

Archetypes of Jung as an Effective Tool of the Adoption Concept in the Political PR and Marketing Explaining Ongoing Rivalry between Candidates to Presidency

Kakhaber DJAKELI *

Abstract

“The communication of ideas between individuals and any resultant adoption of those ideas is a complex mechanism”. (Wills & Midgley, 1973, p. 77) Rogers defined five stages for every individual in an adoption process. But how well this famous five stages of Rogers work in political marketing? What sharpens the process to move from awareness to interest in political market? Why does people’s awareness not always turn into the interest? What makes people to be more involved into the activities of some political brand? The possible answer – good archetypes for their owners make easy the success of the political person on political market. Archetypes of Carl Gustav Jung can be interesting tool in political Branding. Archetypes can work well as a desired positioning for many brands in political markets. By archetype development we can discuss success and failure of some political brands. This concept is linked to brand equity too. To make brand strong marketers have the famous Customer Based Brand Equity model (CBBE). In this model everything is seen from the view of consumers. “Two fundamentally important questions marketers facing are: What do different brands mean to consumers? And how does the brand knowledge of consumers affect their response to marketing activity? The basic premise of the CBBE model is that the power of brand lies in what customers have learned, felt, seen, and heard about the brand, as a result of their experiences over time. In other words, the power of brand lies in what resides in the minds of customers”. (Keller, 2011, p. 71)

From the view of Customer Based Brand Equity model, it is seen that brand knowledge is the key to creating brand equity; hence brand knowledge establishes difference between products, services, ideas, persons. The Brand Knowledge is standing on two legs, or two main components: Brand Awareness and Brand Image.

Keywords: Archetypes, political brands, political marketing

Introduction

“All that happens is a symbol, and as it represents itself perfectly, it points to all the rest”. (Goethe, 1918) According Carl Gustav Jung Archetypes are “forms or images of a collective nature which occur practically all over the earth as constituents of myths and at the same time as individual products of unconscious origin” (Jung, 1980).

Archetypes are very powerful tool for building a personal brand for political market. The psychologist Carl Jung believed that all people have a universal shared unconscious out of which archetypes emerge as forms or images that everyone recognizes. Archetypes are able to make brand more understandable, hence they simplify Brand Knowledge and brand adoption process, make it the easier. Especially archetypes can be beneficial in Political branding, in some countries where Brand Personalities have excessive power on political process; hence all things depend from how people learn the brands. “All definitions typically either implicitly or explicitly rely on brand knowledge structures in the minds of consumers – individuals or organizations – as the source or foundation of brand equity. In other words, the real power of a brand is in the thoughts, feelings, images, beliefs,

attitudes, experiences and so on that exist in the mind of consumers. This brand knowledge affects how consumers respond to products, prices, communications, channels and other marketing activity – increasing or decreasing brand value in the process. Along these lines, formally, customer-based brand equity has been defined as the differential effect that consumer brand knowledge has on their response to brand marketing activity”. (Keller, 2003, p. 7)

Also it seems to be great tool in political marketing. “To get nominated, they (politicians) must connect with voters in a way that offers the meaning promise appropriate to the particular time. John F. Kennedy did this effectively by invoking Camelot”. (Mark & Carol 1993, p. 27) This connection to the electorate, by Invoking Camelot, could not be effective without archetypes.

Brand Knowledge and Archetypes of Jung

Brand knowledge makes easy its success. The archetypes make easy knowledge of the brand. Brand knowledge is not the facts about the brand – it is all the thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, experiences, and so on that becomes linked to the brand in

* Associate professor, Faculty of Business Management, International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia
E-mail: kdjakeli@ibsu.edu.ge

the minds of consumers. (Table 1)

As we know some “mental maps can portray well people’s knowledge to brands. Two particularly important components of brand knowledge are brand awareness and brand image.

Brand image is defined as consumers associations to brand”. (Boivin, 1986)

The success of the implementation of the new idea, new product, and political brand and event depends on the process of its adoption by customers.

The Analyze of the Adoption and New Possible Stage for Political PR and Marketing into It

What made Georgian electorate to follow new political leader? Is it able that, non-researched political fashion in Georgia made people to follow fresh made, inexperienced politician, and billionaire - Ivanishvili? Was it the new fashion in politics? What is the fashion?

