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PART I: OVERVIEW
CONSUMER MARKETING

1.1 Scope

Consumer Marketing 2016-2017 focuses on the consumer marketplace from a marketer’s perspective and assesses marketing activities by companies that sell products and services of all types to the consumer.

Consumer marketing is an ongoing process of planning and executing the marketing mix (product, price, place, and promotion) of products and services to consumers. Marketing includes advertising, distribution, and selling, but it is also concerned with anticipating consumers’ needs and wants, which are typically revealed through market research.

Consumer marketing is also referred to as business-to-consumer (B2C) marketing.

1.2 Market Assessment

Brandweek estimates that U.S. companies spend about $550 billion annually on retail marketing, approximately 25% of which is spent on media advertising.

RKMA estimates that including non-retail sectors – from healthcare to restaurants, from autos to travel, from financial services to entertainment – annual spending on consumer marketing exceeds $1 trillion.

Other assessments of spending for consumer marketing estimate spending even higher. With the market defined to include advertising, branded entertainment, cause-related marketing, celebrity endorsements, consumer promotion, corporate communications, database/direct marketing, digital marketing, experiential marketing, grassroots marketing, in-store marketing, loyalty marketing, market research, package design, public relations, shopper marketing, sponsorships, and trade promotion, the Brand Activation Association (www.bbalink.org) estimates annual consumer marketing spending at $2 trillion.

1.3 Consumer Behavior

Consumer Marketing 2016-2017 has as a companion handbook Consumer Behavior 2015-2016, which provides insight from the consumer point-of-view and assesses consumers’ shopping/spending behaviors.
2.1 Competitor Intelligence

Competitor analysis typically includes lists of current and potential competitors and the following profiles:

- Background: history, location of offices, ownership, and personnel
- Financial information
- Products and services offered
- Marketing, channels of distribution, and pricing
- Corporate strategy
- Current research and product development that might reveal future product introductions
- Strengths that pose a competitive challenge to the firm
- Weaknesses that may be exploited

GreenBook provides a directory of competitor intelligence service providers at www.greenbook.org/market-research-firms/competitive-intelligence.

A directory of competitor intelligence providers is available online from Quirk’s at www.quirks.com/directory/sourcebook/Competitive_Intelligence.aspx.

Strategic & Competitive Intelligence Professionals (SCIP, www.scip.org) provides an online directory of companies providing competitive intelligence at www.scip.org/VendorDirectory.php.

2.2 Consumer Surveys

Surveys are popular tools for identifying consumer attitudes, preferences, and behaviors related to a broad spectrum of interests. There is a host of firms that specialize in this field; some of the major survey firms in the U.S. are as follows:

- ForeSee (www.foresee.com)
- Gallup Inc. (www.gallup.com)
- GfK MRI (www.mri.gfk.com)
- Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com)
- Ipsos (www.ipsos.com)
- J.D. Power and Associates (www.jdpower.com)
- Kantar Retail (www.kantarretail.com)
2.3 Customer Satisfaction Surveys

It is not uncommon for retailers to ask customers about their shopping experience. Questionnaires via email and postcards soliciting feedback are the most popular formats for these surveys. Responses are used by companies to evaluate customer service and product quality, and to guide improvement.

The following companies specialize in designing and implementing customer satisfaction surveys:

- Clarion Research (www.clarionresearch.com)
- CustomerSure (www.customersure.com)
- Informa Research Services (www.informars.com)
- KeyStat Marketing (www.keystatmarketing.com)
- Leger (www.leger360.com)
- Lifestory Research (www.lifestoryresearch.com)
- M/A/R/C Research (www.marcresearch.com)
- Maritz Research (www.maritzresearch.com)
- MarketForce (www.marketforce.com)
- MarketProbe (www.marketprobe.com)
- MAXimum Research (www.maximumresearch.com)
- Medallia (www.medallia.com)
- National Business Research Institute (www.nbrii.com)
- Superior DataWorks (www.supiordataworks.com)
- Voter Consumer Research (www.vcrhouston.com)

In the healthcare field, hospitals are required by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS, www.cms.gov) to measure patient satisfaction. The following are largest among companies that specialize in patient-satisfaction surveys (source: Modern Healthcare):

- Arbor Associates (www.arbor-associates.com)
- Avatar Solutions (www.avatarsolutions.com)
- DSS Research (www.dssresearch.com)
- J.L. Morgan & Associates (www.jlmorganassociates.com)
- National Research Corp. (www.nationalresearch.com)
- Patient Approved (www.patientapproved.com)
2.4 Focus Groups

Focus groups are unstructured settings where a group of people are interviewed about their opinions and attitudes towards a product, service, concept, advertisement, idea, or packaging. Questions are asked by a trained moderator with questionnaire answers typically collected using audience response keypads.

Focus group research is generally used in the consumer marketplace, but is also applicable to qualitative research on business products and services.

GreenBook provides a directory of focus group specialists at www.greenbook.org/#browseLocationArea.

2.5 Geodemographic Segmentation

Information about consumers based on where they live guides companies in siting their new stores. The data is also used to guide direct marketing campaigns as well as the placement of local spot ads. Various geodemographic segmentation tools, primarily based on geographic information system (GIS) technology, are available for this type of analysis.

The following are companies specializing in this field:

- Acxiom (www.acxiom.com)
- Applied Geographic Solutions (www.appliedgeographic.com)
- ESRI (www.esri.com)
- Nielsen SiteReports (www.claritas.com/sitereports/Default.jsp)
- Phoenix Marketing International (www.phoenixmi.com)
- Pitney Bowes Software (www.pbinsight.com)

2.6 Market Research Companies

The 2015 AMA Gold Top 50 Report, by the American Marketing Association (www.ama.org), reported $9.9 billion in U.S. revenue for the 50 largest market research companies. Ranked by annual revenue, these companies are as follows:

- Nielsen (www.nielsen.com): $3.41 billion
- Kantar (www.kantar.com): $964 million
- IMS Health (www.imshealth.com): $962 million
- Ipsos (www.ipsos-na.com): $550 million
- IRI (www.iriworldwide.com): $533 million
- Westat (www.westat.com): $501 million
- GfK (www.gfk.com): $350 million
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comScore (<a href="http://www.comscore.com">www.comscore.com</a>)</td>
<td>$229 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NPD Group (<a href="http://www.npd.com">www.npd.com</a>)</td>
<td>$215 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Power and Associates (<a href="http://www.jdpower.com">www.jdpower.com</a>)</td>
<td>$176 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF International (<a href="http://www.icfi.com">www.icfi.com</a>)</td>
<td>$153 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaritzCX (<a href="http://www.maritzcx.com">www.maritzcx.com</a>)</td>
<td>$128 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abt SRBI (<a href="http://www.abtsrbi.com">www.abtsrbi.com</a>)</td>
<td>$127 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnhumby (<a href="http://www.dunnhumby.com">www.dunnhumby.com</a>)</td>
<td>$126 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Resources Group (<a href="http://www.decisionresourcesgroup.com">www.decisionresourcesgroup.com</a>)</td>
<td>$117 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC International (<a href="http://www.orcinternational.com">www.orcinternational.com</a>)</td>
<td>$84 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Research Corp. (<a href="http://www.nationalresearch.com">www.nationalresearch.com</a>)</td>
<td>$80 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieberman Research Worldwide (<a href="http://www.lrsonline.com">www.lrsonline.com</a>)</td>
<td>$78 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentak (<a href="http://www.rentrak.com">www.rentrak.com</a>)</td>
<td>$75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Strategies International (<a href="http://www.marketstrategies.com">www.marketstrategies.com</a>)</td>
<td>$69 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communispace Corp. (<a href="http://www.communispace.com">www.communispace.com</a>)</td>
<td>$64 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alphaimpactRx (<a href="http://www.alphaimpactrx.com">www.alphaimpactrx.com</a>)</td>
<td>$62 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision Critical Communications (<a href="http://www.visioncritical.com">www.visioncritical.com</a>)</td>
<td>$56 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burke Inc. (<a href="http://www.burke.com">www.burke.com</a>)</td>
<td>$65 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morpace Inc. (<a href="http://www.morpace.com">www.morpace.com</a>)</td>
<td>$49 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception Research Services (<a href="http://www.prsresearch.com">www.prsresearch.com</a>)</td>
<td>$45 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Management Group (<a href="http://www.smg.com">www.smg.com</a>)</td>
<td>$41 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouGov (<a href="http://www.yougov.com">www.yougov.com</a>)</td>
<td>$39 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRS (<a href="http://www.ssrs.com">www.ssrs.com</a>)</td>
<td>$38 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions Research (<a href="http://www.directionsresearch.com">www.directionsresearch.com</a>)</td>
<td>$36 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Strategies (<a href="http://www.marketvision.com">www.marketvision.com</a>)</td>
<td>$33 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius Global Market Research (<a href="http://www.radius-global.com">www.radius-global.com</a>)</td>
<td>$32 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Marketing International (<a href="http://www.phoenixmi.com">www.phoenixmi.com</a>)</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MarketCast (<a href="http://www.mcast.com">www.mcast.com</a>)</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Research (<a href="http://www.hanoverresearch.com">www.hanoverresearch.com</a>)</td>
<td>$29 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informa Research Services (<a href="http://www.informars.com">www.informars.com</a>)</td>
<td>$27 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA Worldwide (<a href="http://www.lraworldwide.com">www.lraworldwide.com</a>)</td>
<td>$25 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reckner (<a href="http://www.reckner.com">www.reckner.com</a>)</td>
<td>$24 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA Group (<a href="http://www.rdagroup.com">www.rdagroup.com</a>)</td>
<td>$23 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS&amp;R Inc. (<a href="http://www.ksrinc.com">www.ksrinc.com</a>)</td>
<td>$22 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAXION (<a href="http://www.naxionthinking.com">www.naxionthinking.com</a>)</td>
<td>$21 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellomy Research Inc. (<a href="http://www.bellomyresearch.com">www.bellomyresearch.com</a>)</td>
<td>$21 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Probe Inc. (<a href="http://www.marketprobe.com">www.marketprobe.com</a>)</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gongos Inc. (<a href="http://www.gongos.com">www.gongos.com</a>)</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Link Group (<a href="http://www.tlg.com">www.tlg.com</a>)</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelton (<a href="http://www.keltonglobal.com">www.keltonglobal.com</a>)</td>
<td>$19 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick Martin Bailey Inc. (<a href="http://www.cmbinfo.com">www.cmbinfo.com</a>)</td>
<td>$17 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rti Research (<a href="http://www.rtiresearch.com">www.rtiresearch.com</a>)</td>
<td>$16 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fors Marsh Group (<a href="http://www.forsmarshgroup.com">www.forsmarshgroup.com</a>)</td>
<td>$16 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 Market Research Reports

The following are some firms that publish market research reports assessing consumer market segments and market characteristics:

- America’s Research Group (www.americasresearchgroup.com)
- BCC Research (www.bccresearch.com)
- Datamonitor (www.datamonitor.com)
- Euromonitor International (www.euromonitor.com)
- First Research (www.firstresearch.com).
- Frost & Sullivan (www.frost.com)
- GfK (www.gfk.com)
- Mintel (www.mintel.com)
- MMGY Global (www.mmgyglobal.com)
- New Strategist Publications (www.newstrategist.com)
- Nielsen Local (www.scarborough.com)
- Packaged Facts (www.packagedfacts.com)
- Paramount Market Publishing (www.paramountbooks.com)
- Parks Associates (www.parksassociates.com)
- Prosper Business Development (www.goprosper.com)
- Richard K. Miller & Associates (www.rkma.com)
- STR Global (www.strglobal.com)
- The Futures Company (www.thefuturescompany.com)
- The NPD Group (www.npd.com)
- The Yankee Group (www.yankeegroup.com)
- Unity Marketing (www.unitymarketingonline.com)
- WSL Strategic Retail (www.wslstrategicretail.com)

A comprehensive collection of market intelligence reports from over 720 publishers is available from MarketResearch.com.

2.8 Media Consumption Research

Several specialized companies offer survey-based data on consumer use of various media. This data is used by advertisers to guide marketing campaigns and ad placements. The following are leading companies in this field:

- Audience Research & Analysis (www.audienceresearch.com)
- Kantar Media (www.kantarmedia.com)
- Media Management, Inc. (www.mediaaudit.com)
- PQ Media (www.pqmedia.com)
- The Nielsen Company (www.nielsen.com)
2.9 Mystery Shopping
Mystery shopping involves unidentified researchers who pose as shoppers to evaluate employee performance, customer service quality, and retail operational performance.
The following are among the largest companies that provide mystery shopping services:
• Deep See Research (www.deepseeresearch.com)
• Measure Consumer Perspectives (www.measurecp.com)
• Secret Shopper (www.secretshopper.com)
• Shoppers’ View (www.shoppersview.com)

A directory of market research companies that specialize in mystery shopping is available at www.greenbook.org/market-research-firms/mystery-shopping.

2.10 Neuroscience Research
Neuroscience research uses biometrics, electroencephalography (EEG), facial coding, implicit association, eye tracking, and other tools to determine what motivates shoppers.

“Today every major market research company has neuroscience offerings, spanning biometrics, facial coding, EEG, implicit association, and eye tracking. The reason for this rapid adoption is that they provide a new lens for understanding unconscious consumer response to stimuli which we know is critically important to decision-making. Neuro enables fresher, deeper, and richer insights, and can add unexpected perspective to evaluations of advertising, brand perceptions, and shopper experience.”

Elissa Moses
Exec. V.P. Neurosciences
Ipsos
At the leading edge of neuroscience research is the use of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scanners to help understand why people make the decisions they do, the role of the subconscious mind in consumer decision-making, and what part of the brain guides them. This is accomplished by measuring the flow of blood in portions of the brain involved in emotions such as wanting and indecision.

Research groups and companies in this field include the following:

- Ahmanson Lovelace Brain Mapping Center at UCLA (www.bmap.ucla.edu)
- Emory University, Neuroscience and Behavioral Biology program (www.nbb.emory.edu)
- Human Neuroimaging Laboratory at the Virginia Tech Carilion Research Institute (http://labs.vtc.vt.edu/hnl/)
- Institute for Neuroscience at George Washington University (http://smhs.gwu.edu/neuroscience/)
- Neurosense (www.neurosense.com)

### 2.11 Public Opinion Polls

Opinion polls are popular tools for identifying consumer attitudes, preferences, and behaviors related to a broad spectrum of interests. There are a host of academic groups and firms that specialize in this field, including the following organizations:

- ABC News Polling Unit (http://abcnews.go.com/politics)
- American Research Group (www.americanresearchgroup.com)
- AP-GfK (http://ap-gfkpoll.com/)
- CBS News (www.cbsnews.com/latest/opinion/)
- Diageo/Hotline Poll (http://diageohotlinepoll.com/)
- Elon University Poll (www.elon.edu/e-web/elonpoll/)
- Fox News Poll (www.foxnews.com/official-polls/index.html)
- Gallup (www.gallup.com)
- GfK MRI (www.mri.gfk.com)
- Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com)
- ICR International Communications Research (www.icrsurvey.com)
- Marist College Institute for Public Opinion (www.maristpoll.marist.edu)
- Market Shares (http://marketsharescorp.com)
- Mason-Dixon (http://mason-dixon.com)
- Monmouth University Polling Institute (www.monmouth.edu/university/monmouth-university-polling-institute.aspx)
- National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago (www.norc.org)
- Pew Research Center (www.pewresearch.org)
- Polling Report (www.pollingreport.com)
- Pollster.com (www.huffingtonpost.com/news/pollster/)
- Public Agenda (www.publicagenda.org)
- Public Mind at Fairleigh Dickenson University (http://publicmind.fdu.edu/index.html)
- Public Policy Polling (www.publicpolicypolling.com)
- Quinnipiac University Polling Institute
Among the prominent annual opinion polls are the *General Social Survey* (www.norc.org/GSS-Website/), by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, and the *Survey of the American Consumer*, by GfK MRI (www.gfk-mri.com/Products/TheSurveyoftheAmericanConsumer.aspx).

### 2.12 Retail Sales Reporting

Sales reporting companies develop comprehensive retail analyses based on sales data provided to them by major retail chains. Reporting companies provide data as varied as products that consumers purchase as well as how much they spend. In addition to receiving a fee for their data, retailers gain access to information that includes their competitors’ sales figures. A few retailers, including Walmart, do not release sales data.

Companies that provide point-of-sale market research data include the following:
- Experian Consumer Insights (www.experian.com/marketing-services/consumer-insights.html)
- IRI (www.iriworldwide.com)
- Market Decisions Research (www.marketdecisions.com)
- SportScanINFO (www.sportscaninfo.com)
- The Nielsen Company (www.nielsen.com)
- The NPD Group (www.npd.com)

Such companies also develop retail market data based on statistical-sample monitoring of households. This approach (e.g., sampling and projecting) was the norm in the data gathering industry before scanner data became available.

### 2.13 Web Traffic Analysis

Assessments of online activities provide insight into consumers’ and businesses’ ever-changing habits as they surf the net or engage in e-commerce activities. They are used by marketers to guide the placement of online ads and promotions.

The following are some market research firms specializing in online tracking:
These companies gather data via tags placed on popular consumer websites. comScore, for instance, has a panel of two million worldwide Internet companies, half of which are in the United States, that opt to share their clickstream data. Nielsen has a panel of more than 200,000 sites in the United States that collect data through tags on their websites.

“The online marketing world has never been more awash in quantifiable information on audience sizes, audience make-ups, and the paths they travel through the Web.”

Advertising Age

2.14 Market Resources
Academic centers of B2C market research are listed in Appendix A of this handbook.

Market analysts that focus on the B2C marketplace are listed in Appendix D of this handbook.

American Marketing Association, 311 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5800, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 542-9000. (www.ama.org)


GreenBook, 116 East 27th Street, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10016. (212) 849-2752. (www.greenbook.org)
# B2C MARKETING BENCHMARKS

## 3.1 Overview
Conducted by Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business (www.fuqua.duke.edu) and sponsored by the American Marketing Association (www.marketingpower.com) and McKinsey & Company (www.mckinsey.com), The CMO Survey (www.cmosurvey.com) is a semi-annual poll of chief marketing officers (CMOs) from B2B and B2C companies.

## 3.2 B2C CMO Survey
The following are responses by CMOs in B2C products and B2C services companies in the February 2015 survey:

### Change in Company Performance, Prior 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales:</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit:</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing ROI:</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer acquisition:</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer retention:</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand value:</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of Expected Growth, Next 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth from within organization:</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from partnerships:</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from acquisitions:</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from licensing:</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expected Sales Via the Internet, Next 12 Months

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2C Products:</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2C Services:</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marketing Spending as a Percentage Of Sales

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2C Products:</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2C Services:</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expected Change in Marketing Budget, Next 12 Months
- B2C Products: 5.0%
- B2C Services: 13.4%

### Distribution of Marketing Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic markets:</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International markets:</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expected Change in Digital Marketing Spending, Next 12 Months
- B2C Products: 10.0%
- B2C Services: 18.0%

### Expected Change in Social Media Spending
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next 12 months:</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next five years:</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Integration of Social Media With Marketing Strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effectively:</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effectively:</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effectively:</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact of Social Media On Business
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have proven the impact quantitatively:</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good qualitative sense of impact, but not quantitatively:</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not been able to show the impact yet:</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage Of Marketing Budget Spent On Mobile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015:</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Marketing Budget Spent On Analytics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015:</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Projects Using Marketing Analytics
- B2C Products: 46.9%
- B2C Services: 30.6%

### Evaluation of Quality of Marketing Analytics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2C Products</th>
<th>B2C Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expected Change in Marketing Hires, Next 12 Months
- B2C Products: 0.7%
- B2C Services: 1.3%

Expected Change in Outsourcing of Marketing Activities, Next 12 Months
- B2C Products: 4.0%
- B2C Services: 3.5%

3.3 Market Resources
Duke University, Fuqua School of Business, 100 Fuqua Drive, Box 90120, Durham, NC 27708. (www.fuqua.duke.edu)
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ADVERTISING SPENDING

4.1 Overview
ZenithOptimedia (www.zenithoptimedia.com), Kantar Media (www.kantarmedia.com), and eMarketer (www.emarketer.com) publish annual assessments of U.S. advertising spending. This chapter presents a summary of the most recent assessments.

4.2 Total Media Advertising and Marketing Services Spend
ZenithOptimedia estimates total U.S. major media and marketing services spending in 2015 at $407.1 billion.

Advertising and marketing spending in 2015, change from 2014, and forecast for 2016 are assessed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (change from 2014)</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>$ 67.0 billion (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>$ 51.6 billion (18.2%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>$ 19.9 billion (-7.0%)</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>$ 17.6 billion (1.0%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>$ 17.4 billion (-2.0%)</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>$ 8.6 billion (4.0%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>$ 0.8 billion (5.0%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total media advertising</td>
<td>$182.8 billion (3.7%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail</td>
<td>$ 49.8 billion (0.5%)</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketing</td>
<td>$ 54.5 billion (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotion</td>
<td>$ 74.7 billion (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>$ 4.6 billion (5.0%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event sponsorship</td>
<td>$ 32.6 billion (8.0%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directories</td>
<td>$ 8.1 billion (-0.8%)</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total marketing services</td>
<td>$224.3 billion (3.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Measured and Unmeasured Media Ad Spend

According to Kantar Media, measured media advertising spending has been as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- 2007: $156.4 billion, an all-time high
- 2008: $143.6 billion (-9.2%)
- 2009: $125.0 billion (-12.3%)
- 2010: $134.2 billion (6.5%)
- 2011: $135.2 billion (0.8%)
- 2012: $139.6 billion (3.2%)
- 2013: $140.2 billion (0.1%)
- 2014: $141.2 billion (0.7%)

Total advertising spending includes measured and unmeasured media. Unmeasured media includes direct response, local media, and other media sources not tracked by Kantar Media.

Measured media advertising, as defined by Kantar Media, includes multi-media ad expenditures for the following: network TV (5 networks); spot TV (125 DMAs); cable TV (71 networks); syndication TV; Hispanic network TV (4 networks); consumer magazines (204 publications); Sunday magazines (8 publications); local magazines (29 publications); Hispanic magazines (18 publications); business-to-business magazines (304 publications); local newspapers (108 publications); national newspapers (3 publications); Hispanic newspapers (46 publications); network radio (5 networks); national spot radio (205 markets); local radio (32 markets); Internet search (Google search engine, excluding mobile); Internet display (1,911 sites monitored at least once a year); and outdoor advertising. Beyond these specific media platforms, there are thousands of small and local media in the U.S. which attract advertising dollars.

For the top 100 advertisers, which represent 42% of total U.S. measured advertising spending, Kantar Media assesses that measured advertising spending is 52% of total advertising spending. Applying this percentage for the total U.S. advertising market suggests that total U.S. advertising spending in 2014 was approximately $270 billion.

