of experience with advertising campaigns. A pilot survey was conducted with a representative sample (n=10) to ensure correct terminology and minimise respondent error. After feedback a final revised version was completed.

RESULTS

Sample Demographics

The survey was conducted with a sample of 87 marketing managers, 52% of whom were female and 48% male. The majority (75%) of respondents were between 20-39 years of age. 48 were between 30-39, a little more than half, and 18 were between 20-29. The majority had a college degree or higher; 59% with a bachelor's degree and 28% with a postgraduate degree. All were client-side and the majority (73%) had never worked on the agency side. There was a wide range of marketing experience: 18 respondents with 0-5 years, 36 with 6-10 years, and another 18 with 11-15 years. Whilst these three groups accounted for 79% of the total, a further 21% had more than 15 years of experience. Almost half had worked on 10 or more advertising campaigns, while 36% had worked on only 3-5 advertising campaigns. A broad range of product categories were covered, the greatest single group (15 cases) being FMCG. The rest were spread thinly over several categories.

Evaluating Advertising Creative

Q1 asked respondents to indicate which criteria they would use for evaluating suggestions for advertising campaigns. The criteria contained items from three categories: strategy, artistry, and originality.

Most respondents claimed that strategy and originality were the two criteria they use to evaluate advertising propositions. However, when comparing the frequency distribution for both the strategy and originality scales, the majority of respondents 'strongly agreed' on all four items in the strategy scale, while the majority 'agreed' rather than 'strongly agreed' with the items in the originality scale. Originality and strategy are both valued, but more value is placed on strategy. While respondents didn't believe artistry to be an important criterion, the majority of them agreed that 'emotionally expressive' was a factor. When evaluating advertising, the tail is cherished, but it does not appear to wag the dog.

Factors of Success

Q2 required respondents to consider past successful advertising campaigns and to indicate which of the factors listed contributed most to that success. The 9 factors (1) product uniqueness, (2) nature of the market, (3) competition, (4) agency-client relationship, (5) market research, (6) financial and managerial resources, (7) media selection, (8) marketing objectives, and (9) message and creativity were represented by a total of 36 statements. The majority of respondents agreed there was an association between most of the factors tested and successful advertising campaigns. Most respondents agreed with one of the four statements given for the competition factor: Q2.22 *The product was launched in a highly competitive market.* On the other hand, the majority were indifferent or neutral with regard to the other three statements: Q2.4 *The market was characterised by many competitors,* Q2.5 *Customers were satisfied with competitors' products,* and Q2.36 *The competitors spent a lot of money advertising their product.*

Strategic Priority

The 12 items in the scales of strategy, artistry, and originality were summated into a new variable 'Strategic Priority' and tested for reliability (Cronbach's Alpha .683). The mean was 40.36, only slightly above the median of 40. This would imply that strategy and creativity both seem to be valued with regard to choosing advertising campaigns. However, the majority of respondents

‘strongly agreed’ with strategy items and only ‘agreed’ with the originality items. This implies that there is still a stronger preference for strategy as a criterion for judging advertising creative suggestions.

Success Due to Strategy

Q2 was designed to measure whether respondents felt previous success was due predominantly to adherence to strategy or because of superior creativity. The 36 items that comprise the 9 various factors related to successful advertising campaigns were ‘summed’ (Cronbach’s Alpha was .791) and the mean calculated, the new variable was then labelled ‘Success Due to Strategy’. The mean score was 125.81 and slightly above the median of 125. This infers that respondents perceived both strategy and creativity as reasons for successful advertising campaigns, with a slight inclination towards strategy.

Predisposition to Strategic or Creative Consideration

Given the closeness of results between ‘strategy’ and ‘creativity’, further analysis was done using ANOVA to identify characteristics of respondents more likely to choose either platform. Results were as follows:

Managers with experience of more than just 1-2 advertising campaigns are more likely to rely on strategic relevance when evaluating advertising campaign ideas ($p=.001$).

Older managers were less likely to use ‘different’ as a criterion. In general, younger managers appear to be more inclined to do so than older managers ($p=.040$).

Managers with more marketing experience were the least likely to apply ‘emotionally expressive’ as a criterion for judging campaign suggestions ($p=.016$).

Managers who had a bachelor’s or postgraduate degree were more likely to value ‘emotionally expressive’ as a criterion for evaluating advertising campaign ideas than managers with only a diploma or A-levels ($p=.007$).