“Fashion is the symbol which describes the subtle and often hidden forces which shape our society – political, economic, psychological...the search for the absolute by man who is only able to create the ephemeral” (Beaton, 1954, p. 9) future. According Beaton, who made important observation – the change, the “Sine qua non”(Beaton, 1954, p. 9) fashion, undermines progress towards aesthetic perfection, which can emerge only after long tradition for the old style. Really on the October parliament elections in 2012 – political coalition, with ephemeral name-Georgian Dream, and some aesthetic symbols, confirmed people that they are savers and supporters of the country.

The results of election are much dependent on type of democracy in the country, what has interesting explanations already in other countries too. For example American political marketing frequently assesses democracy in their country. “American democracy is a paradoxical form of politics. It encourages the free, even fractious expression of conflicting inter-

Table 1 Archetypes of Carl Gustav Jung (Jung, 1990, p. 22)

Archetype	Motivation	Motto	Core desire
Creator	Stability & Control	It can be created	Create something of great value
Caregiver	Stability& Control	Love people as yourself	Protect people
Ruler	Stability & Control	Power is not everything it is the only thing	Control
Jester	Belonging & enjoyment	If I cannot dance I should not be part of your revolution	Enjoy
Regular guy	Belonging & enjoyment	All man and woman created equal	Connection with others
Lover	Risk & Mastery	I only have eyes for you	Intimacy
Hero	Risk & Mastery	I should will and win	Courageous for people
Outlaw	Risk & Mastery	Rules are meant to be broken	Revenge or revolution
Magician	Risk & Mastery	It can happen	Knowledge
Innocent	Independence & Fulfillment	Free to be	To experience to paradise
Explorer	Independence & Fulfillment	Don't fence me in	To find yourself through exploring the world
Sage	Independence & Fulfillment	The truth will set you free	The discovery of truth

ests and expects that to produce social consensus. It celebrates the virtues of citizenship, but does little to encourage it. And it puts its faith in the “common man” while extolling the virtues of “leadership” as the engine of our progress. How America survives, much less prospering has understandably been a recurring question. Political institutions absorb and channel conflict, but in the last four decades haven’t necessarily resolved it. And our civic culture, the widespread public support for democratic norms and procedures, has always been as ambivalent as their first controversial application. Each of these may be necessary, but none seems sufficient” (Renshon, 2000).

How new person is important in politics and people learn about him? In some countries Brand personality in political life play more significant role than their or other political parties. Brand personality is “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand”. (Aaker, 1997) But how does it work when newcomer into politics gains great success fast?

“The communication of ideas between individuals and any resultant adoption of those ideas is a complex mechanism”. (Wills & Midgley, 1973, p. 77) Rogers defined five stages for every individual in an adoption process, these are:

- Awareness: the individual becomes cognizant of the innovation but lacks information about it.
- Interest: the individual is stimulated to seek information about the innovation.
- Evaluation: the individual considers whether it would make sense to try the innovation.
- Trial: the individual tries the innovation on a small scale to improve his estimate of its utility.
- Adoption: the individual decides to make full and regular use of the innovation”. (Rogers, 1962)

The same stages people generally use for learning of any Political Leader. But how well this famous five stages of Rogers work in political marketing? What sharpens the process to move from awareness to interest in political market? Why does people’s awareness not always turn into the interest? What makes people to be more involved into the activities of some political brand? The possible answer – good archetypes for their owners make easy the success of political person on political market.

For political marketing use, between first and second stages of Rogers’s adoption process, according political marketing research undertaken for this article, some new hypothesis, about Archetype Adoption can be implemented. The coinciding of archetypes between customer and branded subject makes easy continuation of adoption. Research undertaken for this article shows that the process of new adoption, like adoption of new thing on political market, especially adoption of the new person, goes easier, if his/her archetypes seems attractive or the same as the archetypes of the customers.