Measured advertising spending by media in 2014 was as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- Total TV: $78.1 billion (5.6%)
  - Broadcast network TV: $28.3 billion (5.1%)
  - Cable TV networks: $27.8 billion (6.9%)
  - Broadcast spot TV: $16.8 billion (5.7%)
  - National syndicated TV: $ 5.2 billion (0.6%)
- Consumer, Sunday, B2B, and local magazine: $22.4 billion (-5.1%)
- National and local newspaper; free-standing insert: $16.7 billion (-9.2%)
- Internet display (desktop only): $12.9 billion (0.9%)
- Network, national spot and local radio: $ 6.7 billion (-3.9%)
- Outdoor: $ 4.4 billion (-0.2%)
Measured advertising spending by sector in 2014 was as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- Retail: $15.74 billion (-2.2%)
- Automotive: $15.45 billion (-6.6%)
- Telecommunications, Internet services, and ISP: $10.55 billion (-2.2%)
- General services: $9.48 billion (4.7%)
- Medicine and remedies: $8.82 billion (7.8%)
- Food, beverages and candy: $8.25 billion (-3.3%)
- Financial services: $7.48 billion (-2.3%)
- Personal care: $6.93 billion (-2.1%)
- Restaurants: $6.38 billion (0.5%)
- Insurance: $5.87 billion (7.7%)
- Airlines, hotels, car rental and travel: $4.39 billion (0.3%)
- Media: $4.35 billion (-2.6%)
- Movies, recorded video and music: $3.95 billion (0.7%)
- Government, politics and religion: $3.68 billion (66.5%)
- Apparel: $3.30 billion (5.4%)
- Computers and software: $2.27 billion (-15.0%)
- Education: $2.18 billion (no change)
- Beer, wine and liquor: $2.01 billion (-1.3%)
- Home furnishings, appliances and electronics: $1.84 billion (3.0%)
- Home supplies and cleaners: $1.83 billion (-9.3%)

4.4 Market Forecast

eMarketer assesses total media advertising spending and forecasts spending through 2018 as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- 2012: $165.0 billion (4.3%)
- 2013: $171.0 billion (3.7%)
- 2014: $180.1 billion (5.3%)
- 2015: $189.4 billion (5.1%)
- 2016: $200.0 billion (5.6%)
- 2017: $209.7 billion (4.8%)
- 2018: $220.6 billion (5.2%)

The distribution of total U.S. media advertising spending is assessed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Digital</th>
<th>Print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Radio: 9.3% 8.9% 8.6% 8.2% 7.8% 7.5% 7.1%
• Outdoor: 4.0% 4.1% 4.0% 3.9% 3.8% 3.7% 3.6%
• Directories: 4.5% 4.0% 3.5% 3.1% 2.8% 2.5% 2.3%

4.5 Market Resources
Advertising Age, 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. (212) 210-0100. (www.adage.com)
eMarketer, 11 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. (800) 405-0844. (www.emarketer.com)
Kantar Media, 100 Park Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10017. (212) 991-6000. (www.kantarmedia.com)
ZenithOptimedia, 299 West Houston Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10014. (212) 859-5100. (www.zenithoptimedia.com)
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CONSUMER RESPONSE TO ADVERTISING

5.1 Preferred Media For Ads

A Harris Poll (www.harrisinteractive.com) found that consumers, by age, find the following most useful in deciding what products and services to purchase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-to-34</th>
<th>35-to-44</th>
<th>45-to-55</th>
<th>55 &amp; older</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television commercials</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper ads</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet search engine ads</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio ads</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet banner ads</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All media viewed equally</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harris also found that consumers, by age, find the following most helpful when shopping for bargains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-to-34</th>
<th>35-to-44</th>
<th>45-to-55</th>
<th>55 &amp; older</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper/magazine ads</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online ads</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail/catalogs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV commercials</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio ads</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All media viewed equally</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Positive Response To Ads

A survey by McCann Truth Central (http://truthcentral.mccann.com) found that 71% of consumers feel positive about the advertising sector, 67% of consumers feel positive about the advertising they see around them, 57% of consumers say advertising gives them something to talk about, and 39% of consumers say they love advertising. When asked how advertising benefits them, survey participants responded as follows:

- Helps me keep informed about the latest offers: 87%
- Helps me know what the latest trends are: 83%
- Entertains me and makes me laugh: 77%

Microsoft Advertising (www.advertising.microsoft.com) found attitudes toward advertising through four specific platforms as follows:
5.3 Negative Response To Ads

In a recent Harris Poll, consumers, by age, said they chose not to purchase a certain brand for the following reasons:

• Found the ads distasteful: 18-to-34 37%, 35-to-44 34%, 45-to-55 32%, 55 & older 37%, Total 35%
• Didn't like the spokesperson: 18-to-34 29%, 35-to-44 24%, 45-to-55 27%, 55 & older 30%, Total 28%
• Didn't like program or event sponsored by the brand: 18-to-34 26%, 35-to-44 26%, 45-to-55 26%, 55 & older 30%, Total 27%

A separate Harris Poll found that 91% of consumers ignore at least some types of ads. The following are the types of ads that consumers, by age, tend to ignore or disregard the most:

• Internet banner ads: 18-to-34 43%, 35-to-44 50%, 45-to-55 48%, 55 & older 45%, Total 46%
• Internet search engine ads: 18-to-34 20%, 35-to-44 14%, 45-to-55 17%, 55 & older 15%, Total 17%
• Television commercials: 18-to-34 7%, 35-to-44 10%, 45-to-55 15%, 55 & older 20%, Total 13%
• Radio ads: 18-to-34 11%, 35-to-44 10%, 45-to-55 9%, 55 & older 7%, Total 9%
• Newspaper ads: 18-to-34 7%, 35-to-44 7%, 45-to-55 5%, 55 & older 5%, Total 6%
• None of these: 18-to-34 14%, 35-to-44 9%, 45-to-55 6%, 55 & older 8%, Total 9%

Almost every online consumer has received information while visiting a website that has nothing to do with their personal interests or demographics. Online Personal Experience, a survey by Harris Interactive, found that people are running out of patience with irrelevant ads. When asked about their response to irrelevant online ads, responses were as follows:

• I get frustrated with websites when content, offers, ads, promotions, etc. appear that have nothing to do with my interests: 74%
• I would leave the site if asked for donations from a political party that I dislike the most: 67%
• I would leave the site if shown ads for a dating service (response from married survey participants only): 57%
• I would leave the site if shown a recommendation to purchase underwear that is for the opposite gender: 50%
5.4 Ignoring Ads

A survey by Harris Interactive assessing various types of media found that 92% of adults typically ignore at least one type of ad. Survey participants identified the ads they most ignore as follows (multiple responses allowed):

- Online banner ads: 73%
- Online social media ads: 62%
- Online search engine ads: 59%
- TV ads: 37%
- Radio ads: 36%
- Newspaper ads: 35%

5.5 Ad Blocking

The practice of blocking online ads is increasing. PageFair (www.pagefair.com), which measures block rates for online publishers, estimates that 200 million Internet users worldwide blocked at least one ad monthly in 2015, double the number that did so two years prior.

Eyeo (www.eyeo.com), the maker of Adblock Plus, the most widely used ad blocking software, reports that it has been downloaded more than 400 million times.

_________________________________________________________________
“Consumers are increasingly using software that blocks advertising on the websites they visit. If current trends continue ... half the ads aimed at consumers never reach their screens. This puts at risk online publishing’s dominant business model, in which consumers get content and services free in return for granting advertisers access to their eyeballs.”

The Economist, 6/6/15

_________________________________________________________________

Until fairly recently, ads were mostly being blocked on desktop and laptop computers but now people are installing the software on their mobile devices, which are expected to account for a growing share of their time online.
5.6 Ad Influence On Millennials

A survey by Adroit Digital (www.adroitdigital.com) asked Millennials which advertising media is most influential in how they perceive brands. Responses were as follows (multiple responses allowed):

- Television: 70%
- Magazines: 60%
- Online display: 42%
- Online video: 39%
- Freestanding kiosks: 31%
- Mobile: 33%
- Radio: 21%
- Billboards: 21%
6.1 Market Assessment
Marketers are using novel techniques to engage movie theater patrons, including use of on-screen ads and lobby displays that are interactive and entertainment-oriented.

Cinema Advertising Council (CAC, www.cinemaadcouncil.org) member companies reported in-theater ad revenue of $631.9 million in 2014. (CAC members account for more than 90% of U.S. movie screens.) On-screen commercials accounted for 93% of cinema ad revenue. Off-screen advertising includes concession-area marketing and in-lobby product sampling promotions.

In 2014, 121 new brands advertised in cinemas, up from 93 new brands in 2013. National and regional advertising accounted for 75.4% of spending; local ads contributed 24.6%.

The largest movie theater advertising companies are National CineMedia (www.nationalcinemedia.com) and Screenvision (www.screenvision.com).

6.2 Patron Demographics
According to Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com), 68% of adults go to the movies at least once a year. By gender and age demographic, those who go to movies are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>At Least One Movie</th>
<th>&gt;10 Movies</th>
<th>Mean Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>At Least One Movie</th>
<th>&gt;10 Movies</th>
<th>Mean Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-to-36</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-to-48</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-to-67</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and older</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>At Least One Movie</th>
<th>&gt;10 Movies</th>
<th>Mean Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without children</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA, www.mpaa.org), 11% of people are frequent moviegoers, going to a cinema at least once a month. The following is a profile of frequent moviegoers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of Frequent</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% of Frequent</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-to-11:</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-to-17:</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-to-24:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-to-39:</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-to-49:</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-to-59:</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and older:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Frequent</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American: 12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian:     49%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic:      32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:         7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of frequent moviegoers in the most populous states is as follows:

- California: 20%
- Texas: 17%
- Michigan: 15%
- Georgia: 14%
- Illinois: 12%
- Ohio: 12%
- Virginia: 11%
- Florida: 9%
- New York: 8%
- North Carolina: 7%
- Pennsylvania: 6%
- Indiana: 5%
- Other states: 11%

According to International Demographics (www.themediaaudit.com), approximately 36% of adults living in metropolitan areas visit movie theaters each month. The following metropolitan areas have the highest percentage of adults who do so:

- Ann Arbor, MI: 53.5%
- San Francisco, CA: 48.3%
• Salt Lake City, UT: 47.5%
• Reno, NV: 47.4%
• San Jose, CA: 47.1%
• Phoenix, AZ: 47.2%
• Spokane, WA: 47.1%
• San Diego, CA: 45.7%
• Nashville, TN: 44.1%
• Dallas-Ft. Worth, TX: 43.1%

The following metropolitan areas have the lowest percentages of adults visiting movie theaters each month:
• Charlotte, NC: 15.0%
• Greenville-Spartanburg, SC: 24.3%
• Pittsburgh, PA: 25.5%
• Louisville, KY: 25.8%
• New Orleans, LA: 26.8%
• Toledo, OH: 26.8%

6.3 Market Resources
Cinema Advertising Council, 9110 E. Nichols Avenue, Suite 200, Centennial, CO 80112. (212) 986-7080. (www.cinemaadcouncil.org)

International Demographics, 10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 200, Houston, TX 77042. (713) 626-0333. (www.themediaaudit.com)

Motion Picture Association of America, 1600 Eye Street NW, Washington, DC 20006. (202) 293-1966. (www.mpaa.org)
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7.1 Market Assessment
According to Kantar Media (www.kantarmedia.com), consumer, Sunday, B2B, and local magazine advertising totaled $22.4 billion in 2014, a 5.1% decline from 2013. Consumer magazine advertising represented 82% of the total, or $18.4 billion.

7.2 Market Leaders
According to The Association of Magazine Media (AMM, www.magazine.org), the following are the top magazine titles based on annual advertising revenue:
- **People**: $1.06 billion
- **Better Homes & Garden**: $670.9 million
- **Sports Illustrated**: $545.2 million
- **Parade**: $509.3 million
- **InStyle**: $483.8 million
- **Good Housekeeping**: $462.5 million
- **Vogue**: $460.3 million
- **Cosmopolitan**: $432.5 million
- **US Weekly**: $403.3 million
- **Elle**: $392.8 million
- **Time**: $372.2 million
- **US Weekend**: $350.9 million
- **Family Circle**: $339.5 million
- **Glamour**: $337.7 million
- **Woman’s Day**: $296.9 million
- **Vanity Fair**: $288.1 million
- **ESPN Magazine**: $286.2 million
- **Harper’s Bazaar**: $279.9 million
- **Real Simple**: $262.4 million
- **Forbes**: $260.4 million

According to the AAM, the following magazines have the highest circulation:
- **AARP the Magazine**: 22,274,096
- **AARP Bulletin**: 22,244,820
- **Costco Connection**: 8,654,464
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine Name</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game Informer Magazine</td>
<td>7,629,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Homes and Gardens</td>
<td>7,615,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader’s Digest</td>
<td>4,536,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Housekeeping</td>
<td>4,348,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Circle</td>
<td>4,092,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td>4,029,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>3,527,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman’s Day</td>
<td>3,311,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3,289,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of Home</td>
<td>3,249,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies’ Home Journal</td>
<td>3,225,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Illustrated</td>
<td>3,023,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>3,015,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>2,872,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Living</td>
<td>2,815,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA Going Places</td>
<td>2,594,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA Living</td>
<td>2,414,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O, The Oprah Magazine</td>
<td>2,388,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamour</td>
<td>2,327,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Rifleman</td>
<td>2,238,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2,217,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbook</td>
<td>2,206,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Legion Magazine</td>
<td>2,191,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPN The Magazine</td>
<td>2,160,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FamilyFun</td>
<td>2,122,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Stewart Living</td>
<td>2,107,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
<td>2,103,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Guide Magazine</td>
<td>2,032,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim</td>
<td>2,028,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeen</td>
<td>2,023,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Baby</td>
<td>2,003,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Simple</td>
<td>2,001,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Weekly</td>
<td>1,964,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Health</td>
<td>1,818,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InStyle</td>
<td>1,810,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Light</td>
<td>1,809,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Weekly</td>
<td>1,771,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1,728,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Day with Rachael Ray</td>
<td>1,728,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Network Magazine</td>
<td>1,725,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideposts</td>
<td>1,723,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Digest</td>
<td>1,661,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>1,630,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Country Living: 1,621,448
• Women’s Health: 1,550,105
• All You: 1,528,079
• Bon Appétit: 1,521,180
• Fitness: 1,501,058
• Self: 1,495,832
• Rolling Stone: 1,469,267
• WebMD The Magazine: 1,465,718
• Golf Magazine: 1,425,807
• Health: 1,368,701
• Scholastic Parent & Child: 1,344,640
• More: 1,312,365
• Weight Watchers: 1,305,417
• Popular Science: 1,304,017
• VFW Magazine*: 1,285,474
• Ebony: 1,280,350
• Where: 1,278,580
• Sunset: 1,273,870
• Vogue: 1,259,826
• Playboy: 1,254,552
• Field & Stream: 1,254,256
• HGTV Magazine: 1,253,555
• Popular Mechanics: 1,218,589
• Car and Driver: 1,208,213
• Vanity Fair: 1,205,229
• The Family Handyman: 1,190,242
• First for Women: 1,185,659
• Allure: 1,168,138
• Birds & Blooms: 1,165,980
• Lucky: 1,122,251
• Motor Trend: 1,118,877
• Elle: 1,109,785
• Woman’s World: 1,106,643
• Boys’ Life*: 1,097,232
• Essence: 1,060,774
• The New Yorker: 1,055,542
• American Hunter*: 1,034,033
• Food & Family (Kraft Foods): 1,024,262
• Teen Vogue: 1,019,853
• Bloomberg Businessweek: 989,186
• Travel + Leisure: 974,972
• Marie Claire: 969,965
• Midwest Living: 964,966
• *This Old House*: 963,501
• *Food & Wine*: 947,286
• *GQ - Gentlemen’s Quarterly*: 938,359
• *Scouting*: 938,145
• *Forbes*: 931,558
• *Reminisce*: 872,210
• *Traditional Home*: 864,505
• *Wired*: 858,818
• *Fortune*: 857,431
• *Ser Padres*: 857,354
• *People Stylewatch*: 830,465

* High proportion of title’s circulation attributed to membership benefits.

### 7.3 Measured Ad Spending By Sector

According to AMM and Kantar Media, the top magazine measured advertising categories are as follows:

- Toiletries & cosmetics: $2.96 billion
- Drugs & remedies: $2.13 billion
- Food & food products: $1.77 billion
- Apparel & accessories: $1.72 billion
- Media & advertising: $1.52 billion
- Retail: $1.47 billion
- Automotive: $1.23 billion
- Direct response companies: $1.17 billion
- Home furnishings: $1.08 billion
- Financial, insurance & real estate: $1.01 billion
- Technology: $ 833 million
- Public transportation, hotels & resorts: $ 781 million

### 7.4 Top Advertisers

According to Kantar Media, the top magazine advertisers, ranked by 2014 spending, are as follows:

- L’Oréal SA: $837.7 million
- Procter & Gamble: $774.7 million
- Pfizer: $367.2 million
- LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA: $291.0 million
- Johnson & Johnson: $233.2 million
- Unilever: $223.4 million
- Mars Inc: $189.4 million
- Berkshire Hathaway Inc: $183.5 million
- Joh A Benckiser: $177.6 million
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- Kellogg: $161.0 million
- Kraft Foods Group: $155.5 million
- Estée Lauder: $155.2 million
- Toyota Motor Corp: $151.3 million
- Allergan: $137.0 million
- Merck & Co: $127.1 million
- Reynolds American: $121.1 million
- Nestlé: $120.3 million
- General Motors: $110.9 million
- Revlon: $97.8 million
- Chanel: $96.6 million
- Energizer: $93.2 million
- Eli Lilly & Co: $93.3 million
- Kering: $84.0 million
- Church & Dwight: $83.5 million
- Comcast: $82.5 million
- Cambell Soup Co.: $79.6 million
- Amazon.com: $77.5 million
- AstraZeneca: $74.8 million
- Target Corp: $74.8 million
- Walt Disney Co.: $74.2 million
- Pepsico: $73.2 million
- Macys: $73.1 million
- Phillips-Van Heusen: $72.5 million
- VF Corp: $72.2 million
- Clorox: $72.1 million
- AT&T: $69.7 million
- Bradford Exchange: $68.1 million
- Fiat Chrysler: $65.8 million
- Bose Corp: $64.8 million
- Compagnie Financière Richemont: $64.5 million
- Kao Corp: $63.7 million
- Luxottica Group: $63.6 million
- Gap: $62.8 million
- Basic Research LLC: $61.1 million
- MacNeil Automotive Products: $60.8 million
- Lorillard: $59.9 million
- Bristol-Myers Squibb: $58.6 million
- Kimberly-Clark: $58.3 million
- Mondelez International: $56.8 million
- Walmart: $54.9 million
7.5 Interactive Media

Over the past few years, magazine publishers have begun to develop and roll out a spate of new formats and platforms for readers. From content viewable via e-reader and tablet to digital distribution to interactive, publishers are positioning themselves among the other enhanced media.

According to a survey by GfK MRI (www.mri.gfk.com), 67% of tablet users say they would rather read an electronic version of a magazine than a paper version. However, the preference may be based more on convenience than aesthetic. Sixty-five percent (65%) of tablet magazine readers say they find the print magazine experience more satisfying. Many tablet magazine readers are dissatisfied with formatting; 72% say they would prefer all digital magazines be formatted the same way. In terms of digital magazine advertisements, 70% would like to be able to buy items by clicking on the ads, and 70% would like electronic ads that are personalized to their interests.

The Association of Magazine Media reported a median age of 44.6 years for digital-only magazine readers; the mean age for print-only readers is 54.8 years. According to iMonitor, by McPheters & Company (www.mcpheters.com), there are 2,234 U.S. magazine branded apps.

The top-selling iPad magazine apps as of January 2015 are as follows (source: iPad App Store):

**Lifestyle Apps**
1. O, The Oprah Magazine
2. Cosmopolitan
3. Crestron Mobile Pro G
4. Martha Stewart Living
5. Real Simple
6. People StyleWatch
7. Reader’s Digest
8. Glamour
9. Better Homes and Gardens
10. GQ
11. Architectural Digest
12. Quiltmania
13. Elle
14. HGTV Magazine
15. InStyle

**Health & Fitness**
1. Men’s Health
2. Weight Watchers Mobile
3. Self
4. Lose It!
5. Runner’s World
6. Yoga Studio
7. **Food Diary and Calories Tracker**
8. **Men’s Fitness**
9. **PostureScreen**
10. **Shape**
11. **DailyBurn**
12. **Prevention**
13. **Jillian Michaels**
14. **Weight Watchers**
15. **Fitness Magazine**

**Food & Drink**
1. **Cook’s Illustrated**
2. **Food & Wine**
3. **Food Network Magazine**
4. **Taste of Home**
5. **Nom Nom Paleo**
6. **Bon Appétit**
7. **Whisky Magazine**
8. **Gourmet Traveller**
9. **Joy of Cooking**
10. **Wine Spectator**
11. **Panna**
12. **Modernist Cuisine at Home**
13. **Fine Cooking**
14. **Jamie Oliver’s Recipes**
15. **Cooking Light**

**7.6 Market Resources**

2015 MPA Magazine Media Fact Book  
(www.magazine.org/insights-resources/magazine-media-factbook-2015)

Association of Magazine Media, 757 Third Avenue, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10017.  
(212) 872-3700.  (www.magazine.org)
8.1 Market Assessment

According to the Newspaper Association of America (NAA, www.naa.org) and Pew Research Center (www.journalism.org), newspaper advertising spending has been as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$44.9 billion</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$46.7 billion</td>
<td>$1.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$47.8 billion</td>
<td>$2.0 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$46.6 billion</td>
<td>$2.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$42.2 billion</td>
<td>$3.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$34.7 billion</td>
<td>$3.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$24.8 billion</td>
<td>$2.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$22.8 billion</td>
<td>$3.0 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$20.7 billion</td>
<td>$3.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$18.9 billion</td>
<td>$3.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$17.3 billion</td>
<td>$3.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$16.4 billion</td>
<td>$3.5 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“For the past five years, newspaper ad revenue has maintained a consistent trajectory: Print ads have produced less revenue (down 5%), while digital ads have produced more revenue (up 3%) – but not enough to make up for the fall in print revenue. Overall ad revenue [in 2014] fell 4%, to just $19.9 billion.”

Pew Research Center, 4/28/15
Print newspaper ad spending is distributed as follows (source: NNA):

- Retail: 58%
- Classified: 24%
- National: 18%

### 8.2 Market Leaders

According to Alliance for Audited Media (www.auditedmedia.com), the following are the Top 25 U.S. newspapers by circulation:

- **The Wall Street Journal**: 2,378,827
- **The New York Times**: 1,865,318
- **USA Today**: 1,674,306
- **Los Angeles Times**: 653,868
- **San Jose Mercury News**: 583,998
- **Daily News (New York City)**: 516,165
- **New York Post**: 500,521
- **The Washington Post**: 474,767
- **Chicago Sun-Times**: 470,548
- **The Denver Post**: 416,676
- **Chicago Tribune**: 414,930
- **The Dallas Morning News**: 409,265
- **Newsday (Long Island)**: 377,744
- **Houston Chronicle**: 360,251
- **The Orange County Register**: 356,165
- **The Star-Ledger (Newark)**: 340,778
- **Tampa Bay Times**: 340,260
- **The Plain Dealer (Cleveland)**: 311,605
- **Philadelphia Inquirer**: 306,831
- **Star Tribune (Minneapolis)**: 301,345
- **The Arizona Republic**: 293,640
- **Honolulu Star-Advertiser**: 268,244
- **Las Vegas Review-Journal**: 252,047
- **The San Diego U-T**: 250,678
- **The Boston Globe**: 245,572

### 8.3 Measured Ad Spending By Sector

By sector, measured newspaper advertising spending is as follows (sources: Kantar Media and Advertising Age):

- Retail: $4.23 billion
- Automotive: $2.68 billion
- General services: $2.43 billion
- Financial services: $1.44 billion
• Media: $1.02 billion
• Telecommunications and Internet services: $784 million
• Airlines, hotels, car rental, and travel: $769 million
• Real estate: $678 million
• Government, politics, and religion: $532 million
• Movies, recorded music, and video: $435 million
• Direct-response advertising: $372 million
• Medicine and remedies: $325 million
• Insurance: $284 million
• Education: $234 million
• Restaurants: $202 million
• Apparel: $136 million
• Home furnishing/appliances/electronics: $135 million
• Computers and software: $99 million
• Hardware and home building supplies: $63 million
• Miscellaneous/other: $788 million

8.4 Top Advertisers

According to Advertising Age (July 2015), the top newspaper advertisers, ranked by annual spending, are as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):
• Macy’s: $378 million (-5.8%)
• Procter & Gamble: $273 million (-0.4%)
• Fry’s Electronics: $148 million (-46.5%)
• Bankrate: $129 million (-11.6%)
• News Corp.: $120 million (38.5%)
• Sprint: $114 million (3.4%)
• Target: $111 million (-15.8%)
• Walmart: $104 million (-12.3%)
• Best Buy: $103 million (-20.3%)
• Sears Holdings Corp.: $99 million (-22.5%)

8.5 Digital Newspapers

More than a third of tablet users in the U.S. read newspapers on their device each month, according to a study by comScore (www.comscore.com). The following is readership of newspapers via tablet:
• Almost every day: 11.5%
• At least once each week: 11.0%
• 1-to-3 times throughout the month: 14.6%
• Ever in the month: 37.1%
The study also found the following demographic profile of readers of digital newspapers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pct. of Audience</th>
<th>Composition Index of Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pct. of Audience</th>
<th>Composition Index of Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-to-17:</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-to-24:</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-to-34:</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-to-44:</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-to-54:</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-to-64:</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Pct. of Audience</th>
<th>Composition Index of Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and more</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 Alternative Newspapers

According to Media Audit National Report, alternative newspapers reach more than 24 million readers each month.