The higher the education level of the managers, the more likely they were to use ‘original’ as a measure for evaluating advertising campaign suggestions ($p=.011$).

LIMITATIONS

The usual limitations that exist with survey research of time and access apply. While probability sampling would be ideal, convenience sampling was used, although selection bias was avoided by obtaining the email lists from an impartial third party. For this study, efforts were made to obtain a broad representation of marketing managers responsible for choosing advertising campaigns. Uncontrollable factors such as holiday absences and scheduling conflicts may have hindered the accessibility of certain prospective respondents, but there is no reason to assume that these would have been other than random. Questionnaire length may have discouraged some individuals from participating although they were told it would take only 10-15 minutes to complete. Finally, part of the questionnaire was of a retrospective nature and respondents may not accurately recall all aspects of the advertising campaigns or indeed report them honestly.

CONCLUSIONS

The study has confirmed that marketing managers value appropriateness over originality when judging advertising campaign ideas, supporting H1. The marketing managers in this study,

consistent with the findings of Rogers (1995), felt strategy was more important than artistry. Creatives viewed emotion as necessary, as in Kover and Goldberg (1995), but marketing managers merely considered it important. The consensus was that strategy and creativity are almost equally important when evaluating potential advertising campaigns, with strategy marginally taking priority. Marketing managers also believed past successful campaigns owed more to strategy than to creativity, disproving H2. This study confirmed that the factors of market research, financial and managerial resources, media selection, and message and creativity contributed to success, but differed from Korgaonkar and Bellenger (1985) with respect to competition and agency-client relationship. Neither factor seemed to have much of an impact on success of these campaigns, although the majority agreed on one of the four statements given in the competition factor: 'the product was launched in a highly competitive market'. This is of particular interest because in Korgaonkar and Bellenger (1985), advertisers believed higher competition meant lower chance of success. For this research, it seems the advertisers felt that a highly competitive market meant a higher chance of success. Also, there was agreement that the nature of the market, product uniqueness, and marketing objectives also contributed to campaign success.

Younger, more educated but less experienced marketing managers are more influenced by creativity or superior creative ideas, while the more experienced marketing managers (in terms of advertising campaign experience) are less prone to be swayed by creative ideas and more inclined to stick to the agreed strategy.

The importance of creativity to advertising is undeniable and the need to align it with marketing strategy is necessary for effective advertising outcomes. Much research has been published on creativity with regard to advertising agencies, but very little exists from the point of view of the advertisers. This study goes some small way to address that paucity.

REFERENCES

- Amabile, T.M., (1997), Motivating Creativity in Organizations: On Doing What You Love and Loving What You Do, *California Management Review*, 40 (1), 39–58.
- Amabile, T.M. (1998), How to kill creativity, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 76, 5, 76-87
- Amabile, T.M., (1996). *Creativity in Context*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Anderson, J. (1992), Weirder than fiction: the reality and myths of creativity, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vo. 6, No. 4, 40-47
- Ansary, A., (2006). Marketing Strategy: Taxonomy and Frameworks. *European Business Review*. **18** (4), 266-293.
- Armstrong, J. Scott, (2008 forthcoming), *Persuasive Advertising*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Belch, M.A., Belch, G.E., (2013) The Future of Creativity In Advertising, *Journal of Promotion Management*, 19(4), pp.395-399
- Bell, J.A., (1992). Creativity, TV Commercial Popularity, and Advertising Expenditures. *International Journal of Advertising*. **11** (2), 165-183.
- Britt, S.H., (1976). Are So-called Successful Advertising Campaigns Really Successful? *Strategic Advertising Decisions*. Columbus: Grid Inc.
- Cummings, A. and Oldham, G. (1997), Managing work contexts for the high potential employee, *California Management Review*, Berkeley, Fall, 22-38.
- Doyle, P., (2002). *Marketing Management and Strategy*. 3rd ed. Essex: Prentice Hall.
- Duckworth, G., (1997). *Excellence in Advertising: The IPA Guide to Best Practice*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Duncan, T.R. and Everett, S.E., (1993). Client Perceptions of Integrated Marketing Communications. *Journal of Advertising Research*. May/June, 30-39.
- Electric Marketing, (2006). *Email Terms and Conditions*. [online] London. Available from: <<http://www.electricmarketing.co.uk/needhelp.html>>.
- Emap Communications, (2006). *ALF: The Monthly Guide to Agencies and Advertisers*. London.
- El-Murad, J. and West, D.C., (2003). Risk and Creativity in Advertising. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 19, 657-673.
- El-Murad, J. and West, D.C., (2004). The Definition and Measurement of Creativity: What Do We Know? *Journal of Advertising Research*. 44 (11/12), 1254-1270.
- Flandin, M.P., Martin, E., and Simkin, L.P., (1992). Advertising Effectiveness Research: A Survey of Agencies, Clients, and Conflicts. *International Journal of Advertising*. **11** (3), 203-214.
- Gross, I., (1972). The Creative Aspects of Advertising. *Sloan Management Review*. **14** (1), 83-109.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., and Black, W.C., (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hirschman, E.C., (1989). Role-Based Models of Advertising Creation and Production. *Journal of Advertising*. **18** (4), 42-53.
- Hill, R., Johnson, L.W., and Rahim, M.H.A., (2007). Advertising Creativity: The View Across the Meeting Room and Across Cultures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*. **19** (1), 9-21.