Rogers has tried to characterize the five adopter groups in terms of ideational values. They are: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority and laggards. “The dominant value of innovators is venture sameness; they like to try new ideas, even at some risk, and are cosmopolitan in orientation. The dominant value of early adopter is respect; they enjoy a position in the community as opinion leaders and adopt new ideas early but with discretion. The dominant value of the early majority is deliberativeness; these people like to adopt new ideas, before the average member, of the social system although they rarely are leaders. The dominant value of late majority is skepticism. They don’t adopt an innovation until the weight of majority opinion seems to legitimize its utility. Finally the dominant value of the laggards is tradition; they are suspicious of any changes ...and adopt the innovation only because it has now taken on a measure of tradition itself”. (Wills & Midgley, 1973, p. 78)

Brand knowledge is made from individual pieces of information (called nodes) that link together in memory to form more complex associative networks (Collins & Loftus, 1975; Wyer & Srull, 1989). And what kind of role archetypes play to meet and receive these nodes well? Accordingly, one of main questions, what can be established to marketing research undertaken for this article, how these feelings to some ventures, deliberativeness, skepticism and tradition adopt Archetypes generally. Take into consideration the characteristics of adoption and its steps, with cosmopolitanism of innovators, the theory of archetypes of famous Carl Gustav Jung can have excessive use. Because implementation of new things according marketing theory hangs on the degree of its adoption by innovators and its distribution to other groups, some new stage can be added to above mentioned Rogers Adoption process. But adoption process of the Innovators can be differentiated from the adoption process of early adopters, or early majority, or late majority and laggards. Because adoption process of innovators seems to be very different, due to their personal distinguishes and due to their independence. Other customer groups, for example early majority or late majority cannot represent such qualities, hence they can be under pressure of others. The problem of social pressure is the main factor, differentiated adoption process of these groups from each other. Taken into consideration all factors above, new stage can be introduced into adoption process of innovators. This new stage is - Archetype Adoption.

So by such additional stage into AIETA model of Rogers Adoption we receive the new AAIETA model (Figure 1).

Now let us clarify why adoption process of different groups is not the same due to the pressure. As Katz postulated, “in addition to serving as networks of communication, interpersonal relations are also sources of pressure to conform to the group’s way of thinking and acting, as well as sources of social sup-



Figure 1 New adoption process AAIETA– with additional stage of Archetype Adoption.

port". (Katz, 1967) This means that as many innovators choose some innovation, as stronger they influence and pressure other groups to insist them using their findings too. Early majority can be as adoptive as innovators, but it will be logical if we assume that, other groups, like early majority, late majority and especially Laggards, will not have the same independence and courage to follow the new idea, or new person, as it was done by courageous innovators.

Accordingly the Adoption process of early adopters can be different, than adoption process of innovators. As Rogers mentioned and we referred above, because the dominant value of early adopter is respect to new idea what can bring him/her to high social position, archetypes can have less influence. The political adoption process of early majority will be also different. As Festinger researched the sources of pressure between groups identified two major sources for uniformity: "

- Social reality: an opinion, a belief, an attitude
- Group location: pressure toward uniformity among members of a group". (Festinger, 1950)

Archetype Analyze of the Rivalry between Georgian Brand Personalities – Marketing Research done after Elections 2012

Just after October 2012 parliamentary elections, at the International Black Sea University focus group research was started. To analyze Archetype development of Georgian Presidents and their main rivals 10 focus groups were gathered and more than hundred people were invited in it. The members for the focus group research were selected from different social groups, different regions and income groups, but those who permanently lived in Georgia last 23 years and who in the period of first elections in Georgian history in 1990 were already 18 years old. The research methodology was simple and effective. Specially printed Cards of different archetypes have been given to focus group members and they arranged archetypes of presidents and their rivals in development, from beginning of the time of the rivalry to the victory or defeat. Problem was a wide spread of time span of presidents of Georgia and their rivals. The first president of Georgia was elected in 1991, the second in 1995 and the third in 2004, and parliament election bringing new leader to the country – Mr. Ivanishvili, was done in 2012. The problem was solved because we have invited middle aged people, having participated to all political events, meetings and demonstrations of last 23 years history of Georgia. The focus group moderator was allowing them to choose Archetypes for political leader and describe their political life only by archetype development. So we received the following archetype development for them. (Table 2)

Finally, it seems logical that first president Gamsakhurdia, had not lost any elections, he was dismissed by military coup, and finally he died in 1993 in Samegrelo region, where he once again was trying to regain his power over the country and defeat his rivals having occupied the country violently. (Table 3)

It seems clear that Shevardnadze gathered very bad archetypes, except Sage, and he also lost in

numbers of archetypes against his rival. Rivals of Shevardnadze collected very good and clear archetypes to win. According this research it seems obviously logical that the presidency of second President Shevardnadze ended by peaceful Rose Revolution, when people of Georgia in 2003 altogether protested in the streets and squares against the bad ruler and he was suppressed to go. The research also shows that person's archetypes, like image, during some period can be changed, hence it is some art of someone's or something's positioning in the mind of customers. (Table 4)