The following is a list of the Top 10 alternative newspaper websites based on cumulative ratings of readers ages 18 and older (source: The Media Audit):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.c-ville.com">www.c-ville.com</a></td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thedailypage.com">www.thedailypage.com</a></td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.austinchronicle.com">www.austinchronicle.com</a></td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.readthehook.com">www.readthehook.com</a></td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.alibi.com">www.alibi.com</a></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, TN:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nashvillescene.com">www.nashvillescene.com</a></td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, AR:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arkansastimes.com">www.arkansastimes.com</a></td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Ft. Lauderdale, FL:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.newtimes.com">www.newtimes.com</a></td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.citypaper.com">www.citypaper.com</a></td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bestofneworleans.com">www.bestofneworleans.com</a></td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differing in many ways from mainstream newspapers, most alternative papers focus heavily on arts and entertainment, restaurant reviews, and local events.
8.7 Classifieds

While the newspaper sector has had steady gradual declines in recent years, the drop in classified ad spending has been dramatic. Spending has dropped from $14.2 billion in 2007 to $3.9 billion in 2014.

A study by Prof. Robert Seamans, Ph.D., at the New York University Stern School of Business and Prof. Feng Zhu, Ph.D., at the Harvard Business School assessed that classified ad buyers save $5 billion each year by posting free listings onto Craigslist instead of buying ads in newspapers.

“While there are many complex reasons for the ongoing demise of newspapers, those looking for one particular thing often land on Craigslist as the culprit that gutted one of the industry’s cash cows. What Henry Ford was to the horse-and-buggy industry, Craig Newmark has been to the newspaper industry.”

Advertising Age

8.8 Market Resources

Alliance for Audited Media, 28 West 44th Street, Suite 1011, New York, NY 10036. (212) 867-8992. (www.auditedmedia.com)


Newspaper Fact Sheet, Pew Research Center, April 2015. (www.journalism.org/2015/04/29/newspapers-fact-sheet/)
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OUT-OF-HOME ADVERTISING

9.1 Market Assessment

According to the Outdoor Association of America (OAAA, www.oaaa.org), out-of-home advertising spending has been as follows:

- 2002: $5.2 billion
- 2003: $5.5 billion
- 2004: $5.8 billion
- 2005: $6.3 billion
- 2006: $6.8 billion
- 2007: $7.3 billion
- 2008: $7.0 billion
- 2009: $5.9 billion
- 2010: $6.1 billion
- 2011: $6.4 billion
- 2012: $6.7 billion
- 2013: $6.9 billion
- 2014: $7.0 billion

_________________________________________________________________

“Outdoor advertising is one of the few traditional media channels forecast to grow over the next few years. Much of the growth comes from a switch away from paper and neon to digital billboards and posters. Now advertisers can vary images by time of day.”

The Economist

_________________________________________________________________

According to OAAA, four distinct factors are driving change in the outdoor industry: consolidation, media fragmentation, modified consumer habits, and technological advances.
9.2 Market Leaders
The following are the top out-of-home advertising companies, ranked by marketshare:

- Clear Channel Outdoor (www.clearchanneloutdoor.com): 19%
- Lamar Advertising Co. (www.lamar.com): 18%
- Outfront Media (formerly CBS Outdoor; www.outfrontmedia.com): 16%

The following are other market leaders:
- City Outdoor (www.cityoutdoorusa.com)
- Fairway Outdoor Advertising (www.fairwayoutdoor.com)
- JCDecaux North America (www.jcdecauxna.com)
- Reagan National Advertising (www.reaganoutdoor.com)
- Titan (www.titan360.com)
- Van Wagner Sports & Entertainment (www.vanwagner.com)

9.3 Spending By Format
By format, out-of-home spending is distributed as follows (source: Outdoor Advertising Association of America):
- Billboards: 64%
- Transit: 17%
- Alternative: 13%
- Street furniture: 7%

9.4 Top Advertisers
According to Advertising Age (July 2015), the top outdoor advertisers, ranked by annual spending, are as follows:
- Comcast: $83 million
- McDonald’s: $70 million
- Time Warner: $63 million
- Apple: $61 million
- T-Mobile: $60 million
- 21st Century Fox: $49 million
- Walt Disney Co.: $43 million
- Berkshire Hathaway: $35 million
- Verizon Communications: $34 million
- AT&T: $33 million

9.5 High Mileage Drivers
Exposure to billboard and outdoor advertising is generally proportional to time spent driving.
The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA, www.fhwa.dot.gov) estimates that Americans drove 3.02 trillion miles in 2014, a 0.6% increase from 2012.

According to International Demographics (www.themediaaudit.com), 15.8% of adults are high-mileage drivers, driving more than 350 miles in a typical week. Among high-mileage drivers, 45% earn more than $75,000 in household income, a figure that is 46% higher when compared to the typical U.S. adult. Further, 29.2% of high mileage drivers earn more than $100,000 in income, compared to 18.8% of all U.S. adults who fall into the same income category.

The following metropolitan areas have the highest percentages of high-mileage drivers:
- Charlotte, NC: 22.4%
- San Antonio, TX: 21.5%
- Columbia-Jefferson City, MO: 21.5%
- Little Rock, AR: 21.2%
- Columbia, SC: 21.0%

### 9.6 Place-Based Advertising
In addition to exposure while driving, consumers view place-based advertising while at airports, restaurants, retail stores, movie theaters, sports venues, and other locations. This advertising is further assessed in Chapter 10 of this handbook.

### 9.7 Market Resources
PLACE-BASED VIDEO ADVERTISING

10.1 Overview
   Digital place-based advertising is thought to be the fastest growing medium after search.
   PQ Media (www.pqmedia.com) estimates digital out-of-home video advertising spending in the U.S. in 2015 at $3.8 billion, with increases of 9.4% annually. Digital billboards are the fastest-growing segment of place-based video advertising.
   The Digital Place-Based Advertising Association (www.dp-aa.org) estimates that 70% of the teen and adult population, or 181 million people, view digital video displays at various venues each month; 52%, or 135 million people, do so each week.

10.2 Video Ads In Public Venues
   Digital Place-Based Video Study, a report by the Digital Place-Based Advertising Association, provides the following assessment of visits to various venues (each month) and exposure to place-based video advertising at these venues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visit Venue</th>
<th>Visit Venue Pct.</th>
<th>View Video Pct.</th>
<th>View Video Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport:</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar:</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeehouse or sandwich shop:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience store:</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug store:</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator:</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food or casual dining restaurant:</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas station:</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery store:</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health club:</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital or medical test facility:</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large retail or department store:</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>69 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical office (doctor, dentist, veterinarian):</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie theater:</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office building lobby:</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping mall:</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>70 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium or arena:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, interior (bus, taxicab, train):</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3 Video Ad Networks

The following are out-of-home networks that distribute place-based video programming to retail outlets, transportation systems, and airports:

**Blue Line Media** ([www.bluelinmedia.com](http://www.bluelinmedia.com))
- Gas pump toppers, as they are known in the industry, are the most popular form of advertising in gas stations. Blue Line Media provides this advertising format in over 150 cities across the U.S.

**Captivate Network** ([www.captivate.com](http://www.captivate.com))
- Captivate Network has a network of over 10,000 high-resolution, flat-panel elevator displays in approximately 1,000 office buildings and suburban office campuses across North America.

- The CBS Outdoor Rail Network (formerly The Rail Network) installs flat-screen monitors on mass transit rail; content includes newscasts from local CBS affiliates.

**CNN Airport** ([www.cnn.com/services/advertise/specs/specs_airport.html](http://www.cnn.com/services/advertise/specs/specs_airport.html))
- CNN Airport, a satellite television network owned by Turner Private Networks, a division of Turner Broadcasting Company, broadcasts general news, weather, stock market updates, entertainment, and travel content to airports across North America.

**Gas Station TV** ([www.gstv.com](http://www.gstv.com))
- Gas Station TV provides television programming on screens at gas station pumps around the country. Its content and advertisements reach 50 million people.

**Home Team Sports** ([HTS, www.hometeamsports.com](http://www.hometeamsports.com))
- HTS, a Fox Sports-owned sales group that sells in-arena signs, promotions, and sponsorships, formed a partnership in March 2014 with Access Sports Media ([www.accesssportsmedia.com](http://www.accesssportsmedia.com)) to sell in-arena video ads on concourse TVs at more than 50 MLB, NBA, NFL, and NHL venues.

**InStore Broadcasting Network** ([www.instoreaudionetwork.com/in2/](http://www.instoreaudionetwork.com/in2/))
- InStore Broadcasting Network, or IBN, provides narrowcast in-store background music, in-store video content, and advertising for delivery within over 18,000 supermarkets and drugstores across the U.S.

**IZ-ON Media** ([www.izonmedia.com](http://www.izonmedia.com))
- IZ-ON Media, formerly Premier Retail Networks, provides programming and advertising for big-box retail stores, restaurants, and supermarkets. The network provides services for approximately 64,000 digital screens deployed in over 10,000 venues across the U.S.
Target’s Channel Red (www.target.com)
• Target-owned Channel Red runs product promos and some entertainment in the electronics/music/movies department at all 1,760-plus Target stores in the U.S.

Transit TV (www.transit-tv.com)
• Transit TV is the largest among companies that provide video programming and ads on public buses.

Walmart Smart Network (www.walmartsmartnetwork.com/connection.aspx)
• The Walmart Smart Network, installed in several departments in Walmart’s 4,400-plus U.S. stores, influences over 7.9 million shoppers per week.

10.4 Market Resources
Digital Place-Based Advertising Association, 122 East 42nd Street, Suite 4905 New York, NY 10168. (212) 371-8961. (www.dp-aa.org)
11.1 Audience Assessment

According to Nielsen Audio (www.nielsen.com/us/en/solutions/capabilities/audio.html), radio reaches more than 241.4 million people ages 12 and older over the course of a typical week.

By age demographic, the radio listening audience is as follows:

- 12-to-17: 22.75 million
- 18-to-34: 66.31 million
- 45-to-49: 61.19 million
- 50 and older: 91.12 million

The diversity of radio formats attracts advertiser-coveted target demographics. According to Arbitron, 93% of African-Americans and 95% of Hispanic-Americans ages 12 and older tune into radio over the course of a week.

Radio reaches 96% of adults ages 18-to-49 with a college education and a household income of more than $75,000.

11.2 Market Assessment

According to the Radio Advertising Bureau (www.rab.com), radio advertising spending has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Spot</th>
<th>Digital</th>
<th>Off-Air</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1.15 billion</td>
<td>$18.48 billion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$1.68 billion</td>
<td>$21.31 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1.15 billion</td>
<td>$16.54 billion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$1.79 billion</td>
<td>$19.48 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1.05 billion</td>
<td>$13.20 billion</td>
<td>$480 million</td>
<td>$1.30 billion</td>
<td>$16.03 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1.10 billion</td>
<td>$14.18 billion</td>
<td>$615 million</td>
<td>$1.39 billion</td>
<td>$17.29 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1.14 billion</td>
<td>$14.06 billion</td>
<td>$709 million</td>
<td>$1.49 billion</td>
<td>$17.40 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.15 billion</td>
<td>$14.20 billion</td>
<td>$776 million</td>
<td>$1.51 billion</td>
<td>$17.63 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1.12 billion</td>
<td>$14.05 billion</td>
<td>$889 million</td>
<td>$1.58 billion</td>
<td>$17.65 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1.07 billion</td>
<td>$13.63 billion</td>
<td>$973 million</td>
<td>$1.83 billion</td>
<td>$17.51 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 Measured Ad Spending by Sector

By sector, measured radio advertising spending is as follows (source: Kantar Media [www.kantarmedia.com]):
• Retail: $1.653 billion
• General services: $1.057 billion
• Automotive: $ 879 million
• Telecommunications and Internet services: $ 587 million
• Financial services: $ 559 million
• Restaurants: $ 469 million
• Insurance: $ 442 million
• Media: $ 378 million
• Government, politics, and religion: $ 290 million
• Airlines, hotels, car rental, and travel: $ 262 million
• Education: $ 189 million
• Medicine and remedies: $ 157 million
• Food, beverages, and candy: $ 133 million
• Movies, recorded music, and video: $ 119 million
• Beer, wine and liquor: $ 90 million
• Computers and software: $ 87 million
• Gas and oil: $ 87 million
• Real estate: $ 48 million
• Personal care: $ 39 million
• Hardware and home building supplies: $ 32 million
• Home furnishing/appliances/electronics: $ 25 million
• Apparel: $ 19 million
• Home supplies and cleaners: $ 14 million
• Direct-response advertising: $ 48 million
• Other: $ 159 million

11.4 Top Radio Advertisers

According to Advertising Age (July 2015), the top network, national, spot, and local radio advertisers, ranked by annual spending, are as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):
• Comcast: $170 million
• T-Mobile: $146 million
• AT&T: $136 million
• Berkshire Hathaway: $134 million
• Home Depot: $115 million
• Verizon: $ 95 million
• Walmart: $ 71 million
• Fiat Chrysler: $ 70 million
• Albertsons/Safeway: $ 69 million
• McDonald’s: $ 68 million
11.5 Digital Radio

eMarketer (www.emarketer.com) assesses U.S. monthly digital radio listeners as follows:

- 2013: 147.8 million
- 2014: 160.2 million
- 2015: 169.9 million
- 2016: 176.7 million
- 2017: 181.2 million
- 2018: 184.8 million
- 2019: 191.6 million

“Digital radio has evolved into a viable, robust digital channel that complements social media, video sites and other mainstream venues. Audio streaming services are aggressively growing their user bases, advertising revenues and integration with technology platforms ranging from game consoles and connected TVs to automobiles and wearables. Virtually any device that can deliver music is fair game for streaming apps, and for many users, these apps are the main conduit to their listening experiences.”

eMarketer, 2/20/15

Ranked by monthly unique visitors in April 2015, the top music sites are as follows (sources: Alexa [www.alexa.com], Compete [www.compete.com], eBizMBA [www.ebizmba.com], and Quantcast [www.quantcast.com]):

- Pandora (www.pandora.com): 60 million
- Yahoo! Music (www.yahoo.com/music): 55 million
- Google Play (https://play.google.com/): 52 million
- Sound Cloud (www.soundcloud.com): 50 million
- MySpace (www.myspace.com): 40 million
- Spotify (www.spotify.com): 16 million
- TuneIn (www.tunein.com): 15 million
- Last FM (www.last.fm): 13 million
- iHeart Radio (www.iheart.com): 7 million
11.6 Market Resources

Radio Advertising Bureau, 125 West 55th Street, 21st Floor, New York, NY 10019. (800) 252-7234. (www.rab.com)
12.1 Audience Assessment

Analysts estimate that adults spend between 3.4 hours and 5.5 hours per day watching television.

Over 87% of households in the United States subscribe to some type of multichannel video service, according to Leichtman Research Group (www.leichtmanresearch.com). Among those who do so, viewing platforms are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Prime</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Prime</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulu</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Leichtman, 44% of U.S. TV households have at least one digital video recorder (DVR), an increase from only 5% that owned one in 2005. Still, about 90% of TV viewing in the United States is live (i.e., viewed during first airing).

According to The Nielsen Company (www.nielsen.com), the monthly time adults, by age and ethnicity, spent watching TV in 2014 was as follows (hours:minutes):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All TV Households</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time-shifted TV:</td>
<td>8:43</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>17:08</td>
<td>17:33</td>
<td>14:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional TV:</td>
<td>152:54</td>
<td>178:09</td>
<td>209:06</td>
<td>276:46</td>
<td>312:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-shifted TV:</td>
<td>10:08</td>
<td>15:08</td>
<td>16:04</td>
<td>15:05</td>
<td>10:51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian-American</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional TV:</td>
<td>47:07</td>
<td>76:07</td>
<td>74:12</td>
<td>104:15</td>
<td>157:44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12.2 Market Assessment

Kantar Media (www.kantarmedia.com) estimates measured television advertising spending in 2014 at $78.1 billion, a 5.6% increase over 2013. Distribution was as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- **Broadcast network TV:** $28.3 billion (5.1%)
- **Cable TV networks:** $27.8 billion (6.9%)
- **Broadcast spot TV:** $16.8 billion (5.7%)
- **National syndicated TV:** $ 5.2 billion (0.6%)

### 12.3 Measured Ad Spending By Sector

By sector, measured TV advertising spending is as follows (sources: Kantar Media and Advertising Age):

- **Automotive:** $8.95 billion
- **Retail:** $6.75 billion
- **Telecommunications and Internet services:** $6.00 billion
- **Food, beverages, and candy:** $5.44 billion
- **Restaurants:** $4.58 billion
- **Medicine and remedies:** $4.51 billion
- **Direct-response advertising (infomercials):** $4.20 billion
- **Movies, recorded music, and video:** $3.47 billion
- **Financial services:** $3.36 billion
- **Personal care:** $3.20 billion
- **Insurance:** $3.15 billion
- **General services:** $3.02 billion
- **Home supplies and cleaners:** $1.46 billion
- **Airlines, hotels, car rental, and travel:** $1.23 billion
- **Beer, wine and liquor:** $1.11 billion
- **Toys and games:** $1.04 billion
- **Computers and software:** $993 million
- **Government, politics, and religion:** $755 million
- **Education:** $743 million
- **Home furnishing/appliances/electronics:** $673 million
- **Media:** $518 million
- **Apparel:** $408 million
- **Pet food and pet care:** $364 million
- **Gas and oil:** $288 million
- **Hardware and home building supplies:** $266 million
• Shipping and freight: $ 183 million
• Sporting goods: $ 136 million
• Real estate: $ 103 million
• Office equipment: $ 69 million
• Miscellaneous: $ 635 million

12.4 Top Advertisers

According to Advertising Age (July 2015), the top TV advertisers, ranked by annual spending, are as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

Network TV
• Procter & Gamble: $826.3 million (10.3%)
• General Motors: $703.3 million (20.1%)
• Verizon Communications: $581.4 million (11.2%)
• AT&T: $573.2 million (-2.6%)
• Apple: $500.7 million (18.1%)
• Toyota Motor Corp.: $443.6 million (-5.5%)
• Ford Motor Co.: $441.8 million (-14.6%)
• Time Warner: $434.7 million (18.6%)
• Sprint: $426.0 million (28.7%)
• Pfizer: $411.2 million (26.9%)

Cable TV Networks
• Procter & Gamble: $751.8 million (-11.6%)
• Berkshire Hathaway: $450.5 million (14.9%)
• General Motors: $379.0 million (-7.3%)
• Yum! Brands: $378.3 million (1.0%)
• General Mills: $356.1 million (11.1%)
• PepsiCo: $336.4 million (3.7%)
• Hershey Co.: $333.1 million (5.0%)
• AT&T: $331.7 million (4.7%)
• Time Warner: $305.3 million (30.4%)
• Toyota Motor Corp.: $301.3 million (2.9%)

Spot TV & National Syndicated TV
• Comcast: $395.9 million (3.5%)
• Fiat Chrysler: $325.8 million (2.6%)
• Nissan Motor Co.: $283.8 million (9.9%)
• Pfizer: $272.5 million (50.9%)
• General Motors: $264.1 million (-1.7%)
• Hershey Co.: $242.1 million (24.2%)
• AT&T: $240.8 million (-29.2%)
• General Mills: $228.9 million (-11.0%)
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• Time Warner Cable: $213.6 million (-1.9%)
• Berkshire Hathaway: $206.2 million (2.7%)

12.5 Average CPM
The average CPM (i.e., cost per thousand households) for primetime network TV has been as follows (source: Television Bureau of Advertising [www.tva.org]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost per 30 sec.</th>
<th>CPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$129,600</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$127,800</td>
<td>$22.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$117,800</td>
<td>$22.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$114,900</td>
<td>$26.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$103,700</td>
<td>$22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$103,600</td>
<td>$19.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$106,500</td>
<td>$22.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$111,500</td>
<td>$24.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$110,200</td>
<td>$25.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.6 Market Resources
Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau, 830 3rd Avenue, 2nd Floor, New York, New York 10022. (212) 508-1200. (www.thecab.tv)

Kantar Media, 100 Park Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10017. (212) 991-6000. (www.kantarmedia.com)

Leichtman Research Group, 567 Bay Road, Durham, NH 03824. (603) 397-5400. (www.leichtmanresearch.com)

Television Bureau of Advertising, 3 East 54th Street, New York, NY 10022. (212) 486-1111. (www.tvb.org)
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TOP ADVERTISERS

13.1 Overview
Based on data from Kantar Media (www.kantarmedia.com), Advertising Age publishes an annual list of the top advertisers ranked by annual U.S. advertising spending. This chapter lists the top advertisers from the July 2015 assessment.

Total ad spending of the top 100 advertisers is $110.0 billion. This total spending consists of $57.4 billion in measured advertising spending and $52.6 billion in estimated unmeasured advertising. (Measured advertising is explained in Section 4.2.) Of total U.S. advertising spending, the top 100 advertisers account for approximately 43%.

13.2 Top Spending Advertisers
The following companies have the highest spending on advertising (source: Kantar Media):

- Procter & Gamble: $4.61 billion
- AT&T: $3.27 billion
- General Motors: $3.12 billion
- Comcast: $3.03 billion
- Verizon Communications: $2.53 billion
- Ford Motor Co.: $2.47 billion
- American Express: $2.36 billion
- Fiat Chrysler: $2.25 billion
- L’Oréal: $2.16 billion
- Walt Disney Co.: $2.11 billion
- Toyota Motor Co.: $2.09 billion
- Johnson & Johnson: $1.97 billion
- Walmart: $1.94 billion
- JPMorgan Chase & Co.: $1.90 billion
- Samsung Electronics: $1.82 billion
- Time Warner: $1.70 billion
- Pfizer: $1.67 billion
- Target Corp.: $1.65 billion
- Macy’s: $1.60 billion
- Bank of America: $1.58 billion
• 21st Century Fox: $1.58 billion
• Anheuser-Busch InBev: $1.57 billion
• Berkshire Hathaway: $1.54 billion
• Sprint: $1.50 billion
• CapitalOne: $1.46 billion
• McDonald’s: $1.42 billion
• Microsoft: $1.41 billion
• T-Mobile: $1.40 billion
• Nissan Motor Co.: $1.34 billion
• Unilever: $1.31 billion
• Nike: $1.31 billion
• Google: $1.28 billion
• Amazon: $1.23 billion
• Kohl’s: $1.19 billion
• PepsiCo: $1.18 billion
• Bayer: $1.09 billion
• LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton: $1.08 billion
• Honda Motor Co.: $1.06 billion
• U.S. Government: $979 million
• Sears Holdings Corp.: $974 million
• Estée Lauder: $955 million
• Volkswagen: $932 million
• Yum! Brands: $898 million
• Allstate Corp.: $893 million
• SABMiller (MillerCoors): $869 million
• J.C. Penney Co.: $887 million
• General Mills: $866 million
• Expedia: $846 million
• State Farm Mutual Auto Insurance: $844 million
• Mars Inc.: $827 million
• Nestlé: $819 million
• Diageo: $800 million
• Sony Corp.: $800 million
• Lowe’s: $798 million
• Apple: $795 million
• Home Depot: $794 million
• Eli Lilly & Co.: $777 million
• Citigroup: $767 million
• Viacom: $759 million
• Hershey: $745 million
• Discover Financial Services: $735 million
• Time Warner Cable: $684 million
• IAC/InterActive Corp.: $671 million
• Kellogg: $666 million
- Coca-Cola: $664 million
- Wells Fargo & Co.: $653 million
- Kroger Co.: $648 million
- Progressive Corp.: $647 million
- Best Buy: $636 million
- eBay: $617 million
- Sanofi: $614 million
- GlaxoSmithKline: $612 million
- Merck & Co.: $604 million
- AstraZeneca: $603 million
- DirecTV: $586 million
- Kraft Heinz Co.: $569 million
- Dish Network: $567 million
- AbbVie: $566 million
- Daimler: $562 million
- Kia Motors Corp.: $554 million
- Doctor’s Associates (Subway): $536 million
- Walgreens Boots Alliance: $521 million
- Cox Enterprises: $497 million
- Gap: $493 million
- Hyundai Motor Co.: $492 million
- Allergan: $487 million
- Visa: $485 million
- Clorox: $470 million
- IBM Corp.: $451 million
- RB (Reckitt Benckiser Group): $444 million
- Liberty Mutual: $441 million
- AB Acquisition (Albertsons and Safeway): $429 million
- Mattel: $415 million
- Dr. Pepper Snapple Group: $414 million
- Colgate-Palmolive: $411 million
- Netflix: $406 million
- Heineken: $403 million
- VF Corp.: $402 million
- Chanel: $401 million
- Church & Dwight: $397 million

### 13.3 Market Resources

*Advertising Age*, 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. (212) 210-0100. (www.adage.com)

Kantar Media, 100 Park Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10017. (212) 991-6000. (www.kantarmedia.com)
TOP ADVERTISING AGENCIES

14.1 Overview

Advertising Age publishes an annual list of the top agencies ranked by annual U.S. revenue. This chapter lists the top U.S. agencies from the May 2015 assessment (parent companies or networks also given).