ISBA: Incorporated Society of British Advertisers, Institute of Practitioners in Advertising, Marketing Communication Consultants Association, and Public Relations Consultants Association, (2006). *Judging Creative Ideas: A Best Practice Guide to Assessing Agency Creativity*. [online] Available from: http://www.isba.org.uk/isba/_documents/1JudgingCreativeIdeas.pdf

Kasof, J., (1995). Explaining Creativity: The Attributional Perspective. *Journal of Creativity Research*. **8** (4), 311-366.

Korgaonkar, P.K., Moschis, G.P., and Bellenger, D.N., (1984). Correlates of Successful Advertising Campaigns. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **24** (1), 47-53.

Korgaonkar, P.K. and Bellenger, D.N., (1985). Correlates of Successful Advertising campaigns: The Manager's Perspective. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **25** (4), 34-39.

Koslow, S., Sasser, S. and Riordan, E., (2006). Do marketers get the advertising they need or the advertising they deserve? Agency views of how clients influence creativity, *Journal of Advertising*, vol 35, No. 3 (Fall), 81-101

Koslow, S., Sasser, S. and Riordan, E., (2003). What is Creative to Whom and Why? Perceptions in Advertising Agencies. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **43** (1), 96-110.

Kotler, P. and Keller, K.L., (2006). *Marketing Management*. 12th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kover, A.J., Goldberg, S.M., and James, W.L., (1995). Creativity vs. Effectiveness? An Integrating Classification for Advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **35** (6), 29-40.

Lauterborn, R., (1990). New Marketing Litany: 4Ps Passe; C-Words Take Over. *Advertising Age*. October, 26.

Malhotra, N.K. and Birks, D.F., (2006). *Marketing Research: An Applied Approach*. 2nd ed. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

McCarthy, E.J., (1960). *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Michell, P.C., (1984). Accord and Discord in Agency-Client Perceptions of Creativity. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **24** (5), 9-24.

Nickerson, R.S. (1999), Enhancing creativity, in *Handbook of Creativity*, Sternberg, R. Ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 392-430.

Norusis, M.J., (2006). *SPSS 15.0 Guide to Data Analysis*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Pickton, D. and Broderick, A., (2005). *Integrated Marketing Communications*. 2nd ed. Essex: Prentice Hall.

Rogers, S., (1995). How to Create Advertising That Works. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*. **10** (2), 20-33.

Rothenburg, R., (1994). *Where the Suckers Moon: An Advertising Story*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Rudestam, K.E. and Newton, R.R., (1992). *Surviving Your Dissertation: A Comprehensive Guide to Content and Process*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Runco, M.A., and Charles, R.E., (1993). Judgements of Originality and Appropriateness as Predictors of Creativity. *Personality and Individual Differences*. **15** (5), 537-546.

Simonton, D.K., (1999). Creativity from a Historiometric Perspective. *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. and Davidson, J.E., (1995). *The Nature of Insight*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Sternberg, R.J. and Lubart, T.I., (1999). The Concept of Creativity: Prospects and Paradigms. *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, D. and Berthon, P., (1997). Antecedents of Risk-Taking Behaviour by Advertisers: Empirical Evidence and Management Implications. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **37** (5), 27-40.
- White, G.E., (1972). Creativity: The X Factor in Advertising Theory. *Journal of Advertising*. **1** (1), 28-32.
- Young, C.E., (2000) Creative Differences Between Copywriters and Art Directors. *Journal of Advertising Research*. **40** (3), 19-26.
- Zinkhan, G.M., (1993). Creativity in Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*. 22 (2), 1-3.