At the end of his presidency, before elections 2012, when his party needed president's great image, unfortunately but logically Misha Saakashvili had collected very risky archetypes. We know that in the beginning of his presidential period, Saakashvili possessed an image of Hero. The Hero acts courageously to improve a situation. Having defeated the corruption and bribery and trying to establish the non – corrupt society Saakashvili was really great. But high costs of society management increased taxes, tariffs and especially penalties. The social base of Misha Saakashvili was the rural part and the urban middle, class of the population which was poor and been highly damaged by increasing fees, taxes and penalties. Just several days before October elections when the multiple videos of revolting prisoner abuse was shown in different TV programs and uploaded to the internet, Saakashvili's image was transformed into the image of Outlaw, and exactly at that time Bidzina Ivanishvili was able to gain an image of Warrior, Caregiver and Hero. Above mentioned Adoption theory, with new stage what we entitled as Archetype Adoption was also proofed during the research undertaken for this article. Tired from dirty rumors about acted President – Saakashvili, people having awareness about new political person Ivanishvili, well adopted him, because his archetypes were liked by majority of population immediately. Especially for Georgia the Caregiver archetype of Ivanishvili became very attractive one. As it is known Caregiver archetype is altruistic – motivated by a desire to help others and protect them from harm. Examples include Mother Teresa. Another archetype – Warrior or Hero, combined with interesting archetype of Innocent person, backed also by archetype of Magician and Sage can build vanguard of archetypes combined in Ivanishvili's victorious brand.

It can be assumed that generally political brands fail because they don't sustain in Archetypes. Archetypal development of the brands of presidents of Georgia and their rivals shows that, long before defeat, they lose best archetypes. Why it happens and how to manage archetypes, is a very challenging question.

Marketing Research to Archetype Rivalry between Candidates of Presidency in Georgian President Elections of 2013 October

To analyze Archetype rivalry between candidates of presidency to 2013 president elections 7 focus groups were gathered and more than hundred people were invited to it. We invited people from all social groups of Georgia: upper meddlers' making themselves,

Table 2 *2 First President Zviad Gamsakhurdia and his Rival*

Archetype development of the first President Zviad Gamsakhurdia	Archetype development of Eduard Shevardnadze the Rival of First President of Georgia	Time periods
Heroic Warrior for the independence, caregiver,	Ruler, outlaw, Sage	Until president elections of Gamsakhurdia 1988-1991
Heroic warrior, ruler, caregiver	Sage, Magician, Explorer, outlaw	After president elections where Gamsakhurdia won well to his death in west Georgia. 1991-1993.

Table 3 *Second President and his rival*

Archetype development of the second President – Eduard Shevardnadze	Archetype development of Misha Saakashvili, the Rival of Second President of Georgia	Time periods
warrior, outlaw, Sage	Member, lover, jester,	Until 1 st president elections of Shevardnadze 1991-1995
Outlaw (corrupt), destroyer, ruler, Sage (but for his clan)	Hero, warrior, Creator, member, jester, explorer, lover, caregiver, sage	After president elections to “Rose revolution” 1995-2003

Table 4 *third president and his rival*

Archetype development of the Third President – Misha Saakashvili	Archetype development of Bidzina Ivanishvili the Rival of third President of Georgia	Time periods
Hero, warrior, Creator, member, jester, explorer, lover, caregiver, outlaw	Caregiver, magician	Until 1 st president elections of Misha Saakashvili 2000-2004
Ruler, jester, outlaw, lover, member, caregiver, Creator,	Caregiver, sage, magician, innocent	Between 1 st and the second president elections 2004-2008
Outlaw, ruler, creator,	Warrior – Hero, sage, explorer, Caregiver, magician, innocent, member, creator, jester	From second president elections to the parliament elections of Georgia 2012, October 2008-2012

middle social group members, lower-meddlers and lower-lowers. Previously the focus group moderator had asked them to mention only two most important archetypes for each candidate, to motivate their brain to choose strongest archetype images of candidates to presidency of Georgia. Accordingly we received the following table 5.

Here once again we can emphasize archetype adoption phenomenon of the population.