14.2 Top 100 Agencies

Ranked by annual U.S. revenue, the 100 largest advertising agencies are as follows:

- Epsilon (Alliance Data Systems Corp.): $1.79 billion
- Deloitte Digital (Deloitte): $757 million
- IBM Interactive (IBM Corp.): $709 million
- Acxion Corp.: $707 million
- SapientNitro (Publicis): $606 million
- BBDO Worldwide (Omnicom): $577 million
- Accenture Interactive (Accenture): $566 million
- Leo Burnett Worldwide (Publicis): $487 million
- Edelman (DJE Holdings): $482 million
- PwC Digital Services (PricewaterhouseCoopers): $471 million
- Rapp (Omnicom): $455 million
- Publicis Worldwide (Publicis): $454 million
- McCann Erickson Worldwide (Interpublic): $445 million
- DigitasLBi (Publicis): $444 million
- J. Walter Thompson (WPP): $435 million
- Y&R (WPP): $435 million
- Experian Marketing Services (Experian): $433 million
- Harte Hanks: $427 million
- Weber Shandwick (Interpublic): $425 million
- Merkle: $425 million
- Wunderman (WPP): $398 million
- Razorfish (Publicis): $357 million
- FleishmanHillard (Omnicom): $352 million
- IN Marketing Services (Advantage Sales and Marketing): $352 million
- Havas Worldwide (Havas): $343 million
- TBWA Worldwide (Omnicom): $331 million
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Brand</th>
<th>Revenue (Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCB (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$329 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (WPP)</td>
<td>$318 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inVeniv Health</td>
<td>$301 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosetta (Publicis)</td>
<td>$293 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindshare Worldwide (WPP)</td>
<td>$290 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OgilvyOne Worldwide (WPP)</td>
<td>$288 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saatchi &amp; Saatchi (Publicis)</td>
<td>$288 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDB Worldwide (Omnicom)</td>
<td>$288 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starcom USA (Publicis)</td>
<td>$287 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchum (Omnicom)</td>
<td>$280 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMD Worldwide (Omnicom)</td>
<td>$275 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogilvy &amp; Mather Advertising (WPP)</td>
<td>$274 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaVest USA (Publicis)</td>
<td>$270 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/GA (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$258 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRM/McCann (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$258 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBay Enterprise (eBay)</td>
<td>$253 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>$246 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenith (Publicis)</td>
<td>$236 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novus Media (Omnicom)</td>
<td>$220 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MarketStar (Omnicom)</td>
<td>$216 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC (WPP)</td>
<td>$215 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBC Health (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$209 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGarryBowen (Dentsu)</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burson-Marsteller (WPP)</td>
<td>$197 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Holiday (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$191 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Global (WPP)</td>
<td>$190 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havas Health (Havas)</td>
<td>$189 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$188 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCrossing (Hearst Corp.)</td>
<td>$187 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Media</td>
<td>$187 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Group</td>
<td>$186 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wieden &amp; Kennedy</td>
<td>$183 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaCom (WPP)</td>
<td>$175 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catapult (Alliance Data Systems Corp. Epsilon)</td>
<td>$171 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huge (Interpublic)</td>
<td>$169 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Arm (Omnicom)</td>
<td>$165 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VML (WPP)</td>
<td>$164 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carat (Dentsu)</td>
<td>$162 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integer Group</td>
<td>$158 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKQA (WPP)</td>
<td>$150 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP&amp;B (MDC Partners)</td>
<td>$148 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogilvy CommonHealth Worldwide (WPP)</td>
<td>$146 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer-Krasselt</td>
<td>$145 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George P. Johnson (Project Worldwide)</td>
<td>$145 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Interbrand (Omnicom): $ 143 million
• 360i (Dentsu): $ 143 million
• Mullen (Interpublic): $ 140 million
• Possible (WPP): $ 139 million
• Hill & Knowlton Strategies (WPP): $ 138 million
• GMR Marketing (Omnicom): $ 138 million
• Match Marketing Group: $ 135 million
• Meredith Xcelerated Marketing (Meredith Corp.): $ 131 million
• Organic (Omnicom): $ 127 million
• UM (Interpublic): $ 125 million
• Octagon (Interpublic): $ 124 million
• Assembly (MDC Partners): $ 122 million
• Zimmerman Advertising (Omnicom): $ 122 million
• Jack Morton Worldwide (Interpublic): $ 121 million
• Moxie (Publicis): $ 121 million
• Martin Agency (Interpublic): $ 121 million
• 72andSunny (MDC Partners): $ 120 million
• Proximity (Omnicom): $ 120 million
• Ogilvy Public Relations (WPP): $ 115 million
• Trailer Park (Engine Group): $ 115 million
• Digital Health LifeBrands (Publicis): $ 115 million
• Golin (Interpublic): $ 114 million
• Gyro: $ 114 million
• Lowe (Interpublic): $ 113 million
• KBS+ (MDC Partners): $ 111 million
• Havas Media Group (Havas): $ 110 million
• Goodby, Silverstein & Partners (Omnicom): $ 109 million
• PlattForm Advertising: $ 107 million
• Maxus (WPP): $ 106 million
• RPA: $ 105 million

14.3 Market Resources
Advertising Age, 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. (212) 210-0100. (www.adage.com)
PART III: DIGITAL MARKETING
### 15.1 Market Assessment

According to the *IAB Internet Advertising Revenue Report*, by the Interactive Advertising Bureau (www.iab.net), digital advertising spending has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Desktop/Laptop</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$12.5 billion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$16.9 billion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16.9 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$21.2 billion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$21.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$23.4 billion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$23.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$22.7 billion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$25.4 billion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$26.0 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$30.1 billion</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
<td>$31.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$33.2 billion</td>
<td>$3.4 billion</td>
<td>$36.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$35.7 billion</td>
<td>$7.1 billion</td>
<td>$42.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$37.0 billion</td>
<td>$12.5 billion</td>
<td>$49.5 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Digital advertising spending by format in 2014 was distributed as follows:

- Search: 37%
- Mobile: 28%
- Banner: 16%
- Digital video: 7%
- Classifieds: 5%
- Lead generation: 3%
- Rich media: 3%
- Sponsorship: 2%

* Rich media refers to an ad that uses advanced technology such as streaming video, downloaded programs that interact with the user, and ads that change when the user’s mouse passes over it.

Media formats were distributed as follows:

- Display: 51%
- Search: 45%
- Other: 5%

Internet ad spending by sector in 2014 was distributed as follows:

- Retail: 21%
- Financial services: 13%
• Automotive: 12%
• Telecommunications: 9%
• Leisure travel: 9%
• Consumer electronics and computers: 7%
• Consumer packaged goods: 6%
• Healthcare and pharmaceuticals: 5%
• Media: 5%
• Entertainment: 4%

15.2 Digital Agencies
According to Advertising Age (May 2015), the following are the largest digital ad agencies and networks (parent companies or networks also given):
• Epsilon (Alliance Data Systems Corp.): $1.13 billion
• Deloitte Digital: $757 million
• IBM Interactive (IBM Corp.): $709 million
• SapientNitro (Sapient Corp.): $620 million
• Accenture Interactive: $566 million
• Wunderman (WPP): $474 million
• PwC Digital Services: $471 million
• DigitasLBi (Publicis): $444 million
• Digital@Ogilvy (WPP): $411 million
• Razorfish (Publicis): $357 million
• Rapp (Omnicom): $318 million
• Havas Digital Group (Havas): $315 million
• Rosetta (Publicis): $293 million
• Merkle: $271 million
• R/GA (Interpublic): $258 million
• MRM/McCann (Interpublic): $258 million
• eBay Enterprise: $253 million
• FCB (Interpublic): $226 million
• Publicis Healthcare Communications Group: $210 million
• iCrossing (Hearst Corp.): $187 million

15.3 Top Advertisers
According to Advertising Age (July 2015), the top Internet display advertisers, ranked by annual spending, are as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):
• Comcast: $215.9 million (-30.9%)
• AT&T: $168.0 million (-32.8%)
• Procter & Gamble: $158.7 million (-31.5%)
• American Express: $155.3 million (20.8%)
• Verizon: $151.5 million (-24.5%)
• Fidelity Investments: $134.7 million (33.6%)
• Capital One: $128.4 million (21.4%)
• Fiat Chrysler: $125.8 million (14.8%)
• Walt Disney Co.: $112.2 million (-20.0%)
• TD Ameritrade: $100.3 million (11.4%)

15.4 Display Ads
eMarketer (www.emarketer.com) assesses display ad spending as follows:

- 2010: $ 9.9 billion
- 2011: $12.3 billion
- 2012: $15.0 billion
- 2013: $17.7 billion
- 2014: $20.8 billion
- 2015: $23.1 billion
- 2016: $25.2 billion

Display ad spending is distributed as follows (in billions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banner ads:</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
<td>$9.6</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$10.9</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video:</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich media:</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships:</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A March 2015 report by eMarketer assessed display ad revenue by company as follows (in billions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook:</td>
<td>$3.28</td>
<td>$5.29</td>
<td>$6.82</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>$10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google:</td>
<td>$2.54</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td>$3.52</td>
<td>$3.81</td>
<td>$4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter:</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.92</td>
<td>$2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo!:</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOL:</td>
<td>$0.76</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
<td>$0.94</td>
<td>$1.07</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon:</td>
<td>$0.46</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>$0.82</td>
<td>$0.99</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft:</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>$0.49</td>
<td>$0.46</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn:</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
<td>$0.37</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobile display ad revenues are assessed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook:</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$2.54</td>
<td>$4.91</td>
<td>$6.29</td>
<td>$7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google:</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$1.89</td>
<td>$2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter:</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>$2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple (iAd):</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td>$0.49</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandora:</td>
<td>$0.37</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>$1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo!:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$0.76</td>
<td>$0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“The biggest challenge facing most of these companies is transitioning from desktop ads to mobile ads.”

Forbes, 7/9/15

15.5 Real-Time Bidding On Ad Exchanges

Buying and selling digital ads in real time takes place on ad exchanges. The Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB, www.iab.net) defines real-time bidding (RTB) as a data-driven model allowing advertisers or their agencies to bid on digital media (display, video, mobile, social, etc.) in real time at the impression level.

IAB defines an ad exchange as a virtual marketplace were participating suppliers auction their impressions to eligible buyers. The ad exchange announces each impression in real time and asks buyers if they are interested and at which price.

Larger ad exchanges include Google’s AdX, Yahoo’s Right Media, and Facebook Exchange.

15.6 Programmatic Advertising

Programmatic advertising is a general term that refers to the automation of buying and selling digital ads. Originally the term was synonymous with real-time bidding (RTB) for digital ads. Use of the term has expanded to include serving the right ad to the right person at the right time using digital channels. The term is used also to describe how online campaigns are booked, analyzed, and optimized using demand-side software.

Programmatic ad spending was $10.1 billion in 2014, according the Interactive Advertising Bureau. Display banner ads for desktop and mobile accounted for 80% of the total.
“That $10.1 billion represents a massive shift in how advertisers buy media and publishers sell it. It also accounts for more than half of all revenue from online display advertising. But there are also inconsistencies in how industry players define programmatic, as well as transparency shortfalls across ad formats and media marketplaces, making it difficult to clearly delineate the area. In the IAB report, programmatic refers to display and video ads on desktop and mobile that were bought and sold through automated channels.”

Advertising Age, 7/20/15

Ten companies accounted for 66% of total programmatic revenue in 2014; 25 companies accounted for 75%. Ad-tech companies’ revenue comprised about 55% of the programmatic total while publishers collected 45%.

The ad-tech company category includes those that make money from programmatic buying and selling before the revenue gets to publishers, including agency trading desks and a range of technology companies that facilitate sales for publishers and buys for marketers. The fees those tech companies charge buyers and sellers to use a demand-side platform or ad server, among other technology, can represent a markup from 15% to 50% over the cost of the ad space. For example, ad networks, which can facilitate both the purchase and sale of online ad inventory, typically charge 30% to 50% in value-add mark-up fees, with a few networks charging even more. By contrast, the fees for demand-side platforms, agency trading desks, and exchange marketplaces tend to fall below 30%, according to the IAC.

In a May 2015 survey by Econsultancy (www.econsultancy.com), senior marketers reported the benefits of running programmatic brand advertising campaigns as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Increased efficiency: 64%
- Reduced overall advertising costs: 58%
- Ability to optimize and target the right audience in real time: 56%
- Higher ROI: 52%
- Opportunity to leverage first-party data: 52%
- Ability to build effective cross-device campaigns: 49%
- Greater data and insights to understand customers: 49%
15.7 Native Ads

Native advertising refers to media where the ad experience follows the natural form and function of the user experience in which it is placed. The intent of native ads is to make the paid advertising feel less intrusive and thus increase the likelihood users will click on it.

According to Socintel360 (www.socintel360.com), native ad spending has been, and is forecast, as follows:

- 2012: $1.5 billion
- 2013: $2.2 billion
- 2014: $3.2 billion
- 2015: $4.3 billion
- 2016: $5.7 billion
- 2017: $7.1 billion
- 2018: $8.8 billion

BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com) compares spending for display and native ads served on social media sites as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2.9 billion</td>
<td>$1.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$4.3 billion</td>
<td>$2.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$5.4 billion</td>
<td>$2.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$7.9 billion</td>
<td>$3.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$11.1 billion</td>
<td>$3.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$14.1 billion</td>
<td>$4.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$16.7 billion</td>
<td>$4.6 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a survey reported in Advertising Is Going Native, published in January 2015 by the Association of National Advertisers (www.ana.net), the following were identified as important components of native advertising (percentage of respondents):

- Native ad is contextually relevant to the surrounding editorial content: 63%
- Native ad is placed within page/program editorial content: 31%
- Native ad format looks like the surrounding editorial content: 26%
- Upon interaction, native ad behaves like the surrounding editorial content: 22%
“Despite protestations from some quarters over the blurring of boundaries between editorial content and advertising, native ads have emerged as a powerful tool for publishers to monetize digital media and for marketers to cut through the clutter and get their messages across to consumers.”

eMarketer, 1/22/15

15.8 Market Resources
IAB Internet Advertising Revenue Report, PricewaterhouseCoopers. (www.iab.net/AdRevenueReport)

Interactive Advertising Bureau, 116 East 27th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10016. (212) 380-4700. (www.iab.net)
16.1 Email Spending
Forrester Research (www.forrester.com) estimates annual email marketing spending at $4.4 billion.

One of the most appealing aspects of email marketing is that sending an email is free – marketing costs are essentially all related to campaign administration. The Direct Marketing Association (www.thedma.org) reports that email campaigns have a 4,300% return-on-investment (ROI) and earn $42.08 for each dollar spent.

2015 Marketing Trends Survey, by StrongView (www.strongview.com) found that 60.7% of marketers increased email budgets in 2015; 4.3% decreased spending.

“As mobile devices have become indispensable, marketers have started to effectively adjust to the mobile preference expressed by their consumers over the past few years. By incorporating responsive design in their emails, building adaptive landing pages, or optimizing the mobile path-to-purchase, marketers have set an intention to truly cater to their mobile audience.”

Center For Media Research
Research Brief, 4/8/15

16.2 Mobile Viewing Of Email
Yesmail (www.yesmail.com) reported the following trends in email performance for mobile devices compared with desktop:
• Mobile clicks accounted for 40% of all email clicks in 2014, a 10% increase from 2013. Mobile conversion rate (i.e., purchase resulting from an email click) grew by 70% in 2014 while desktop conversion rate declined by 4%.
• Mobile revenue share grew by a third and made up 20% of all email-generated revenue in 2014.
• In 2014, the share of orders completed on mobile devices grew by 21% of all email-generated orders.
• Average order value (AOV) for mobile grew by 28% in 2014, doubling the annual growth of desktop AOV.

16.3 Email Marketing Trends
A May 2015 survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 (www.ascend2.com) explored strategies for email marketing trends. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

**Most Important Objectives Of Email Marketing Strategy**
- Increase engagement: 63%
- Increase lead generation: 51%
- Improve acquisition/retention: 43%
- Improve lead nurturing: 35%
- Increase brand awareness: 32%
- Increase email list size: 14%
- Improve list segmentation: 13%
- Improve analytics and reporting: 11%

**Most Important For Measuring Email Marketing Performance**
- Click-through rate: 73%
- Conversion rate: 71%
- Email ROI: 42%
- Open rate: 40%
- Opt-out rate: 13%
- Social shares: 9%
- Inbox delivery rate: 9%
- Bounce rate: 8%

**How Click-Through Rates Are Changing**
- Increasing significantly: 6%
- Increasing modestly: 33%
- Not changing: 34%
- Decreasing modestly: 22%
- Decreasing significantly: 5%
Most Effective Methods For Increasing Click-Through Rates

- Meaningful call-to-action offer: 65%
- List segmentation for targeting: 47%
- Message personalization: 42%
- Testing and optimization: 35%
- Mobile-friendly design: 33%
- Drip/event-triggered campaigns: 22%
- Video email: 10%
- Social sharing: 6%

Most Difficult Methods To Execute For Increasing Click-Through Rates

- List segmentation for targeting: 41%
- Meaningful call-to-action offer: 35%
- Drip/event-triggered campaigns: 32%
- Message personalization: 31%
- Testing and optimization: 31%
- Video email: 28%
- Social sharing: 20%
- Mobile-friendly design: 17%

Most Challenging Obstacles To Email Marketing Success

- Low click-through rates: 53%
- Lack of an effective strategy: 41%
- Lack of quality content: 32%
- Lack of internal resources: 31%
- Lack of list hygiene: 28%
- Inability to segment lists: 22%
- Budget constraints: 15%
- Mobile device use: 9%

16.4 Email List Growth

A January 2015 survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 explored strategies for email marketing trends. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

Most Important Objectives Of Email Marketing Strategy

- Increase conversion rates: 57%
- Improve lead generation: 51%
- Increase email list size: 48%
- Increase open/click rates: 40%
- Improve email relevance: 22%
- Improve list hygiene/accuracy: 21%
- Improve brand loyalty: 19%
- Improve social integration: 9%
How Email List Size Is Changing
- Growing rapidly: 15%
- Growing slowly: 61%
- Not changing: 16%
- Shrinking slowly: 6%
- Shrinking rapidly: 3%

Most Effective Tactics For Email List Growth
- Website access: 43%
- Content downloads: 42%
- Upcoming events: 30%
- Social media sharing: 29%
- Purchase process: 22%
- Paid search campaigns: 20%
- Email forward-to-a-friend: 14%
- Call center/in-store email capture: 11%

Most Difficult Tactics To Execute For Email List Growth
- Social media sharing: 40%
- Paid search campaigns: 39%
- Email forward-to-a-friend: 31%
- Content downloads: 22%
- Call center/in-store email capture: 21%
- Purchase process: 21%
- Website access: 16%
- Upcoming events: 12%

Most Challenging Obstacles To Email Marketing Success
- Content relevance/value: 44%
- List growth expertise: 43%
- Email list hygiene/accuracy: 40%
- Strategy effectiveness: 39%
- Externally sourced list quality: 23%
- Social audience conversion: 19%
- Spam regulatory compliance: 17%
- Unsubscribe rate: 12%

16.5 Segmentation And Targeting
According to Digital Optimizer Report, by Lyris (www.lyris.com), 85% of email marketers segment their lists. Marketers said the following are the most effective methods used to segment email marketing lists (percentage of respondents):
• By demographics: 39%
• By purchase history: 28%
• By open rates: 26%
• By click-through rates: 25%
• By type of purchase: 20%
• By website activity: 11%
• By amount of purchase: 10%
• By social media activity: 6%

In a February 2015 survey, The Relevancy Group (www.relevancygroup.com) found customer data attributes used by marketers to segment audiences as follows (percentage of respondents):
• Demographics: 41%
• Geographic: 39%
• Customer satisfaction: 34%
• Click through on email offers: 33%
• Customer spending: 31%
• Frequency of purchase, conversion: 29%
• Customer lifetime profitability: 28%
• Transaction purchase behavior: 27%

16.6 Factors Influencing Email Open Rate

According to Yesmail, the number of emails sent by marketers increased 9% in 2014; the open rate decreased by 3%. These trends are driving marketers to intensify efforts to get recipients to open promotional emails.

A survey by Campaigner (www.campaigner.com) asked U.S. Internet users the primary influence for reading promotional emails. Responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):
• Familiarity of sender name: 24%
• Email subject line: 16%
• It depends on my email reading device: 10%
• Email body length: 6%
• Awareness of a deal or promotion: 6%

Blue Hornet Networks (www.bluehornet.com) reported consumers are most likely to open the following types of emails (percentage of respondents):
• Emails from brands whose products I often purchase online: 70%
• Emails from brands whose products I often purchase in-store: 70%
• Emails from brands that I don’t usually purchase from but I like to get inspiration from their styles and products: 18%
• Emails that contain news and content, not specifically product-related: 16%
People typically scan the subject lines in their inbox before deciding what messages are worth their time and attention. A study of 24 million emails by MailChimp (http://mailchimp.com) looked at response rates for various subject lines. The metric of assessment was the standard deviation from the mean open rate for a user/list. Words with positive impacts resulted in increased open rates, and words with negative impacts hurt those same rates. The following is a summary of findings:

**Name Personalization**

Though the use of both first and last names in a subject line is less common than the use of either alone, it has the largest positive impact on open rates. The impact of name personalization on open rate in standard deviations is as follows:
- First and last name: 0.33
- Last name only: 0.17
- First name only: 0.09

**Free vs. Freebie**

While including “free” in the subject line entices potential readers to open the message, use of the word “freebie” was found to result in a much larger increase in open rates. The impact of these words on open rate in standard deviations is as follows:
- Freebie: 0.26
- Free: 0.02

**Words That Imply Time Sensitivity**

Attention-grabbing words like “urgent” and “important” result in open rates that are much higher than normal. The impact of these words on open rate in standard deviations is as follows:
- Urgent: 0.79
- Breaking: 0.68
- Important: 0.55
- Alert: 0.31

**Announcements, Invitations and Cancellations**

Recipients are much more intrigued by announcements and event invitations than cancellations and reminders. The impact of these words on open rate in standard deviations is as follows:
- Announcement: 0.46
- Invitation: 0.34
- Invited: 0.34
- Announcing: 0.32
- Invite: 0.28
- Invites: 0.28
- Announced: 0.26
- Announces: 0.21
- Announce: 0.21
Words Associated with Charity
  Words related to charitable actions and donations had a generally negative impact on open rates. The impact of words associated with charity on open rate in standard deviations is as follows:
  • Helping: 10.12
  • Fundraising: 0.13
  • Raffle: -0.14
  • Fundraiser: -0.17
  • Charity: -0.18
  • Donate: -0.56

Frequently Used Word Pairs
  Frequently used word pairs often have significant impacts on open rates. Sometimes two words can provide context that a single word can’t convey. The impact of word pairs on open rate in standard deviations is as follows:
  • Thank you: 0.57
  • Supreme Court: 0.51
  • Appeals Court: 0.32
  • Sneak peek: 0.08
  • Sign up: -0.18
  • Breast cancer: -0.27
  • Last chance: -0.45

A 2015 survey by Howling Mad (www.howlingmad.com) found marketers split-test email campaign subject lines as follows (percentage of respondents):
  • All campaigns: 7%
  • Most campaigns: 21%
  • A few campaigns: 49%
  • Never: 22%

“All email marketers want opens, clicks, and conversions, but to get there they need something to draw in readers – that’s where subject lines come in.”

eMarketer, 1/13/15
16.7 Personalization

A January 2015 survey by Listrak (www.listrak.com) found attitudes toward retail email as follows:

- Find it useful when a retailer sends me emails featuring recommended products based on what I’ve previously purchased: 80%
- Find it useful when a retailer sends me emails based on what I’ve looked at online, but not purchased: 71%
- Like it when retailers personalize my emails by using my name in the subject line or the body of the email: 68%

Silverpop (www.silverpop.com) found that 71% of consumers are more likely to make a purchase if an email from a retailer or brand has been tailored to them based on their likes and preferences following previous shopping behavior.

“Research has found that personalized email offers are what consumers really want, and they’re more likely to make a purchase after receiving personalized emails.”

eMarketer, 3/17/15

A January 2015 report by Yes Lifecycle Marketing (www.yeslifecyclemarketing.com) suggested the following ways that marketers can make each email personal for each individual:

- Consider personalizing emails when the reader opens them rather than solely based on past behaviors or when the email is sent. Discount countdown clocks, live social feeds, and changing hero images can all be optimized at the moment reader opens an email.
- The elements that a marketer uses depends on the device. It’s important to recognize when and where the customer will receive a message to determine the approach with personalized content.
- An effective way to personalize an email is by using predictive analytics. With that, marketers can embed the right calls-to-action, make videos more personal, and even tailor the right frequency of emails for each person. Even frequency is a form of personalization, so it’s important to recognize how often a person wants to communicate with you.
- Email marketers should consider location as they personalize their messages, and match the culture, look, and feel of a reader’s location.
16.8 Time-Of-Delivery Effectiveness

Responses to promotional emails vary with the time of delivery. The following is a summary of studies that show response variations.

GetResponse (www.getresponse.com) assessed email marketing open and click rates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Open Rate</th>
<th>Click Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experian Marketing Services (http://www.experian.com/marketing-services/) reports the following day-of-week analytics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Unique Open Rate</th>
<th>Unique Click Rate</th>
<th>Transaction Rate</th>
<th>Revenue Per Email</th>
<th>Average Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>$181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An assessment by Docstoc (www.docstoc.com) reported the following open rate (OR) and click-through rate (CTR):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pct. of Emails</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>CTR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 a.m. to 6 a.m.</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 a.m. to 12: p.m.</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 p.m. to 6 p.m.</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p.m. to 12: a.m.</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MailerMailer (www.mailermailer.com) provides the following assessment:

- Open rates fluctuate marginally throughout the week, with Sundays, Tuesdays, and Fridays generating the highest open rates.
- Email messages that are scheduled to be delivered between 1:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m. can expect higher volumes of email opens and clicks. Emails delivered between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. also experience a considerable jump in their open and click rates. There is a notable drop off during the middle of the day in which email opens and clicks tend to be stagnant for several hours.
According to SimpleRelevance (www.simplerelevance.com), most consumers have limited windows of time allocated for responding to emails. While people open email several times throughout the day, 62% only click through to a commercial website during one single hour per day. Email use varies by gender and income as follows:

- Men tend to open email an average of eight time-periods throughout the day, while women average seven.
- Men click more frequently in the early morning, 4:00 a.m. until 9:00 a.m., while women click more frequently in the afternoon to evening, 10:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m.
- For all hours in which men and women open their email, 57% of men and 66% of women prefer one single hour per day in which they actually click through. Twenty-two percent (22%) of men and 19% of women have two one-hour time-periods per day to click through an email.
- People earning $150,000 or more are more likely to click in the early morning from 5:00 a.m. until 8:00 a.m., while people earning $75,000 or less are more active from 9:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m.

Experian Cheetahmail (www.experian.com/cheetahmail.com) reported the following email marketing campaign statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Unique Open Rate</th>
<th>Unique Click Rate</th>
<th>Transaction Rate</th>
<th>Revenue Per Email</th>
<th>Average Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 a.m. to 4 a.m.</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>22¢</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 a.m. to 8 a.m.</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>18¢</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 a.m. to 12 p.m.</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>17¢</td>
<td>$174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 p.m. to 4 p.m.</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>15¢</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 p.m. to 8 p.m.</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>16¢</td>
<td>$182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 p.m. to 12 a.m.</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>48¢</td>
<td>$246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a survey by StrongMail (www.strongmail.com), U.S. marketing professionals identified the following benefits of having their promotional emails arrive during a set delivery window (percentage of respondents):

- Increased engagement: 55%
- Ability to run more time-sensitive promotions: 52%
- Increased revenue: 33%
- Improved customer service: 25%
- Increased competitive advantage: 23%
- No benefits: 9%
“In everyday life, most people don’t want to be bothered late at night. But the opposite seems to be true when it comes to email.”

eMarketer

16.9 Email Marketing Services

Email marketing services provide campaign management, database management, analytics, reporting, and tracking.

The following are website links for major email marketing services providers:

• Acxiom Corp. (www.acxiom.com)
• Anchor Computer (www.anchorcomputer.com)
• Applied Information Group (www.appliedinfo.com)
• Arial Software (www.arialsoftware.com)
• AWeber Communications (www.aweber.com)
• Blue Hornet Networks (www.bluehornet.com)
• Boomerang (www.boomerang.com)
• Bridgeline Digital (www.bridgeline.com)
• Bronto Software (www.bronto.com)
• Campaigner Email Marketing (www.campaigner.com)
• ClickSquared (www.clicksquared.com)
• Concep (www.concep.com)
• Constant Contact (www.constantcontact.com)
• Cooler Email Inc. (www.coolermail.com)
• Dynamic Network Services (http://dyn.com)
• eBay Enterprise (www.ebayenterprise.com)
• EchoMail Inc. (www.echomail.com)
• Email Answers (www.emailanswers.com)
• Emailvision (www.emailvision.com)
• Ennect (www.ennect.com)
• Epsilon (www.epsilon.com)
• ExactTarget (www.exacttarget.com)
• Experian CheetahMail (www.experian.com/marketing-services/cheetahmail.html)
• FreshAddress (www.freshaddress.com)
• GetResponse (www.getresponse.com)
• Global IntelliSystems (www.gliq.com)
• IBM Enterprise Management
  (http://www-01.ibm.com/software/marketing-solutions/email-marketing-solution)
• iContact (www.icontact.com)
• IMN Inc. (www.imninc.com)
• Infogroup (www.infogrouplistservices.com)
• iPost (www.ipost.com)
• Lift Network (www.liftmysales.com)
• Listrak Inc. (www.listrak.com)
• MailChimp (http://mailchimp.com)
• Merkle (www.merkleinc.com)
• Message Systems (www.messagesystems.com)
• Net Atlantic (www.netatlantic.com)
• NetProspex, a Dun & Bradstreet company (www.netprospex.com)
• PulsePoint (www.pulsepoint.com)
• Purseend (www.puresend.com)
• Q Interactive (www.qinteractive.com)
• Reach Marketing (www.reachmarketing.com)
• Real Magnet (www.realmagnet.com)
• Return Path (www.returnpath.com)
• Sailthru (www.sailthru.com)
• Savicom (www.savicom.net)
• SDL International (www sdl.com)
• Silverpop (www.silverpop.com)
• Socket Labs (www.socketlabs.com)
• SourceLink (www.sourcelink.com)
• StreamSend Email Marketing (www.streamsend.com)
• SubscriberMail (www.subscribermail.com)
• TailoredMail (www.tailoredmail.com)
• Topica (www.topica.com)
• VerticalResponse (www.verticalresponse.com)
• WhatCounts (www.whatcounts.com)
• Xert Communications (www.xert.com)
• Xtenit (http://xtenit.com)
• Yesmail (www.yesmail.com)
• Zeta Mail Solutions (www.zetamailsolutions.com)

16.10 Market Resources
Email Experience Council, 1615 L Street NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20036. (888) 804-4521. (www.emailexperience.org)

Email Insider, MediaPost Communications, 15 East 32nd Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10016. (212) 204-2000. (www.mediapost.com/publications/email-insider/)

Email Marketing Reports (www.email-marketing-reports.com)
17.1 Market Assessment

According to eMarketer (www.emarketer.com), U.S. mobile advertising spending has been, and is forecast, as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- 2013: $ 9.60 billion (120.0%)
- 2014: $14.97 billion (56.0%)
- 2015: $21.24 billion (41.8%)
- 2016: $28.27 billion (33.1%)
- 2017: $35.62 billion (26.0%)

BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com) assesses mobile ad spending as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 8.98 billion</td>
<td>$ 4.27 billion</td>
<td>$13.25 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$12.16 billion</td>
<td>$ 6.58 billion</td>
<td>$18.75 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$15.13 billion</td>
<td>$ 9.09 billion</td>
<td>$24.22 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$18.42 billion</td>
<td>$12.08 billion</td>
<td>$30.50 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$21.26 billion</td>
<td>$15.06 billion</td>
<td>$36.32 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$23.77 billion</td>
<td>$17.86 billion</td>
<td>$41.63 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobile ad spending is distributed as follows:

- Search: 51%
- Display (banners, rich media, and other): 38%
- Video: 7%
- SMS/MMS/P2P messaging: 3%
- Other (classified, email, lead gen): 1%

The Mobile Marketing Association (www.mmaglobal.com) assessed total U.S. marketing expenditures on mobile – including media buys, CRM, internal support, and measurement services – at $13.1 billion in 2014.
“Mobile is more personal than television or desktop. Consumers take this screen with them and use it to organize all aspects of life – finances, schedules, entertainment, and communications. There is no better way to reach a consumer than via mobile.”

Geomarketing, 7/9/15

The eMarketer, BIA/Kelsey, and Mobile Marketing Association assessments include B2B as well as B2C marketing spending.

2015 Marketing Trends Survey, by StrongView (www.strongview.com), found that 60.7% of marketers increased email budgets in 2015; 4.3% decreased spending.

17.2 Market Leaders

eMarketer assesses mobile ad revenue share in 2015 as follows:

- Google: 35.2%
- Facebook: 16.7%
- Twitter: 3.7%
- Yahoo!: 3.7%
- Pandora: 2.6%
- YP: 2.2%
- Apple (iAd): 2.8%
- Yelp: 0.9%
- Amazon: 0.6%
- Millennial Media: 0.3%
- LinkedIn: 0.4%
- All others: 31.0%

17.3 Mobile Marketing Agencies

According to Advertising Age (May 2015), the following are the ad agencies with the highest mobile marketing revenue (parent companies or networks also given):

- PwC Digital Services: $94.0 million
- R/GA (Interpublic): $65.1 million
- Wunderman (WPP): $65.0 million
- Huge (Interpublic): $65.0 million
• SapientNitro (Sapient Corp.): $61.9 million
• Razorfish (Publicis): $53.0 million
• AKQA (WPP): $52.5 million
• Epsilon (Alliance Data Systems): $50.1 million
• Possible (WPP): $41.7 million
• Mobile@Ogilvy (WPP): $40.0 million

17.4 Mobile Marketing Survey

A survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 (www.ascend2.com) explored strategies for mobile marketing. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

**Most Important Objectives In Mobile Marketing Strategy**
- Improve customer engagement: 55%
- Increase lead generation: 40%
- Increase brand awareness: 39%
- Increase website traffic: 36%
- Increase sales transactions: 33%
- Improve customer service: 26%
- Increase email opt-in list: 15%

**Types Of Mobile Marketing Used**
- Mobile-optimized website: 54%
- Mobile apps: 35%
- Mobile social media: 33%
- Mobile-optimized email: 32%
- Mobile advertising: 26%
- SMS messaging: 22%
- Mobile search: 21%
- Geo-targeting: 19%
- QR codes: 12%

**Most Challenging Obstacles To Mobile Marketing Success**
- Lack of in-house expertise: 38%
- Budget limitations: 36%
- Lack of an effective strategy: 32%
- Adopting mobile practices: 21%
- Measurement/accountability: 20%
- Cross-channel integration: 26%
- Lack of mobile website: 21%
- Privacy concerns: 16%
17.5 Mobile Ad Types

There are three general types of mobile banner ads, as follows:

Expandable Banner
• The expandable banner expands beyond the confines of the traditional banner. Multiple flash panels can be launched by a click, roll-over, or auto-initiation.

Polite Banner
• The polite banner is a flash-enabled banner that uses “polite” sequential downloading and proprietary compression technology to allow extra large file sizes to fit within standard publisher specs.

Standard Banner
• The standard banner does not support interactions or banner expansion.

Mobile Performance Benchmarks, by DG MediaMind (www.mediamind.com), assessed the relative performance of mobile ad formats, analyzing more than one billion impressions across more than one thousand mobile campaigns. The study reported click-through rates (CTRs) as follows:

- Expandable banners: 0.63%
- Polite banners: 0.28%
- Standard banners: 0.09%

Within expandable banners, the verticals that generated the highest user expansions were entertainment (9.0%), electronics (8.9%), and automotive (5.5%).

17.6 Mobile Shopping Apps

With usage of mobile devices like smartphones and tablets steadily increasing among consumers, more retailers are integrating mobile technologies with the store experience to accommodate the wired and always-connected lifestyle. Mobile apps send alerts to smartphones announcing special deals, wish lists can be synched from a customer’s device to a store’s handheld unit or computer, and checkout is made speedier when a customer pays instantly via mobile cashier.

These in-store mobile efforts are helping retailers to combat showrooming, which is when a customer visits a store to see and touch a product but browses online – sometimes while still in the store – for a better deal.

The following are examples of mobile shopping apps used by retailers:

Geolocation
• Customers accepting a retailer’s invitation to receive mobile alerts receive texts or other messaging announcing a special sale or deal once they are within a certain area designated by the store. For example, if a customer comes within 5 miles of a particular store during a rainstorm, he or she may get an alert about umbrellas or rain boots.
• Foursquare and other mobile services track shoppers’ location and offer coupons or promotional deals at nearby stores.

**Mobile-specific Deals**
• L.L. Bean and Target have made available mobile-only deals or experiences, including access for customers to scan an in-store QR code to make a purchase or have an item delivered.
• Some mall-based retailers post ads at their storefront that shoppers can scan for coupons.
• Shopkick gives mobile shoppers points toward gift cards. Participating stores include Best Buy, Macy’s, and Target.
• Chains have launched apps offering customers gift cards in exchange for permission to share data about their purchases.

**Store Navigation**
• Several big-box retailers like Walmart and Home Depot have navigation apps that help customers find departments and items inside their stores. Store layouts, aisle numbers locating specific items, and mapped shopping lists are a few of the features of some of the apps. In-store location services like Meridian and Indoor Atlas track shoppers’ paths and promote coupons for nearby items.

**Tablet-assisted Shopping**
• PacSun and Guess have installed iPads in some stores and allow customers to browse through “look books,” check in-store inventory, and even to make purchases. A recently opened Aéropostale store installed iPads in fitting rooms so customers could choose their own music while trying on clothes. The store also has kiosks throughout offering style guides. In select Target stores, iPads are on hand to help employees in the beauty department assist customers with brands and advice.

**Wi-Fi**
• Retailers have added Wi-Fi in their stores to provide mobile access to customers who may have a smart device but not a mobile connection. This connectivity allows customers to log on and engage with a store’s mobile platform as well as gives access to merchandise and product information.

**17.7 Market Resources**
18

SEARCH

18.1 Organic Vs. Paid Search
There are two categories of search: organic search (i.e., listings on search engine results pages that appear because of their relevance to the search terms) and paid search (i.e., listings that are paid based on number of clicks on search engines). Paid search is also referred to as pay-per-click advertising.

Comparing organic search with paid search, a June 2015 study by Experian Marketing Services (www.experian.com/marketing-services/marketing-services.html) reported search traffic distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organic</th>
<th>Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia entertainment</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping and classified</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experian reported that search engines deliver 41% of all website traffic for the 1,000 largest retailers.

Marketers use separate strategies for the two types of search. Search engine optimization (SEO) is deployed to gain placement of listings near the top of search engine results pages. Search engine marketing (SEM) is the method of gaining traffic by purchasing ads on search engines.

18.2 Search Agencies
According to Advertising Age (May 2015), the following are the ad agencies with the highest annual search revenue (parent companies or networks also given):

- iCrossing (Hearst Corp.): $112.2 million
- iProspect (Dentsu): $96.7 million
- GroupM (WPP): $85.2 million
- Merkle: $84.1 million
- 360i (Dentsu): $75.3 million
- Resolution Media (Omnicom): $60.9 million
- Acronym: $50.2 million
- Performics (Publicis): $48.7 million
- Starcom MediaVest Group (Publicis): $40.3 million
- Razorfish (Publicis): $35.3 million
18.3 SEO Marketing Strategy

A June 2015 survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 (www.ascend2.com) explored strategies for search engine optimization. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

**Most Important Objectives Of A Search Engine Optimization Strategy**
- Improve search engine rankings: 66%
- Increase website traffic: 58%
- Increase lead generation: 55%
- Increase online sales: 24%
- Improve brand awareness: 24%
- Increase the ROI of SEO: 22%
- Increase CTA conversions: 17%

**Most Effective SEO Tactics**
- Relevant content creation: 72%
- Keyword/phrase research: 48%
- Frequent website updating: 34%
- Relevant link building: 33%
- Social media integration: 28%
- Frequent blogging: 23%
- Mobile search optimization: 17%
- Website URL restructuring: 16%

**Most Difficult SEO Tactics To Implement**
- Relevant link building: 52%
- Relevant content creation: 46%
- Frequent blogging: 28%
- Frequent website updating: 28%
- Mobile search optimization: 25%
- Social media integration: 22%
- Website URL restructuring: 20%
- Keyword/phrase research: 20%

**Most Useful Metrics For Measuring SEO Performance**
- Website visitor traffic: 54%
- Leads generated: 50%
- Visitor conversion rate: 47%
- Keyword search rankings: 44%
- Visitor duration/engagement: 26%
- Return on SEO investment: 22%
- Sales revenue: 19%
- Brand awareness: 7%
Most Challenging Obstacles To Search Engine Optimization Success

- Changing search algorithms: 40%
- Budget constraints: 38%
- Managing keyword/phrases: 34%
- Limited internal skills: 34%
- Lack of quality control: 33%
- Lack of an effective strategy: 31%
- Measuring the ROI of SEO: 29%
- Use of mobile devices: 13%

18.4 Paid Search

The basic paid search strategy is to bid on a cost-per-click basis – using Google’s AdWords or similar search engine program – to secure a top paid listing from a term or phrase consumers logically would use to find a product or service.

Paid search listings are attractive to marketers because charges are only incurred when users click on ads. As a result, effectiveness and return on investment are easily assessed.

eMarketer (www.emarketer.com) assesses search ad spending, by platform, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desktop</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$14.3 billion</td>
<td>$8.7 billion</td>
<td>$23.0 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$12.8 billion</td>
<td>$12.8 billion</td>
<td>$25.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$10.6 billion</td>
<td>$17.9 billion</td>
<td>$28.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 9.1 billion</td>
<td>$21.3 billion</td>
<td>$30.4 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

“eMarketer expects mobile to overtake U.S. search ad dollars this year. At the same time, there will be 154.4 million mobile search users.”

eMarketer, 6/1/15

In a survey by Kenshoo (www.kenshoo.com), 69% of search marketing professionals rated the performance of Google’s Product Listing Ads (PLAs) at least slightly better than paid search. Sixty-two percent (62%) of marketers said they had shifted part of their budget from existing paid search to PLAs.
18.5 Local Search

BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com) assesses the distribution of local searches performed on desktops/laptops and on mobile devices (i.e. smartphones and tablets) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Desktop</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>54.9 billion</td>
<td>19.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61.6 billion</td>
<td>30.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>69.2 billion</td>
<td>46.0 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>65.6 billion</td>
<td>66.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>64.6 billion</td>
<td>81.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>63.8 billion</td>
<td>94.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>63.2 billion</td>
<td>113.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>62.7 billion</td>
<td>127.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>62.3 billion</td>
<td>141.9 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Last year, mobile passed desktop for local search. Rapid growth is set to continue for the former.”

eMarketer, 6/1/15

18.6 Market Resources

eMarketer, 11 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. (800) 405-0844. (www.emarketer.com)

Search Engine Marketing Professional Organization (SEMPO), 401 Edgewater Place, Suite 600, Wakefield, MA 01880. (781) 876-8866. (www.sempo.org)

Search Insider, MediaPost Communications, 1140 Broadway, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10001. (212) 204-2000. (www.mediapost.com/publications/search-insider/)
**19.1 Overview**

According to Pew Research Center’s Internet & American Life Project (www.pewinternet.org), 79% of online adults used social networking sites in 2014, up from 73% in 2013 and 67% in 2012. The percentages by age are as follows:

- 18-to-29: 89%
- 30-to-49: 80%
- 50-to-64: 62%
- 65 and older: 47%

Although online seniors are less likely than other age groups to use social networking sites, adoption rates for those 65 and older have tripled in the last five years, from 13% in 2009 to 47%.

Fifty-one percent (51%) of online adults use multiple social networking sites, according to Pew. The distribution of number of sites used is as follows:

- None: 21%
- One: 28%
- Two: 24%
- Three: 16%
- Four: 8%
- Five or more: 4%

**19.2 Social Media Ad Spending**

BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com) assesses total U.S. social media advertising spending as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 5.4 billion</td>
<td>$2.8 billion</td>
<td>$ 8.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 7.9 billion</td>
<td>$3.3 billion</td>
<td>$11.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$11.1 billion</td>
<td>$3.6 billion</td>
<td>$14.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$14.1 billion</td>
<td>$4.1 billion</td>
<td>$18.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$16.7 billion</td>
<td>$4.6 billion</td>
<td>$21.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$18.4 billion</td>
<td>$5.2 billion</td>
<td>$23.6 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19.3 Social Media Marketing Strategy

A survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 (www.ascend2.com) explored social media strategy. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

Most Important Objectives In Social Media Strategy

- Increased engagement: 50%
- Increase brand awareness: 48%
- Increase lead generation: 46%
- Increase website traffic: 36%
- Increase sales revenue: 35%
- Increase content reach: 28%
- Increase search rankings: 18%
- Increase lead nurturing: 17%

Metrics Tracked To Gauge Social Media Marketing Performance

- Website traffic: 64%
- Lead generation: 51%
- Engagement rate: 51%
- Content reach: 41%
- Conversion rate: 41%
- Search engine rankings: 29%
- Sales revenue: 28%
- Brand awareness: 22%

Extent Of Analytics Used To Gauge Social Media Marketing Performance

- Extensive use of analytics: 19%
- Moderate use of analytics: 41%
- Limited use of analytics: 35%
- Do not use analytics: 5%

Most Challenging Obstacles To Social Media Strategy

- Lack of in-house resources/skills: 43%
- Inability to measure ROI: 42%
- Lack of an effective strategy: 39%
- Lack of compelling content: 34%
- Lack of integration across marketing: 31%
- Inadequate budget: 28%
- Lack of consensus on importance: 23%
- Inability to become mobile-aware: 6%
19.4 Social Media Marketing Tactics

In a survey by Forrester Research (www.forrester.com), U.S. advertisers who spend at least $100,000 on social media marketing annually reported marketing tactics on social media channels as follows (percentage of respondents):

- We create branded social network pages and post messages on those pages: 73%
- We buy social network ads: 56%
- We create branded accounts (microblogs) and post messages to these accounts: 52%
- We pay to promote content (social networks): 51%
- We create branded tabs on social networks: 40%
- We create branded apps: 38%
- We pay to promote content (microblogs): 37%

19.5 Social Media Posts

A January 2015 report by Fannit Marketing Services (www.fannit.com) recommended the following as optimal times for social media posts:

**Blogs**
- Best times to post are Monday, Friday and Saturday at 11:00 a.m
- Worst times to post are 11:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.

**Facebook**
- Best times to post are weekdays, 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- Worst times to post are all weekends, 10:00 pm to 4:00 am

**LinkedIn**
- Best times to post are 7:00 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- Worst times are Monday and Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**Pinterest**
- Best times to post are on Saturday from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.
- Worst times to post are 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 pm, and 1:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m.