Table 5 *The Archetype rivalry of some Presidency Candidates to 2013 elections*

Archetypes of Jung	Hero	warrior	outlaw	innocent	sage	Magician	Ordinary guy	Creator	Caregiver	Jester	Ruler	lover	Explorer
Margvelashvili (Georgian Dream)				X	X								
Baqradze (UNM)			X				X						
Burjanadze		X	X										
Natelashvili		X								X			
Davitashvili		X	X										
Targamadze						X				X			

Here once again we can emphasize archetype adoption phenomenon of the population

It seems obvious that, archetypes, as a universal language, can be very effective tool in Political Marketing and branding. Especially in developing countries with messianic tradition of life, coming from the culture, Political Branding like Invoking Camelot can be very effective, in the beginning phase of political battle for any politically active subject or object. At the same time, political branding needs great sustainability of archetype development, in the process of brand building. Especially, at the end phase of the elections, scandals seem to be very painful and unexpected, like Georgian prison rape crisis, destroying powerful brand – United National Movement and his leader, President of the country. Against such scandals and activities, political brands should prepare their Risk Management Programs, wisely explaining, or describing ways to regain their archetypes, what are much valuable for success.

The research undertaken at the International Black Sea University, comparing different politicians of Georgia and their archetypes, shows that Political Person’s brand is much sustainable, if archetypes are retained well.

The example of first President of Georgia, Zviad Gamsakhurida and his brand shows longest sustainability in the history of Georgia, because his ideals and archetypes were not changed in his life and were not dead by his tragic end. The other examples show that presidents, having lost their archetypes were defeated easily. Jung’s archetypes show not only importance of sustainability of good image of political brands, because this is self-evident, but importance to maintain the previous archetype what supported, or mostly improved influence of political person on the political

market. In future according these research political brands should do archetype identification political and social researches, allowing them the way they should follow to maintain the archetypes, mostly encouraged the general public to distinguish and follow their owners. This marketing research also showed that Archetypes should be assessed as Brand Assets of Politicians and their political unions.

This also shows that political brands in the process of brand building development should choose archetypes and according all marketing instruments establish strategy of archetype development and archetype risk management.

For the continuation of the research, interesting objective is chosen. What can be the role of archetypes and archetype development of political brands in the process of Brand Building Blocks, especially in the east European political markets, where political branding turns into dramatic duel between brand personalities and their followers?

Perhaps one of the lessons of this paper may be that for political marketing researchers, at least, there is new Archetypal Adoption stage in the process of adoption and Archetypal Analyze of rivalry between brand personalities and possible archetypal explanation of the success of some political brands and some failures. The research will be continued to find Archetype Adoption’s universal character, in political markets, between first and second stages of Rogers’s adoption process.

References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, 347–356
- Beaton, L. (1954). *The Class of Fashion*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson
- Boivin, Y. (1986). A Free Response Approach to the Measurement of Brand Perceptions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 3, 11-17
- Collins, A. M. and Loftus, E.F. (1975). A Spreading Activation Theory of Semantic Processing. *Psychological Review*, 82(6), 407–428.
- Festinger, L. (1950). *Psychological Review*. vol. 57, 9-15
- Goethe. (rev. 1918). *The Aphorisms*. Berlin. K. 223-224
- Jung, C.G. (1980). *On Synchronicity. The Portable Jung*. Ed. Joseph Campbell. New York: Penguin.
- Jung, C.G. (1990). *The Archetypes and the Unconscious. The Collected Works*. 2nd ed. Trans. RFC Hull. London: Rutledge.
- Katz, E. (1967). *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Spring edition, 5(12), 12-19.
- Keller, K.L.(2011). *Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*; In B. A. Weitz and R. Wensley (Eds.), *Handbook of Marketing*. London: Sage
- Keller, K. L. (2003). Understanding Brands, Branding and Brand Equity. *Interactive Marketing*, 5 (1), 7-20.
- Mark & Carol (1993). *Person the Hero and the Outlaw*. London: Rutledge, Penguin
- Rogers, E. (1962). *Diffusion of Innovations*. Free Press
- Rossiter, J., Percy, L. (1987). *Advertising and Promotion Management*. New York: Mc. Graw-Hill
- Stanley, R. (2000). Political Leadership as Social Capital: Governing in a Divided National Culture. *Political Psychology*. Vol.21, No 1, pp. 199-226
- Wills, G., Midgley, D. (1973). *Fashion Marketing*. London: George Allen & UNWIN LTD
- Wyer, R. S., Srull, T.K. (1989). Person Memory and Judgment. *Psychological Review*, 96(1), 58–83