**Twitter**
- Best times to post are weekends from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- Worst times to post are 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.
- Engagement goes up 30% on weekends compared to weekdays
“One should post social media updates when the audience has the highest chance of seeing them, not whenever you think of it or happen to have a free minute. If you aren’t posting to a social media site when most of your audience members are on it, all the time spent crafting the update goes to waste.”

Center for Media Research
Research Brief, 1/14/15

19.6 Social Media Metrics

The CMO Survey (www.cmosurvey.org) by Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business (www.fuqua.duke.edu) reported social media metrics used by marketers as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Hits/visits/page views: 60.7%
- Number of followers or friends: 45.0%
- Repeat visits: 38.7%
- Conversion rates (from visitor to buyer): 31.3%
- Buzz indicators (web mentions): 24.2%
- Sales levels: 16.8%
- Online product/service ratings: 14.0%
- Customer acquisition costs: 13.7%
- New promoter score: 12.8%
- Revenues per customer: 12.5%
- Other text analysis ratings: 11.7%
- Customer retention costs: 6.3%
- Abandoned shopping carts: 6.0%
- Profits per customer: 6.0%

19.7 Market Resources

The Social Graf, MediaPost Communications, 1140 Broadway, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10001. (212) 204-2000. (www.mediapost.com/publications/the-social-graf/)
20.1 Market Assessment

According to eMarketer (www.emarketer.com), U.S. digital video ad spending has been, and is projected, as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- 2013: $3.82 billion (32.2%)
- 2014: $5.81 billion (52.0%)
- 2015: $7.77 billion (33.8%)
- 2016: $9.59 billion (23.4%)
- 2017: $11.25 billion (27.3%)
- 2018: $12.82 billion (13.9%)
- 2019: $14.38 billion (12.1%)

“Advertising accounts for the lion’s share of digital video revenues and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. Even though growth rates are slowing for this maturing category, they will remain at double-digit levels.”

eMarketer, 4/2/15

20.2 Video Ad CPM

Credit Suisse (www.creditsuisse.com) assesses the U.S. video ad cost per thousand views (CPM) for indirect placements, midtier sites, and premium destinations as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Midtier</th>
<th>Premium</th>
<th>Avg. CPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010:</td>
<td>$16.10</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$26.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011:</td>
<td>$16.90</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$40.50</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012:</td>
<td>$17.80</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$36.50</td>
<td>$25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013:</td>
<td>$18.60</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$32.80</td>
<td>$24.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20.3 Video Ad Engagement

Consumers are 27 times more likely to click through online video ads than standard banners, according to Media Mind (www.mediamind.com).

According to a report from Unruly (www.unrulymedia.com), online video viewers are almost three times more likely to click through to a brand’s website from their smartphone or tablet than from their laptop or desktop computer. The average click through rate (CTR) for mobile campaigns is 13.6%, compared with 5.4% for desktop.

The Nielsen Company (www.nielsen.com) reports that native online video ads can generate an 82% brand lift.

According to Google (www.google.com), 79% of in-stream online video ads are watched to their midpoints; 72% are watched to their completion.

Social and mobile gaming video ads have a 91% completion rate, according to MediaBrix (www.mediabrix.com).

20.4 Video Ads And Online Retail Spending

A January 2015 study by Liveclicker (www.liveclicker.com) reported average order value (AOV) among online retailers based on the percent of product pages with video as follows:

- 50% to 75% of pages with video: $297.50
- 25% to 50% of pages with video: $170.83
- Less than 25% of pages with video: $177.32

The AOV based on the number of videos viewed by a customer was as follows:

- 1: $159.19
- 2: $172.20
- 3: $195.77
- 4: $199.76
- 5 to 9: $258.37
- 10 or more: $348.52
“According to research from Liveclicker, the AOV for customers that watch video on a product page is at least 50% higher than a site’s overall AOV. Further, retailers with video on most of their product pages have a 68% higher AOV than retailers that have video on just a few of their product pages. Also, if a customer watches more videos, their AOV is higher. Analysis determined that customers that watched 10 or more videos spent an average of 119% more. Retailers with video on a majority of product pages realize a 79% higher conversion rate than those that had only a few product page videos, and a 31% higher conversion rate than those with some product page videos.”

Center For Media Research
Research Brief, 1/19/15

20.5 Product Videos
In a February 2015 poll by Animoto (www.animoto.com), 62.5% of digital video viewers said that companies using video marketing understood how to reach their customers, and 56% believed video was mandatory for company websites.

When asked about their attitudes toward product videos, consumer responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):
- Product demonstration videos are helpful: 83%
- Product overview videos are helpful before a purchase: 77%
- Videos showing how the product is made are helpful: 59%
- Customer testimonials are helpful: 56%
- Videos about the company are helpful: 49%
“Consumers don’t want to spend time reading about a product; they want videos. And brands that cater to such demands stand to see higher sales and gain loyal customers.”

eMarketer, 5/28/15

20.6 Video Ad Viewing By Platform
A February 2015 study by Videology (www.videologygroup.com) reported the distribution of digital video ad campaigns by platform as follows:
• PC only: 46%
• PC, mobile and connected TV: 39%
• PC and mobile: 11%
• Mobile only: 2%
• PC and connected TV: 1%
• Connected TV only: 1%

“Video advertisers are expanding efforts to reach consumers across devices.”

eMarketer, 2/27/15

20.7 Mobile Video Ads
eMarketer estimates mobile video ad spending in 2015 at $2.6 billion, a 70% increase over the prior year and more than one-third of the $7.8 billion that will be spent on digital video advertising.
“Mobile video ad spending is booming as consumers spend more time on their mobile devices. Mobile video is attractive for a marketer because of the interactivity of mobile touchscreen and a perception that smartphones offer a more personal video experience than videos watched on a desktop.”

*The Wall Street Journal, 6/4/15*

According to *State Of Mobile Advertising* by Opera Mediaworks (www.operamediaworks.com), the traffic and revenue shares of mobile video ads in 2014 by operating system were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Share</th>
<th>Revenue Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Android:</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iOS:</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbian:</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlackBerry:</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows:</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey by IPG Media Lab (www.ipglab.com) found 64% of highly attentive smartphone users who watched video ads intend to purchase the product advertised. This compares to 56% and 52%, respectively, of highly attentive viewers on tablets and PCs.

“Digital video advertisers that want to grab viewers’ attention, take note: The device on which a consumer views video ads matters far more than mood or location – or even the content genre. According to research by IPG Media Lab, smartphones have the biggest influence on attention, followed by tablets and then PCs.”

*eMarketer*
20.8 Viral Video Ads

In digital media, viral is the Internet equivalent of old-fashioned word-of-mouth. Sharing content is ubiquitous on the Web among users who find online videos they find novel or entertaining enough to pass on to others – spreading the message across the Internet like a virus.

Ranked by number of shares, the following were the top viral video ads in 2014 (source: Viral Video Chart by Unruly Media [http://viralvideochart.unrulymedia.com]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company/Brand</th>
<th>Video Title</th>
<th>Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activia</td>
<td>Shakira - La La La ft. Carlinhos Brown</td>
<td>5,819,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7-7knsP2n5w">www.youtube.com/watch?v=7-7knsP2n5w</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Fox</td>
<td>Devil's Due Devil Baby Attack:</td>
<td>2,153,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PUKMUZ4tJq">www.youtube.com/watch?v=PUKMUZ4tJq</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>The Last Game</td>
<td>2,151,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4zcc_N20Ryg">www.youtube.com/watch?v=4zcc_N20Ryg</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budweiser</td>
<td>Puppy Love</td>
<td>1,976,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uQB7QRyF4p4">www.youtube.com/watch?v=uQB7QRyF4p4</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Greetings</td>
<td>World's Toughest Job:</td>
<td>1,894,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HB3xM93rXbY">www.youtube.com/watch?v=HB3xM93rXbY</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>First Kiss</td>
<td>1,548,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpbDHxCV29A">www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpbDHxCV29A</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Like a Girl</td>
<td>1,482,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XjJQbJWyDTs">www.youtube.com/watch?v=XjJQbJWyDTs</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Winner Stays</td>
<td>1,431,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3XviR7esUvo">www.youtube.com/watch?v=3XviR7esUvo</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Life Insurance</td>
<td>Unsung Hero:</td>
<td>1,289,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uaWA2GbcnJU">www.youtube.com/watch?v=uaWA2GbcnJU</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTAC</td>
<td>The Power of Love:</td>
<td>1,101,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PmCDxY2JAE">www.youtube.com/watch?v=PmCDxY2JAE</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrol</td>
<td>Footkhana: Neymar Jr. v Ken Block:</td>
<td>1,049,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KCQnzPyifk0">www.youtube.com/watch?v=KCQnzPyifk0</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Most Shocking Second a Day Video:</td>
<td>973,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RBQ-IoHfimQ">www.youtube.com/watch?v=RBQ-IoHfimQ</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>Frozen: Let It Go Singalong:</td>
<td>896,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=moSFlvxnbgk">www.youtube.com/watch?v=moSFlvxnbgk</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCKH8</td>
<td>Potty-Mouthed Princesses Drop F-Bombs for Feminism:</td>
<td>813,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XqHYzYn3WZw">www.youtube.com/watch?v=XqHYzYn3WZw</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>Eyes on the Road:</td>
<td>805,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R22WNkYKeo8">www.youtube.com/watch?v=R22WNkYKeo8</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoorDown</td>
<td>Dear Future Mom:</td>
<td>804,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ju-q4OnBtNU">www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ju-q4OnBtNU</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>Monty the Penguin:</td>
<td>770,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iccscUFY860">www.youtube.com/watch?v=iccscUFY860</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC</td>
<td>God Only Knows</td>
<td>725,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XqLTSe8h0jo">www.youtube.com/watch?v=XqLTSe8h0jo</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procter &amp; Gamble</td>
<td>Pick Them Back Up:</td>
<td>688,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zsZ5yOlHQQ">www.youtube.com/watch?v=zsZ5yOlHQQ</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLM</td>
<td>Lost And Found Service:</td>
<td>670,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NK-T_t166TY">www.youtube.com/watch?v=NK-T_t166TY</a>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20.9 Market Resources
Web Video Marketing Council, 17 Colonial Road, Dover, MA 02030. (508) 686-2802.
(www.webvideomarketing.org)
WEBSITE STRATEGY

21.1 Overview
Websites are an essential element of most businesses. The primary function of a business website is to inform consumers about the company and its products or services. Nearly three-quarters (74%) of consumers indicate that they use company sites to get information about products or services, according to a survey by Oracle (www.oracle.com), and 44% believe the information available on most company’s websites meets their needs.

A recent study from the Corporate Executive Board (www.executiveboard.com) concluded that the best thing a company can do in terms of its digital strategy is to optimize its website.

“Websites are one area of importance when it comes to branding, providing companies with an opportunity to inform visitors what their brand is all about, on their own turf. As such, it’s important for sites to be in tip-top shape.”

eMarketer, 6/11/15

21.2 Domain Names
There is a benefit to a brand with an eponymous domain name or a generic but clever domain name that describes its products or service. Well-chosen domain names can make it easier for consumers to link to the brand on the Internet.

Prime domain names hold great value, and a brokerage industry has developed specializing in their sale. As of August 2015, 122 domain names were reportedly sold for $1 million or more; 415 had sold for $200,000 or more. The record is Insurance.com, which sold for $35.6 million in 2010.
21.3 Professional-Looking Sites

In a May 2015 survey of small- and medium- size business owners and managers by 99designs (www.99designs.com), 76% said that a professional-looking website attracted more/better customers. By sector, those of this opinion are as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Entertainment: 88%
- Retail: 87%
- Advertising & marketing: 87%
- Healthcare: 81%
- Food & beverage: 79%
- Education: 78%
- Airlines: 75%
- Automotive: 69%
- Insurance: 67%
- Real estate: 55%
- Finance: 50%

21.4 Website Marketing Optimization

A survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 (www.ascend2.com) explored strategies for website marketing optimization. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

Most Important Objectives In Website Marketing

- Increase lead generation: 60%
- Increase traffic: 50%
- Increase visitor engagement: 42%
- Increase sales transactions: 35%
- Increase brand awareness: 32%
- Improve mobile optimization: 18%
- Improve website personalization: 11%
- Improve customer service: 9%

Most Important Pages Or Processes Optimized

- Website homepage: 57%
- Product or solutions pages: 44%
- Lead registration forms: 27%
- Content download landing pages: 25%
- Company pages (i.e., about, support, etc.): 24%
- Paid search listing landing pages: 17%
- Cart and payment process: 14%
- Promotional or trial offer pages: 10%
When Optimized, Visible Page Elements With Most Impact On Website Performance

- Calls to action: 62%
- Headlines: 50%
- Page layout: 41%
- Images: 39%
- Body copy: 26%
- Bullet copy: 14%
- Sub-headlines: 11%
- Form fields: 8%

Extent Of Testing For Optimization Purposes

- Extensively: 6%
- Moderately: 41%
- Not Used: 53%

Use Of Personalization

- Extensively: 5%
- Moderately: 18%
- Not Used: 77%

How Personalization Is Performed (among companies using personalization)

- Multiple versions of web pages are manually created for various customer segments and presented based on visitor selection: 53%
- Marketing technology automatically generates and presents personalized pages based on IP, behavioral, and other data: 36%

Most Challenging Obstacles To Achieving Website Objectives

- Limited website budget: 45%
- Lack of quality content: 31%
- Lack of testing and analytics: 29%
- Lack of an effective strategy: 28%
- Limited marketing integration: 27%
- Lack of in-house expertise: 26%
- Lack of visitor personalization: 20%
- Convoluted conversion paths: 19%

21.5 Landing Page Optimization

An April 2015 survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 explored strategies for landing page optimization (LPO). The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):
Most Important Objectives In Landing Page Optimization Strategy

- Increase conversion rates: 93%
- Improve lead quality: 58%
- Improve segmentation/targeting: 30%
- Increase brand awareness: 25%
- Increase page views: 17%
- Improve analytics and reporting: 13%
- Improve mobile optimization: 9%
- Improve testing methods: 7%

Most Effective Methods For Optimizing Conversion Rates

- A/B testing: 52%
- Segmentation/targeting: 44%
- Copy optimization: 43%
- Responsive design: 35%
- Event-triggered email: 27%
- Usability testing: 20%
- Customer survey/feedback: 16%
- Multivariate testing: 16%

Most Difficult Conversion Optimization Methods To Execute

- Multivariate testing: 41%
- Segmentation/targeting: 34%
- Usability testing: 31%
- Copy optimization: 29%
- Customer survey/feedback: 20%
- Responsive design: 19%
- A/B testing: 18%
- Event-triggered email: 16%

Most Useful Metrics For Measuring Landing Page Performance

- Conversion rate: 75%
- Cost per conversion: 40%
- Revenue per conversion: 33%
- Bounce rate: 31%
- Landing page views: 27%
- Traffic by source: 23%
- Time on page: 22%
- Device (i.e., desktop vs. mobile): 7%

Most Challenging Obstacles To Landing Page Optimization Success

- Limited internal resources: 45%
- Lack of conversion-worthy content: 41%
- Lack of an effective LPO strategy: 40%
• Inadequate analytics and reporting: 26%
• Lack of testing skills: 23%
• LPO budget constraints: 22%
• Complexity of LPO practices: 17%
• Adopting mobile optimization: 15%
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ANALYTICS

22.1 Overview
Marketing organizations use analytics to determine the outcomes of campaigns or efforts and to guide decisions for investment and consumer targeting.

Analytics software can include the following functions:
- Analyze ad performance
- Automated reports and marketing dashboards
- Capture and incorporate customer feedback
- Data warehousing, reporting, and analysis
- Marketing mix analysis
- Mine data to develop predictive models
- Prospect segmentation and targeting
- Real-time reporting of users’ interests and behaviors
- Strategic and financial performance management

Web analytics software can include the following functions:
- Combine data sets from online advertising, rich media, and search campaigns
- Data on website traffic
- Integration to drive dynamic Web content
- Mobile analytics
- Optimize customer acquisition, conversion, and retention
- Reporting on real-time hits, page views, sessions, path analysis, and visitors
- Search engine bid management
- Social media measurement

22.2 Analytics Software
The following are vendors of marketing analytics software:

CallSource
- Product: Results
- Website: www.callsource.com

IBM Corporation
- Product: IBM Real-Time Analytics Matching Platform (RAMP)
- Website: www.ibm.com/us/en
IBM SPSS
• Products: IBM SPSS Data Collection, IBM SPSS Modeler, IBM SPSS Statistics
• Website: http://www-01.ibm.com/software/analytics/spss

Infegy
• Product: Social Radar
• Website: www.infegy.com

Infor
• Product: Infor 10x Analytics
• Website: www.infor.com

MicroStrategy
• Products: MicroStrategy Intelligence, MicroStrategy Mobile
• Website: www.microstrategy.com

MLS Data Management Solutions
• Product: MLS Data Management Solutions
• Website: www.mlsc.com

Oracle
• Products: Oracle Business Development Foundation, Oracle Business Intelligence Applications, Oracle Scoreboard and Strategy Management
• Website: www.oracle.com

Sailthru
• Product: SmartData
• Website: www.sailthru.com

SAP
• Products: BusinessObjects Intelligent Search, BusinessObjects Text Analysis, BusinessObjects VizServer
• Website: http://www54.sap.com/solutions/analytics/business-intelligence.html

SAS
• Products: SAS Analytics, SAS Business Analytics, SAS Customer Intelligence
• Website: www.sas.com

Teradata
• Products: Data Warehouse database systems, Master Data Management
• Website: www.teradata.com
22.3 Web Analytics Software

The following are vendors of web analytics software:

Adobe Systems
• Products: Adobe Analytics, Adobe Discover, Adobe Genesis Insight, DigitalPulse, Search&Promote, SiteCatalyst, TagManager, Test&Target
• Website: www.adobe.com

Bridgeline Digital
• Product: iAPPS Analyzer
• Website: www.bridgelinedigital.com

Clicky Web Analytics
• Products: Clicky Web Analytics, Twitter Analytics
• Website: www.clicky.com

Google
• Product: Google Analytics
• Website: www.google.com/analytics

IBM Enterprise Marketing Management
• Products: IBM Digital Analytics, IBM Digital Analytics Accelerator, IBM Digital Analytics for Social Media, IBM Digital Analytics Impression Attribution, IBM Digital Analytics Lifecycle, IBM Digital Analytics Multichannel, IBM Digital Analytics Multisite
• Website: http://www-142.ibm.com/software/products/us/en/category/SWX00

Lyris Inc.
• Products: Lyris HQ, Lyris HQ Mobile
• Website: www.lyris.com

Metronome Labs
• Products: Examine, Explain, Focus, Loader, Metronome Capture
• Website: www.metronomelabs.com
Pardot, a Salesforce company
• Product: Pardot Marketing Automation
• Website: www.pardot.com

Parker Software
• Product: WhosOn
• Website: www.parker-software.com

Sailthru
• Product: SmartData
• Website: www.sailthru.com

SAP
• Product: SAP Business Intelligence
• Website: www.sap.com

SAS
• Products: SAS Web Analytics
• Website: www.sas.com

VisiStat Inc.
• Products: AdCaM, Identities, LeadCaster Pulse, Social Media Analytics, VisiStat Web Analytics
• Website: www.visistat.com

Webtrends
• Product: Webtrends Stream
• Website: www.webtrends.com

Yahoo! Web Analytics
• Products: Yahoo! Web Analytics
• Website: http://web.analytics.yahoo.com
BIG DATA

23.1 Overview

Big Data refers to the application of advanced computing tools with vast troves of data. Big Data incorporates customer data, competitive data, online data, offline data, and other data sets for business intelligence.

In a survey by Connoteate (www.connoteate.com), half of business executives agreed on the following definition of Big Data: An aggregate of all external and internal web-based data. Others define it as the mass amounts of internal information stored and managed by an enterprise, or web-based data and content businesses use for their own operations.

However Big Data is defined, it is clear that the business world is being transformed by Big Data as more and more companies seek actionable insights from the mountains of raw data that they store or have access to.

In a July 2015 survey by Millward Brown Digital (www.millwardbrowndigital.com), 40% of marketing executives cited Big Data as the largest opportunity for marketers in 2015. But, the survey found declines in marketing executives’ comfort with Big Data. Only 14% of marketers said the feel confident with their company’s use of Big Data, compared with 39% who responded similarly in a 2014 survey.

_________________________________________________________________

“Marketers don’t yet feel comfortable navigating all of the data that is at their fingertips.”

The Wall Street Journal, 7/6/15

_________________________________________________________________

In a survey of U.S. Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) and Chief Information Officers (CIOs) by KPMG (www.kpmg.com), 63% said that their company had changed its business strategy because of Big Data; 56% of large companies worldwide had done so.
23.2 Market Assessment

Wikibon (www.wikibon.org) estimates 2015 spending in the U.S. for Big Data hardware, software, and services at $28 billion, a figure which is projected to increase to $50 billion by 2018.

Market leaders are as follows:

- IBM: $1.35 billion
- HP: $664 million
- Teradata: $435 million
- Dell: $425 million
- Oracle: $415 million
- SAP: $368 million
- EMC: $336 million
- Cisco Systems: $214 million
- Microsoft: $196 million
- SAS Institute: $187 million

McKinsey & Company (www.mckinsey.com) has billed Big Data as the next $100 billion market opportunity.

23.3 Key Players

Large computing and IT companies garner over 90% of the U.S. Big Data market. Dozens of small startups specializing in Big Data have entered the market.

The following are companies active in the U.S. Big Data market (sources: Advertising Age [www.adage.com/bigdataguide], Forbes, and Wikibon):

- 1010data* (www.1010data.com)
- Accenture (www.accenture.com)
- Actian* (www.actian.com)
- Actuate (www.actuate.com)
- Aerospike* (www.aerospike.com)
- Alteryx* (www.alteryx.com)
- Amazon Web Services (http://aws.amazon.com/big-data/)
- Attivio (www.attivio.com)
- Basho* (www.basho.com)
- Booz Allen Hamilton (www.boozallen.com)
- Capgemini (www.capgemini.com/big-data-analytics)
- Cloudera* (www.cloudera.com)
- Couchbase* (www.couchbase.com)
- Datalogix (www.databox.com/marketers-guide-to-big-data-partners/)
• Datameer* (www.datameer.com)
• DataStax* (www.datastax.com)
• Dell (http://software.dell.com/solutions/big-data-analytics/)
• Deloitte (www.deloitte.com)
• Digital Reasoning* (www.digitalreasoning.com)
• Direct Data Networks (www.ddn.com)
• Dstillery* (www.dstillery.com)
• EMC (www.emc.com/campaign/bigdata/index.htm)
• Epsilon (www.epsilon.com)
• Evidon* (www.evidon.com/analytics)
• eXelate* (www.exelate.com)
• Experian Marketing Services (www.experian.com/marketingservices)
• Fractal Analytics* (www.fractalanalytics.com)
• Fusion-IO (www.fusionio.com)
• Google (https://developers.google.com/bigquery/)
• Hitachi Data Systems (www.hds.com/solutions/big-data/)
• Hortonworks* (www.hortonworks.com)
• IBM (http://www-01.ibm.com/software/data/bigdata/)
• Informatica (www.informatica.com/us/vision/harnessing-big-data/)
• Intel (www.intel.com/bigdata)
• Jaspersoft (www.jaspersoft.com)
• Jupiter Networks (www.juniper.net/us/en/solutions/enterprise/data-center/)
• Kognito* (www.kognito.com)
• Krux* (www.krux.com)
• Lucidworks* (www.lucidworks.com)
• Mapr* (www.mapr.com)
• Marklogic (www.marklogic.com/what-is-marklogic/big-data-search/)
• Microstrategy (www.microstrategy.com)
• mongoDB (www.mongodb.com)
• Netapp (www.netapp.com)
• Neustar* (www.neustar.biz)
• Opera Solutions* (www.operasolutions.com)
• Oracle (www.oracle.com/bigdata)
• Oracle Eloqua (www.eloqua.com)
• Palantir* (www.palantir.com)
• Pentaho (www.pentaho.com)
• Pervasive Software (www.pervasivesoftware.com)
• PricewaterhouseCoopers (www.pwc.com/us/en/increasing-it-effectiveness/big-data.jhtml)
• Qliktech (www.qliktech.com)
• Rackspace (www.rackspace.com)
23.4 Applications In Consumer Marketing

Among all areas of application for Big Data, surveys indicate that the greatest opportunities are related to consumer marketing.

A survey of business executives by the IBM Institute for Business Value (http://www-935.ibm.com/services/us/gbs/thoughtleadership/) reported primary objectives of current Big Data programs as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Customer-centric outcomes: 49%
- Operational optimization: 18%
- Risk/financial management: 15%
- New business models: 14%

In a February 2015 study by Vanson Bourne (www.vansonbourne.com), improving the customer experience (60%) and the need to get new customers (54%) were the leading factors driving the need for Big Data projects.

A survey by NewVantage Partners (www.newvantage.com), reported business functions that are driving investments in Big Data as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Sales, marketing: 77%
- Risk management, fraud, security, regulatory compliance, monitoring: 68%
- New product development and innovation: 64%
- Research, discovery: 64%
- IT and operational management: 64%
- Customer, CRM, personalization: 62%
- Corporate strategy, planning: 52%
Organizations are most interested in the following types of Big Data applications (source: NewVantage Partners):

- Customer transaction data: 82%
- Financial data: 75%
- Market data: 68%
- Social media data: 65%
- Behavioral data: 65%
- Fraud detection data: 62%
- External data sources (e.g., demographics): 61%
- Text data (e.g., documents, voice data, pictures): 57%

“Companies' increased customer focus, demand for business growth and expansion and the need to keep up with competitors are all fueling Big Data adoption.”

eMarketer, 6/25/15

In a survey by Gartner (www.gartner.com), business and IT executives identified the top three priorities for Big Data applications as follows (percentage of respondents):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced customer experience</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process efficiency</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New products/new business models</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More targeted marketing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost reduction</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey by Forbes Insights (www.forbes.com/forbesinsights) and Rocket Fuel (http://rocketfuel.com) asked brand executives what marketing initiatives have most benefitted from the use of Big Data. Responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Increasing insights into consumer behavior: 52%
- Increasing sales: 47%
- Increasing lead generation: 42%
- Increasing customer satisfaction: 41%
- Increasing ROI: 39%

When asked the leading benefits of Big Data, brand executives responded as follows (percentage of respondents):
• Developing greater insight into the customer experience across all types of media, and then crafting a strategy that turns this understanding into positive results: 63%
• Using customer feedback to pinpoint the types of products that consumers want, and then acting on them: 50%
• Dissecting customer behavior to understand when, where, and under what circumstances consumers engage with brands and make purchases: 44%
• Understanding customer opinion about products and services: 42%
• Fine-tuning marketing initiatives in real time: 31%

In a survey by Spencer Stuart (www.spencerstuart.com) marketing executives said they see impact of Big Data analytics as follows (percentage of respondents):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEO/SEM/email/SMS marketing</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer segmentation</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing strategy</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/retention programs</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media analysis</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand strategy</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media outreach</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-digital advertising</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/service development</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**23.5 Challenges**

*2015 Big Data Survey*, by 2nd Watch (www.2ndwatch.com), reported that IT and business executives find the following primary technical challenges to implementing Big Data (percentage of respondents):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data quality issues</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated infrastructure</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal expertise</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and security challenges</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silos of data and legacy apps</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much data</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrating the mass of data that is already available is a primary challenge in implementing Big Data.
“Big Data has been a driving force in the B2C world for the past eight or so years. But, consider the fact that 90% of data that has been created through smart devices, computers, social media, etc. has been generated in the past two years.”

Center For Media Intelligence
Research Brief, 12/2/14

Marketers must also find outside sources that provide the needed data to supplement in-house customer and sales data.

“Most B2C companies don’t have enough data on their own customers to qualify as Big Data. Unless you are as large as organizations like Walmart or Amazon, whose sites are less like commerce sites and more like customer-centric marketplaces, you just won’t have that kind of scale and activity within your own customer base.”

Center For Media Intelligence
Research Brief, 12/2/14

Overall, corporations see opportunities related to Big Data as outweighing the challenges. When asked in a survey by the CMO Council (www.cmocouncil.org) how their organization viewed Big Data, responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):

• Part opportunity/part obstacle, but we have a long way to go: 61%
• Part opportunity/part obstacle, and we’re almost there: 19%
• Full opportunity - we have the storage, processing capacity, and skilled personnel to use the analytics we need: 15%
• Full obstacle - it strains our data storage capacity and our internal processes and we’re unable to harness data for consistent, confident decision-making: 5%
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24.1 Elements Of Branding

The integral elements of branding are name, logo, and slogan.

Brand Names

• According to Prof. Jennifer J. Argo, Ph.D., an expert on branding at the School of Business at the University of Alberta, “Companies have spent millions of dollars choosing their brands and their brand names and they’ve been picked explicitly to have an influence on consumers.”

“We often hear comments like: ‘Names don’t matter. What matters is the quality of the product and service. But names do matter. Names are the way consumers file ideas in their minds.’”

Laura Ries, President
Ries & Ries

• Researchers have identified several strategies that companies could use to create effective brand names. Some naming strategies produce brand names that explicitly convey information about the product or its attributes (e.g., DieHard auto batteries). Other strategies may result in names that are not obviously connected to the product’s features. An example is the use of sound symbolism, which focuses on the impact of the linguistic structure of brand names on consumer perceptions (e.g., Prozac communicates efficacy through the letter ‘z’).

• Hearing the spoken names of certain brands is known to stimulate cravings and subsequently influence spending habits. Investigating this influence on consumer behavior, Prof. Argo found that audible exposure to repetitive-sounding brand names across several product categories favorably affects how consumers perceive and choose items. The research, published in the Journal of Marketing, showed
that exposure to a brand name that has sound repetition in its phonetic structure and is spoken aloud produces a positive response, favorably affecting consumers’ brand evaluations, reactions to cross-selling, and product choice. Examples include Coca-Cola, Jelly Belly, and Kit Kat.

- Domino’s Pizza recently changed its name to Domino’s. Domino’s dropped the term ‘pizza’ because its stores have a wide variety of other items, including pasta, salad, wings, chicken sandwiches, chocolate cakes, and more. The word ‘pizza’ was deemed unnecessary because most consumers still associate the fast-food chain named Domino’s with pizza.

- Famous corporate name changes include About.com (originally The Mining Co.), America Online - AOL (originally Quantum Computer Services), Best Buy (originally Sound of Music), Cingular (originally Cellular One), Compaq (originally Bridge Gate Computers), Ebay (originally AuctionWeb), Google (originally Backrub), Hertz Rent-A-Car (originally DrivUrSelf), International Business Machines – IBM (originally Computing Tabulating Recording Company), Java (originally Oak Software), L’Oréal (originally Cosmair), MySpace.com (originally FreeDiskSpace.com), Navistar (originally International Harvester), Netscape (originally Mosaic Systems), Nike (originally Blue Ribbon Sports), Nintendo (originally Marafuku), Nissan (originally Datsun), Oracle (originally Software Development Labs), Paypal (originally Confinity), Playboy (originally Stag Party), Starbucks (originally Il Giornale Coffee Company), Subway (originally Peter’s Super Submarines), Tide (originally Dreft), United Parcel Service - UPS (originally Merchant’s Parcel Delivery), Walkman (originally Sound Around), Yahoo! (originally Jerry’s Guide to the World Wide Web), and Yum! Brands (originally Tricon).

**Logo**

- “If in the business of communications, ‘image is king,’ the essence of this image, the logo, is the jewel in its crown,” according to Paul Rand, a graphic designer who designed the IBM, ABC, Cummins Engine, and Westinghouse logos, which have been in use for decades.

- *Advertising Age* estimated that a logo change can cost a large corporation several hundred million dollars. A major part of that cost is removing the old logo everywhere it appears and putting up new material. For a brand like Pepsi, for example, which changed its logo in 2008, this includes logo changes on trucks, vending machines, stadium signage, point-of-sale materials, and more – around the world.

- Companies that introduced logo changes in 2014 and 2015 include Absolute Vodka, Airbnb, Birds Eye, Black + Decker, DeviantArt, Disney Channel, Facebook, Foursquare, Google, Hershey, Intel, Lexmark, Lipton, Netflix, PayPal, Penguin Press, Pizza Hut, Reebok, Visa, and Volvo.
“A company’s logo is its visual shorthand, and good logos send a direct message – they are clear, unique, and memorable. Most importantly, they represent the authentic story of what a company stands for. A strong logo can support a company for decades, but as companies change with increasing speed, the lifespan of a logo has decreased, with a greater need to be nurtured to keep up. Sometimes the need for a logo change is obvious and follows a major business decision like a merger, acquisition, spinoff, reorganization, or a complete industry transformation. Or it might be a matter of modernizing a traditional logo that was designed well before the days of Twitter and Facebook and simply doesn’t translate well across these channels.”

Brendan Murphy, Senior Partner
Lippincott

Slogans
• Slogans are coined to crystallize defining characteristics of a brand. A good slogan is short – thus easy to remember – and clever. Some slogans have become so famous they have entered day-to-day lingo.
• The following are some of the most popular brand slogans:
  - Allstate Insurance Co.: “You’re in good hands with Allstate.”
  - American Express: “Don’t Leave Home Without It.”
  - Apple Computer: “Everything is easier on a Mac.”
  - Apple iPod: “1,000 songs in your pocket.”
  - AT&T Wireless: “Reach out and touch someone.”
  - AT&T Wireless: “How Many Bars Do You Have?”
  - Bacardi: “You know when it’s Bacardi.”
  - BMW: “The ultimate driving machine”
  - Bounty: “The quicker picker-upper”
  - Budweiser: “When you say Budweiser, you’ve said it all.”
  - Burger King: “Have it your way”
- Calvin Klein: “Between Love and Madness Lies Obsession.”
- Charmin: “Please don’t squeeze the Charmin.”
- Coca-Cola: “It’s the real thing.”
- DeBeers: “Diamonds are forever.”
- Disneyland: “The Happiest Place on Earth.”
- Foster’s: “Australian for beer.”
- Gatorade: “Is it in you?”
- Goodyear Tires: “The best tires in the world have Goodyear written all over them.”
- Honda: “The Power of Dreams”
- Jaguar: “Born to Perform”
- Johnnie Walker: “Keep Walking”
- Kellogg’s Rice Krispies: “Snap! Crackle! Pop!”
- KFC: “Finger lickin’ good”
- Lay’s: “Betcha can’t eat just one.”
- Lee Jeans: “Lee. The jeans that built America.”
- M&Ms: “The milk chocolate melts in your mouth, not in your hand.”
- Maxwell House: “Good to the last drop.”
- McDonald’s: “I’m lovin’ it!”
- Meow Mix: “Tastes so good cats ask for it by name.”
- Miller: “It’s Miller time!”
- Morton Salt: “When it rains, it pours!”
- Nescafé: “One thing leads to another.”
- Nike: “Just do it!”
- Nokia: “Connecting people.”
- Pepsi: “The choice of a new generation.”
- Pepsodent: “You’ll wonder where the yellow went when you brush your teeth with Pepsodent.”
- Porsche: “Porsche – There is No Substitute.”
- Reebok: “I am what I am.”
- Sony: “Like no other.”
- State Farm Insurance: “Like a good neighbor, State Farm is there.”
- Subway: “Eat fresh.”
- The New York Times: “All the news that’s fit to print.”
- Timex: “Takes a licking and keeps on ticking”
- U.S. Army: “Be all you can be.”
- United Airlines: “Fly the friendly skies.”
- Verizon: “Can you hear me now?”
- Visa: “It’s Everywhere You Want To Be.”
- Volkswagen: “Volkswagen. Drivers wanted.”
- Wheaties: “Breakfast of champions.”
Aside from the most popular slogans, consumer association of brands with slogans is poor. In a survey published in the Journal of Advertising Research, of 649 slogans of national brands that were tested by Chiranjeev Kohli, Ph.D., a marketing professor at California State University Fullerton, three fourths were recalled by less than 1% of consumers. Even the most memorable slogans don’t perform that great. The most memorable slogan – “Just do it” for Nike – was recalled by 58% of those interviewed, followed by 38% for McDonald’s “I’m lovin’ it,” and 28% for Burger King’s “Have it your way.”

Among the best slogans are those that are two-sided. It says something about a brand and also differentiates the brand from its competition. “Eat Fresh” is an example of a two-sided slogan. It implies that Subway serves only fresh food, and also that other fast-food chains do not. “Have It Your Way” is another two-sided slogan. It says that Burger King will prepare your hamburger the way you like it while its major competitors will not.

“A two-sided slogan is like a two-sided knife, it cuts both ways. It says something positive about your brand and something negative about the competition. It’s difficult to find many examples of two-sided slogans. [Companies] seldom give much thought about what to say about the competition.”

Laura Ries, President
Ries & Ries

24.2 Sensory Branding

Scent marketing is becoming increasingly important as brands search for innovative ways to distinguish themselves. According to a study published in the Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective, ambient scent has the strongest impact when it comes to enhancing consumer behavior in terms of emotion, evaluation, willingness to return to a store and purchase intention. Smells are more quickly and strongly associated with memories than visual or auditory cues, because smell is the only sense directly connected to the brain’s limbic system, which houses emotions and
memories.

Among consumer business sectors, hotels have done a particularly good job at using scent to create sensory environments. Sheraton Hotels & Resorts, for example, uses Welcoming Warmth, a mix of fig, jasmine, and freesia, while Westin Hotel & Resorts disperses White Tea, which attempts to provide the “Zen-retreat” experience. Marriott offers different scents for its airport, suburban, and resort properties. According to Mitzi Gaskins, vice president and global brand director for JW Marriott, scent is just as important as music, lighting and botanical elements in creating the right mood.

Scent branding has also been used in retail stores. Abercrombie & Fitch, one of the first retailers to use the approach, has scented its stores with Fierce, the brand’s signature scent and men’s cologne, since 2008. Samsung’s stores use a proprietary scent developed by International Flavors & Fragrances (IFF) that influences customers to spend an average of 20% to 30% more time mingling among the electronics products. IFF also reproduced the smell of a new pair or sneakers that is dispersed in some Foot Locker stores.

Ford Motor Co.’s Lincoln brand disperses Essence of Lincoln, its signature scent, through ventilation systems in select showrooms. The scent is said to exude luxury and warmth, including scents like green tea to encourage a sense of upscale well-being, and jasmine and tonka to create a relaxing atmosphere.

Florida-based Ocean Bank scents each of its 21 branches with Ocean Blue. The bank is considering scented checkbook covers and pens.

“We’re where music was 15 years ago. You wouldn’t walk into an established retailer today without some sort of music playing, but that wasn’t the case 15 or 20 years ago. You can walk into a beautifully designed space, and it’s rendered meaningless if there’s a bad smell or an absent smell. Industries as varied as retail, hospitality, auto dealers and financial services are now looking to scent as a way to better define their brands.”

Roger Bensinger
Executive Vice President
AirQ by Prolitec
Advertising Age, 12/8/14
Advances in technology are set to enhance the use of scents in the marketplace. Researchers at the University of California in San Diego, for example, have built "smell-o-vision" prototypes, compact TV accessories that can emit thousands of scent options in tandem with on-screen action or commercials. With this technology, perfume scents could be emitted during a Chanel spot and herbal scents released during a McCormick ad.

ScentWorld Events (www.scentworldevents.com) estimate 2014 spending on scent marketing at $300 million; the annual growth rate is $15%.

### 24.3 Color Branding

Multi-colored logos and designs associated with a brand may be artistic, but logos with single colors win memorability, according to Laura Ries, President of Ries & Ries (www.ries.com). The following are some examples of brands that have a strong color identity:

- The Golden Arches of McDonald’s
- The blue boxes of Tiffany & Co.
- The red cans of Coca-Cola
- The pink ribbons of Susan G. Komen for the Cure
- The brown trucks of UPS

________________________________________

“When consumers rent a car at an airline terminal, they usually head for a color instead of a name: yellow for Hertz, red for Avis, and green for National.”

Laura Ries, President
Ries & Ries

________________________________________
BUY AMERICAN INITIATIVES

25.1 Preference For U.S.-Made Products

In a recent Harris Poll (www.harrisinteractive.com), 61% of adults said they are more likely to purchase something when an ad touts it is ‘Made in America,’ 3% said they are less likely to buy it, and 35% said they are uninfluenced either way.

The following are demographics of consumer influence by ‘Made in America’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Much More Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat More</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-to-34:</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-to-44:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-to-54:</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and older:</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Much More Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat More</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East:</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest:</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West:</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall 26% 35% 35% 3%

A poll by *The New York Times* had findings consistent with the Harris Poll.

“Two-thirds of Americans say they check labels when shopping to see if they are buying American goods, according to a *New York Times* poll taken early this year. Given the example of a $50 garment made overseas, 46% said they would be willing to pay from $5 to $20 more for a similar garment made in the United States.”

*The New York Times*
Other surveys have found preference to be even higher. In a survey by Boston Consulting Group (BCG, www.bcg.com), 80% of adults said they preferred U.S.-made goods and that they are willing to pay more for them.

25.2 Buy American Initiatives

Recognizing consumers’ preference for domestic products, many companies incorporate Made In America messaging into their marketing and advertising campaigns.

Mass Market Retailers identified the following suppliers of retail products that are committed to manufacturing in the United States and who promote this in their ads:

- Advanced Beauty Inc. (www.advancedbeauty.com)
- Alliance Rubber Co. (www.rubberband.com)
- American Greetings Corp. (www.americangreetings.com)
- Annin Flagmakers (www.annin.com)
- AP&G Inc. (www.catchmaster.com)
- Arcadia Farms Inc. (www.arcadiafarms.com)
- Beaumont Products (www.beaumontproducts.com)
- Bryson Industries (www.brysonusa.com)
- Bullet Aids (www.bulletacneaid.com)
- Burke Brands LLC (http://alternativeorigincoffee.com)
- California Scents (www.californiascents.com)
- Cameron Smith & Associates Inc. (www.csarecruiters.com)
- Capital Cups Inc. (www.usakidscups.com)
- Carma Laboratories Inc. (www.mycarmex.com)
- Chemence Inc. (www.chemence-us.com)
- Continental Consumer Products (www.salongrafix.com)
- Garcoa Laboratories (www.garcoa.com)
- Gloria Duchin Inc. (www.gloriaduchin.com)
- Huhtamaki Inc. (www.us.huhtamaki.com)
- Kraft Foods Group (www.kraftfoodsgroup.com)
- Lion Brand Yarn (www.lionbrandyarn.com)
- LNK International (www.lnkintl.com)
- McLane Co. (www.mclaneco.com)
- Onyx Brands (www.onyxbrands.com)
- Osram Sylvania Inc. (www.sylvania.com)
- Red Heart Yarns (www.redheart.com)
- Scandinavian Tobacco Group Lane Ltd. (www.stglane.com)
- Seventh Generation Inc. (www.waterbobble.com)
- Shiloh Technologies (www.shilohtech.com)
- Splintek (www.sleepright.com)
- Vitatech Nutritional Sciences Inc. (www.vitatech.com)
- Wahl Clipper Corp. (www.wahlhomeproducts.com)
“The slogan ‘Buy American’ may strike some as a sales pitch, or as a way to push American manufacturing. But it can be more than that. By promoting a made-in-the-USA brand, we believe that impression could generate further brand loyalty.”

Marsha Martin, CEO
Onyx Brands
Mass Market Retailers

Walmart announced plans to spend an additional $50 billion through 2023 on U.S.-made goods over the next decade. Other companies also recently announced initiatives to bring manufacturing back to the U.S. Apple, for example, announced that it would manufacture some of its Mac product line domestically. Apparel retailer Club Monaco has launched lines and products marketed specifically as Made in America.

“Not since the 1970s has ‘Made in America’ been such a hot way to market your product.”

Advertising Age
CAUSE MARKETING

26.1 Overview
Today’s consumers are looking more and more at the societal impacts of companies they do business with. For many, the actions and perceived attitudes of companies are strong influences. As such, companies are increasing their roles among today’s causes and issues.

Cone Inc. (www.coneinc.com) defines cause marketing, also called cause branding, as a business strategy that helps an organization stand for social issues and social impacts while making an emotional and relevant connection to customers. Cause branding is a powerful vehicle that brings a company’s values to life. It is a multi-dimensional strategy, integrating and maximizing philanthropy, community relations, marketing, and human resources to build brand equity, enhance reputation, cultivate trust, and positively influence stakeholder behavior, while improving society.

According to Barkley (www.barkley.com) and PR Week, 75% of companies engage in some form of cause marketing.

26.2 Spending
IEG Sponsorship Report (www.ieg.com) estimates cause-related spending by marketers in 2015 at $1.9 billion.

By category, retail and financial services are the most active sectors sponsoring causes, in part because of the transactional nature of their business.

“Retail in general, particularly department stores, have always been active in supporting community causes. It’s the nature of the retail segment to be involved.”

Jim Andrews, Senior V.P.
IEG
Marketing Daily
Among individual companies, Bank of America leads in cause marketing (18% of causes reported BoA as a sponsor), followed by Coca-Cola (14%), and Wells Fargo (13%).

26.3 Effectiveness

According to Performance Research (www.performanceresearch.com), 41% of U.S. consumers believe companies can best improve brand perceptions by increasing their cause sponsorships – ahead of sports and arts/cultural categories. Wendy Liebmann, chief executive at WSL Strategic Retail (www.wslstrategicretail.com), found that a store that “supports the community or worthwhile causes” ranked No. 8 in a list of the 10 reasons shoppers consider a store as their favorite.

Though mothers and Millennials are generally noted as most strongly supporting causes, a survey by Barkley found that patronage of companies that support causes cuts across generational and gender lines. Fifty-five percent (55%) of men said they would pay more for a brand or product that supported a cause they cared about, and 67% said they would try a new brand because of a cause.

In the Barkley survey, men said they are most likely to support the following types of causes (percentage of respondents):

- Causes that affect children: 20%
- General health-related causes: 18%
- Poverty-related causes: 12%
- Animal welfare-related causes: 11%
- Disaster-related causes: 10%
- Health-related causes that affect men: 9%
- Environmental causes: 8%

In a recent survey by Cone Inc., 41% of people said they have bought a product because it was associated with a cause.

26.4 Cause Marketing Halo Awards

The Cause Marketing Halo Awards (13th annual), presented by the Cause Marketing Forum (www.causemarketingforum.com), recognizes one business and one nonprofit organization each for their leadership and outstanding efforts in the pursuit of doing well by doing good. The 2015 honorees were CVS Health and United Nations Foundation. The following campaigns were also honored in 2015:

Best Education Campaign
- Silver: Science Sleuth - 3M & DoSomething.org
Best Environmental or Animal Campaign
- Gold: Orvis Cover Dog Photo Contest - The Orvis Company & Morris Animal Foundation
- Silver: Bee Friendlier - Cascadian Farm & Xerces Society and University of Minnesota Bee Lab

Best Health-Related Campaign
- Gold: Strike Through Cancer One Dime at a Time - Jason’s Deli & University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center
- Silver: Lung Force - CVS Health & American Lung Association

Best Message-Focused Campaign
- Gold: Sports Matter - Dick’s Sporting Goods & The Dicks Sporting Goods Foundation
- Silver: Children’s Miracle Network Hospitals Radiothons - iHeartMedia & CMN Hospitals

Best Social Media Campaign
- Gold: Sports Matter - Dick’s Sporting Goods & The Dick’s Sporting Goods Foundation
- Silver: Star Wars Force for Change - Disney & U.S. Fund for UNICEF

Best Social Service Campaign
- Gold: Matter to a Million - HP & Kiva
- Silver: Share A Meal - Unilever & Feeding America

Best Transactional Campaign
- Gold: NB SparkStart - New Balance & Boys & Girls Clubs of America
- Silver: Taste of Groupon - Groupon & Feeding America

Best Video
- Gold: Father’s Day Surprise - WestJet & Ronald McDonald House Charities Canada
- Silver: In Her Shoes - CIBC & Canadian Breast Cancer Foundation

26.5 Compassionate Consumerism
Brands that donate a percentage of sales proceeds to humanitarian causes, a concept that retail analysts call compassionate consumerism, are increasingly popular. The following are some such brands:

Ethos® Water
- Ethos® Water, a subsidiary of Starbucks, was created with the social mission of helping children get clean water. Five cents (5¢) of each sale of Ethos Water goes to the Starbucks Foundation, which supports water, sanitation, and hygiene.
education programs in water-stressed countries. As of January 2015, $7.4 million had been granted to support programs benefitting more than 430,000 people around the world.

**FEED Projects**
- FEED Projects makes handbags, T-shirts, and accessories and donates a percentage of profits to United Nations anti-hunger programs.

**Krochet Kids**
- Founded in 2008, Krochet Kids International, whose slogan is “Buy a Hat. Change a Life”, empowers women in Uganda and Peru by training and employing them to craft hats and other clothing. Items are sold at most Whole Foods stores, at boutiques, and online.

**Threads for Thought**
- Urban Outfitters stores feature apparel by Threads for Thought, which gives part of its sales proceeds to humanitarian groups including the International Rescue Committee and the National Resources Defense Council.

**TOMS**
- Launched in 2007, TOMS is the originator of the one-for-one concept and is credited with giving rise to the compassionate consumerism phenomenon. TOMS donates a pair of shoes to a child who lives in poverty for every pair of shoes sold.

**Treasure & Bond**
- Owned by Nordstrom and located in the SoHo district of New York City, Treasure & Bond sells apparel and accessories from smaller brands and designers, with store’s profits going to a rotating roster of local charities.

**Warby Parker**
- Warby Parker, an eyeware company founded in 2010, donates a pair of glasses for each pair it sells. Rather than donate glasses using a more traditional “one-for-one” model, Warby Parker funds the production of a pair of eyeglasses for non-profit organization VisionSpring, which VisionSpring in turn sells either directly to consumers or companies. As of mid-2015, Warby Parker had distributed over 500,000 pairs of eyeglasses to people in need.

“When done right, altruistic retailing strategies do good and make donors feel good, too.”

*Bloomberg Businessweek*
26.6 Market Resources
Cause Marketing Forum, 63 Overlook Place, Rye, NY 10580. (866) 205-8480. (www.causemarketingforum.com)
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CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENTS

27.1 Effectiveness of Celebrity Endorsements

In a recent Harris Poll (www.harrisinteractive.com), consumers, by age, said they found the following types of celebrities most persuasive when endorsing a product in an ad:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Celebrity</th>
<th>18-to-34</th>
<th>35-to-44</th>
<th>45-to-55</th>
<th>55 &amp; older</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business leaders</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television or movie stars</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singers or musicians</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former political figures</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For brands using celebrity endorsers, the possibility of a scandal poses a risk. But the actual impact of such scandals is actually less than might be expected. The Harris Poll found that 74% of consumers are not impacted when a celebrity endorser gets involved in a scandal. The following are opinions by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Brand</th>
<th>18-to-34</th>
<th>35-to-44</th>
<th>45-to-55</th>
<th>55 &amp; older</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel worse</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel better</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Celebrity endorsements are particularly effective for cause marketers. Fifty-three percent (53%) of adults said in a Harris Poll that celebrities make a positive difference for their cause; 15% said they made a large difference. By generation, those who said celebrity endorsers make a difference were as follows (percentage of respondents):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Large Difference</th>
<th>Some Difference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Whether it’s to spread awareness of a disease or a conflict in another country, or even to help pass or stop a piece of legislation, celebrities get involved in causes hoping that their name recognition will help spur others to also get involved.”

Harris Poll

27.2 Brand Ambassadors

Traditionally celebrities have been paid simply to appear in ads. A recent trend is to retain celebrities as brand ambassadors, in most cases giving them a role in how a brand is presented in the marketplace. In some instances, celebrities hold a stake in the company.

The following are some celebrity-brand partnerships:

- 50 Cent: VitaminWater
- Alicia Keys: BlackBerry
- Ashton Kutcher: PopChips
- Beyoncé: Pepsi
- Fergie: Markwins
- Gwen Stefani: HP
- Justin Timberlake: Bud Light Platinum, Callaway Golf
- Kate Perry: Eylure
- Lady Gaga: Polaroid
- Taylor Swift: Diet Coke
- will.i.am: Intel
“Now brands aren’t just featuring celebs in marketing campaigns, they’re giving stars a place in the marketing suite. The model for these tie-ups is a partnership anointing A-listers with lofty titles like Chief Creative Officer, Head of Creative Design, Chief Innovator, and Brand Ambassador. Styling celebrities as ambassadors is an attempt to position the tie-up as more authentic at a time when consumers have become more cynical about endorsements.”

Advertising Age

27.3 Celebrity-Branded Merchandise
According to The Licensing Letter, annual retail sales of celebrity-licensed merchandise in the U.S. are $5.34 billion. Entertainment celebrities account for $2.44 billion of the total.

“With the fragmentation of today’s marketplace and the constantly evolving consumer trends, brands face more challenges than ever before in retailing loyalty. One thing that has not changed, however, is Americans’ fascination with celebrities. Increasingly, brands and celebrities are finding opportunities with each other through licensing partnerships. A recent brand-license survey indicates that 75% of retail buyers believe that celebrity-endorsed products sell better than non-endorsed merchandise.”

Mass Market Retailers
27.4 Consumer Perceptions Of Celebrities

The Davie-Brown Index (DBI), developed by the celebrity talent division of The Marketing Arm (http://themarketingarm.com/davie-brown-entertainment.html), rates consumer perceptions of approximately 3,000 celebrities. Based on a 1.5 million-member consumer research panel, the DBI provides marketers with a systematic approach for quantifying the use of celebrities in their advertising and marketing initiatives. The list is updated weekly.

Klout Score (http://klout.com/corp/score) measures the influence of celebrities and others on social networks. Klout weighs more than 400 data points, including the number of Twitter mentions and Facebook fans, and assigns a 1-to-100 score representing influence.
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CONTENT MARKETING

28.1 Overview
Branded content includes anything created on behalf of a brand – be it company website content, a YouTube video, Facebook page, or mobile app – and hosted directly by the brand. Branded content, also referred to as sponsored content and native advertising, educates, entertains, amuses, informs, and otherwise serves a function or satisfies a customer need.

“Content marketing differs from advertising in two fundamental ways. First, content resides on owned or earned media. If there’s a media buy involved, it’s advertising, not content marketing. Second, content marketing is a pull, rather than a push, strategy. Content doesn’t interrupt, it attracts.”

Advertising Age

28.2 Content Spending
According to The Content Council (www.thecontentcouncil.com), businesses spend $43.9 billion annually for content marketing. Distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creation/Production</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print/traditional</td>
<td>$16.3 billion</td>
<td>$ 8.5 billion</td>
<td>$25.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital media</td>
<td>$  8.3 billion</td>
<td>$ 5.1 billion</td>
<td>$13.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events, video, and</td>
<td>$  3.6 billion</td>
<td>$ 1.7 billion</td>
<td>$  5.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$28.4 billion</td>
<td>$15.7 billion</td>
<td>$43.9 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of total content spending, $27.7 billion, or 63%, is B2C; 37% is B2B.
A 2015 study by The Content Council assessed that content marketing budgets account for 23.3% of total marketing budgets. By 2017, this figure is projected to increase to 33.1%.

A survey by Curata (www.curata.com) reported the following content marketing mix:

- Original content: 65%
- Curated content: 35%
- Syndicated content: 10%

### 28.3 Content Marketing Tactics

*The State of B2C Content Marketing: 2014 Benchmarks, Budgets, and Trends,* by the Content Marketing Institute (www.contentmarketinginstitute.com), reported content marketing tactics used by marketers as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Social media (excluding blogs): 88%
- Articles on website: 78%
- E-newsletters: 76%
- Videos: 72%
- Blogs: 72%
- In-person events: 65%
- Articles on other websites: 61%
- Mobile content: 46%
- Microsites: 43%
- Case studies: 41%
- Infographics: 40%
- Mobile apps: 39%
- Online presentations: 39%
- Print magazines: 37%
- Branded content tools: 37%
- White papers: 31%
- Digital magazines: 30%
- Webinars/webcasts: 30%
- Annual reports: 30%
- Print newsletters: 29%
- Research reports: 28%
- Licensed/syndicated content: 25%
- Books: 24%
- eBooks: 23%
- Podcasts: 19%
- Virtual conferences: 18%
- Games/gamification: 17%
Among marketers that use social media in their content marketing programs, social media sites used to distribute content are as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Facebook: 89%
- Twitter: 80%
- YouTube: 72%
- LinkedIn: 71%
- Google+: 55%
- Pinterest: 53%
- Instagram: 32%
- SlideShare: 19%
- Flickr: 18%
- Tumblr: 18%
- foursquare: 16%
- Vimeo: 16%
- StumbleUpon: 13%
- Vine: 13%

### 28.4 Content Marketing Survey

A March 2015 survey of marketing and sales professionals by Ascend2 (www.ascend2.com) explored trends in content marketing. The following is a summary of the findings of the survey (percentage of respondents):

#### Most Important Objectives Of A Content Marketing Strategy

- Improve customer engagement: 52%
- Increase lead generation: 52%
- Increase brand awareness: 44%
- Increase sales revenue: 38%
- Improve lead nurturing: 32%
- Increase website traffic: 28%
- Increase customer retention: 26%
- Improve search engine rankings: 19%

#### Most Effective Types Of Content Used

- Articles/case studies: 54%
- Videos: 46%
- Infographics: 43%
- Research/white papers: 36%
- Webinars/online events: 30%
- eNewsletters: 28%
- Photos/illustrations: 24%
- News releases: 10%
**Most Difficult Types Of Content To Create**
- Videos: 59%
- Webinars/online events: 50%
- Research/white papers: 50%
- Infographics: 34%
- Articles/case studies: 31%
- eNewsletters: 13%
- Photos/illustrations: 8%
- News releases: 6%

**Most Useful Metrics For Measuring Content Marketing Success**
- Conversion rate: 50%
- Quality of leads: 45%
- Website traffic: 42%
- Number of leads: 37%
- Sales revenue: 30%
- Subscriber list growth: 27%
- Social media sharing: 27%
- Search engine rankings: 17%

**Most Challenging Obstacles To Content Marketing Success**
- Lack of content creation resources: 53%
- Lack of an effective strategy: 42%
- Budget constraints: 40%
- Inability to measure effectiveness: 33%
- Lack of cross-channel integration: 27%
- Lack of employee skills: 25%
- Lack of a variety of content types: 24%
- Lack of management support: 15%

### 28.5 Blogs
According to a survey by WP Engine (www.wpengine.com), 46% of consumers read the blogs of their favorite brands. The following are key findings of the survey:
- Forty-eight percent (48%) feel that it’s important for a brand to include brand content on their blog to assure customers have the most up-to-date information (32%).
- Forty percent (40%) believe there are negative effects if brands do not provide content on their blogs to prevent losing communication with customers and keeping the brand more relevant.
- Forty percent (40%) prefer to read content directly from a company blog rather than a news magazine or website.
- Fifty-two percent (52%) prefer to go directly to the company website for content about the brand, vs. 25% going to social media and 22% to third-party articles.
Sixty percent (60%) want to see content directly from brands, including articles on important issues (27%), research on the company’s industry (16%), and funny stories (12%).

Ninety-six percent (96%) of consumers do not want to see stories about how celebrities use a company’s products.

### 28.6 Assessing ROI

In a survey by the Content Marketing Institute, B2C content marketers reported using the following metrics to measure the ROI of content campaigns (percentage of respondents):

- Web traffic: 62%
- Sales: 54%
- SEO ranking: 39%
- Higher conversion rates: 39%
- Time spent on website: 38%
- Qualitative feedback from customers: 35%
- Subscriber growth: 34%
- Customer renewal rates: 26%
- Benchmark lift of company awareness: 23%
- Inbound links: 23%
- Benchmark lift of product/service awareness: 21%
- Sales lead quantity: 16%
- Sales lead quality: 15%
- Cost savings: 15%

### 28.7 Market Resources

Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) Council, 1494 Hamilton Avenue, San Jose, CA 95125. (408) 677-5300 x5333. ([www.cmocouncil.org](http://www.cmocouncil.org))

Content Marketing Institute, 17040 Amber Drive, Cleveland, OH 44111. (888) 554-2014. ([www.contentmarketinginstitute.com](http://www.contentmarketinginstitute.com))


The Content Council, 355 Lexington Avenue, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10017. (212) 297-2191. ([www.thecontentcouncil.org](http://www.thecontentcouncil.org))
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COUPONS

29.1 Consumer Use Of Coupons

In the *Shopper Marketing Survey*, by Valassis (www.valassis.com), 80.9% of consumers surveyed reported regular use of coupons. But only 3.4% of consumers said they only purchase a product when they have a coupon.

A study by Linkable Networks (www.linkablenetworks.com) reported that 67% of women search online for coupons and deals; 56% of men do so.

According to *2015 Coupon Facts*, by NCH Marketing (www.nchmarketing.com), consumer use of coupons is as follows:

- Always: 23.3%
- Often: 27.3%
- Sometimes: 28.1%
- Rarely or never: 21.3%

Consumers saved $3.7 billion through coupon use in 2014. Coupon users save $11.20 on average per shopping trip with coupons, or 11.5% of the basket total cost.

A total of 315 billion coupons for consumer packaged goods (CPG) were distributed in 2014. The free-standing insert (FSI) was the dominant vehicle for coupon distribution, accounting for more than 91.2% of all coupons distributed and 50.8% of all coupons redeemed.

“In the digital age, paper coupons still rule, according to data from NCH Marketing.”

*Bloomberg Businessweek*

29.2 Redemption

The *Shelby Report* (www.theshelbyreport.com) estimates the total number of consumer packaged goods (CPG) coupons redeemed as follows:

CONSUMER MARKETING 2016-2017

- 160 •
• 2000: 4.4 billion
• 2001: 3.9 billion
• 2002: 3.7 billion
• 2003: 3.5 billion
• 2004: 3.2 billion
• 2005: 3.0 billion
• 2006: 2.6 billion
• 2007: 2.6 billion
• 2008: 2.6 billion
• 2009: 3.3 billion
• 2010: 3.3 billion
• 2011: 3.5 billion
• 2012: 2.9 billion
• 2013: 2.9 billion
• 2014: 2.8 billion

Note: Estimate based on coupons that are processed through clearinghouses; mobile coupons and some digital coupons do not go through clearinghouses.

Coupon redemption in America peaked in 1992, at the end of a recession, when 7.9 billion coupons were redeemed. There was a significant drop off in coupon redemption in 2012 as the U.S. economy improved, a trend which continued through 2013 and 2014. Of the 325 billion coupons issued in 2014, the redemption rate was 1%, according to NCH Marketing.

Redemption is distributed by retail category as follows (source: Coupon Facts):

• Grocery stores: 54.7%
• Mass merchandisers: 26.9%
• Drug stores: 7.5%
• Military commissaries: 3.9%
• Other: 7.0%

CPG categories rank in coupon use as follows (source: Coupon Facts):
1. Hair care
2. Shaving needs
3. Oral hygiene
4. Vitamins & supplements
5. Skin care preparations
6. Pet food
7. Detergents
8. Paper & plastic products
9. Fresheners & deodorizers
10. HBC cross-sector
11. Cough & cold remedies
12. Gastrointestinal remedies
13. Personal cleansing & bath products
14. Household cleaners
15. Packaged meat & seafood - refrigerated
16. Cosmetics
17. Deodorant
18. Health aids & remedies
19. Eye care treatment products & solutions
20. Breakfast foods - shelf stable
29.3 Coupon User Demographics

IRI (www.iriworldwide.com) provides the following demographics of coupon users (by age):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Digital Coupon Users</th>
<th>Newspapers Clippers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-to-24:</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-to-34:</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-to-44:</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-to-54:</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-to-64:</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older:</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Purse String Survey, published by Valassis, sources for coupons and deals among Millennials (ages 18-to-34) are as follows (percentage of survey respondents):

- Newspaper: 51%
- Emails/coupon alerts: 50%
- Internet searches: 38%
- Mail: 33%
- In-store offers: 25%
- Links from savings sites/blogs: 23%
- Retail circulars: 21%
- Coupon books: 20%

According to a recent survey conducted by International Demographics (www.themediaaudit.com), among those earning $75,000 or more in household income, 53.8% had used coupons within the prior month, a figure that is 8% higher when compared to the general population. Those earning under $50,000 in household income were 7% less likely to have used a coupon in the prior month. Consumers with a college degree were 15% more likely to have used a coupon within the prior month, while those with only a high school education were 9% less likely to have used a coupon.

According to GfK MRI (www.mri.gfk.com), the following cities have the highest percentage of adults who clip coupons from FSIs and Sunday newspapers:

1. Springfield-Holyoke, MA
2. Rochester, NY
3. Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY
4. Harrisburg-Lancaster-Lebanon-York, PA
5. Syracuse, NY
6. Buffalo, NY
7. Hartford & New Haven, CT
8. Wilkes Barre-Scranton, PA
9. Youngstown, OH
10. Rockford, IL
29.4 Digital Coupons

eMarketer (www.emarketer.com) assesses digital coupon use by adults as follows:

- 2012: 92.3 million
- 2013: 102.5 million
- 2014: 110.8 million
- 2015: 121.3 million

Smartphone mobile coupon usage is as follows (source: eMarketer):

- 2012: 29.9 million
- 2013: 42.1 million
- 2014: 58.1 million
- 2015: 83.1 million

Tablet mobile coupon usage is as follows (source: eMarketer):

- 2012: 32.3 million
- 2013: 47.1 million
- 2014: 60.5 million
- 2015: 66.4 million

________________________________________

“Mobile coupons are cheaper than paper coupons to distribute, and they also get redeemed more frequently. And while traditional paper coupons still account for more coupon-related spending overall, most of the growth in the space is happening on mobile.”

eMarketer, 5/15/15

________________________________________

A survey by Forrester Research (www.forrester.com) found shoppers who redeemed digital coupons found via smartphone did so as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Purchase via computer: 33%
- Purchase in-store: 27%
- Purchase via smartphone: 25%
- Purchase via tablet: 14%
- Purchase from a catalog: 1%
“Why cut coupons when you can load them on your mobile device with the touch of a button? However, this doesn’t keep them away from brick-and-mortars. More than one-quarter of digital couponers who had found a coupon via smartphone in the three months leading up to polling ultimately redeemed that deal in a store.”

eMarketer, 8/21/14

The study eCirculars and Online Deals, by Ipsos OTX (www.ipsosotx.com), found Internet users preferred digital delivery methods of coupons and promotions for the following reasons:
• Convenient: 80%
• Ease of management: 71%
• Don’t really use offline deals: 42%

Based on unique monthly visitor data from Alexa (www.alexa.com), the following were the most-visited coupon websites in April 2015:
• Groupon (www.groupon.com): 30.00 million
• Retail Me Not (www.retailmenot.com): 24.00 million
• Zulily (www.zulily.com): 20.00 million
• Coupons (www.coupons.com): 18.25 million
• Shop At Home (www.shopathome.com): 18.00 million
• SlickDeals (www.slickdeals.com): 17.00 million
• Living Social (www.livingsocial.com): 12.00 million
• Woot (www.woot.com): 10.00 million
• eBates (www.ebates.com): 7.50 million
• Fat Wallet (www.fatwallet.com): 6.00 million
• Gilt (www.gilt.com): 5.90 million
• Deals Plus (www.dealsplus.com): 5.50 million
• Brads Deals (www.bradsdeals.com): 5.00 million
• Savings (www.savings.com): 4.50 million
• Deal Catcher (www.dealcatcher.com): 3.50 million
29.5 Market Resources
Coupon Information Center, 115-D South Saint Asaph Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. (703) 684-5307. (www.couponinformationcenter.com)

Coupons.com, 400 Logue Avenue, Mountain View, CA 94043. (650) 605-4600. (www.coupons.com)

NCH Marketing Services, 155 Pfingsten Road, Deerfield, IL 60015. (847) 317-5500. (www.nchmarketing.com)
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CROWDSOURCING

30.1 Overview
Crowdsourcing, or soliciting opinions and ideas from the general public on how to tackle certain issues, has applications in marketing, advertising, and product design. *Wired* magazine is credited with coining the term in 2005.

The use of crowdsourcing is on the rise. The *Merchandise Planning and Allocation Survey*, by Boston Retail Partners (http://bostonretailpartners.com), found the use among retailers for product design increased 550% in 2014.

30.2 Benefits Of Crowdsourcing
Weber Shandwick (www.webershandwick.com) and KRC Research (www.krcresearch.com) reported that 55% of Fortune 200 companies have engaged in some type of crowdsourcing project. In a survey of executives in companies that had done so, 95% said the tactic was at least somewhat valuable for their corporation.

When asked the most valuable aspect of crowdsourcing efforts, responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):
- Provides new perspectives and diverse opinions: 36%
- A way to build engagement and relationships with key audiences: 25%
- Invites clients and customers from non-traditional sources to contribute ideas and opinions: 22%
- Brings new energy into the process of generating ideas: 16%

In addition to benefitting from the results of the group query, crowdsourcing is a great way for companies to engage their customers. For example, when Mars ran a global contest to choose a new color for its M&M candy, more than 10 million people participated.

30.3 Case Studies
The following are examples of companies that have used crowdsourcing to engage and interact with their customers:

**Ben & Jerry’s**
- Ben & Jerry’s was one of the first companies to use crowdsourcing when in 2003 more than 360,000 customers voted to add Primary Berry Graham to its lineup of flavors. More recently, the company asked residents of five cities – New York City;
Portland, OR; San Francisco; Seattle; and Washington, DC – to vote to determine the names of new ice cream flavors that reflect their locales.

Dell
• Dell (www.dell.com) launched IdeaStorm (www.ideastorm.com), a website to allow the company to gauge which ideas are most important and most relevant to the public. As of August 2015, 23,700 ideas had been submitted, of which 549 were implemented; over 850,000 votes and comments have been submitted.

Facebook
• Since 2008, Facebook (www.facebook.com) has used crowdsourcing to create different language versions of its site. The company says this offers the advantage of providing site versions that are more compatible with local cultures.

Firehouse Subs
• In 2013, as part of its Pickle Bucket Post-a-Thon promotion, Firehouse Subs made $2 charitable donations for each of the first 375 pictures uploaded to its Facebook page. In another promotion, the chain called for fans to post YouTube videos of their original songs about a limited-time offer for its King's Hawaiian Pork & Slaw sandwich.

GeniusRocket
• GeniusRocket (www.geniusrocket.com), an advertising agency, uses curated crowdsourcing for the production of creative video content, including live action, motion graphics, and animation.

Lay’s
• 3.8 million customers submitted flavor ideas to the Lay’s Do Us A Flavor crowdsourcing contest. Three winners – Cheesy Garlic Bread, Chicken & Waffles, and Sriracha – were chosen and introduced in stores nationwide. Customers’ social media votes chose Cheesy Garlic Bread to become a permanent part of the Lay’s product line.

Macy’s
• Macy’s asked customers to send in patriotic videos as part of its American Icons ad campaign and aired select videos in 30-second What Makes America Great commercials.

Pepsi
• In a Pepsi marketing campaign customers submitted Pepsi can artwork. The winning entries received a $10,000 prize and their designs were featured on 500 million Pepsi cans sold in the United States.
Pizza Hut
• Pizza Hut asked its customers to submit videos of themselves mimicking a quarterback’s pre-snap ‘hut hut’ call and included select clips in a 30-second mash-up that aired before the 2014 Super Bowl broadcast.

Starbucks
• Starbucks (www.starbucks.com) launched My Starbucks Idea (www.starbucks.com/coffeeshouse/learn-more/my-starbucks-idea) to collect suggestions and feedback from customers.

Threadless
• Artists submit designs for t-shirts on the Threadless website where they are voted on by a community of followers. Artists submitting designs that garner the most votes receive a $2,000 payment, and their designs are printed and sold by the company.

Unilever
• Unilever used crowdsourcing to find creative ideas for its next TV campaign for its snack food brand Peperami.

30.4 Market Resources

Crowdsourcing.org. (www.crowdsourcing.org)

The following are resources used to implement crowdsourcing projects:
- Amazon Mechanical Turk (Mturk, www.mturk.com)
- CrowdFlower (www.crowdflower.com)
- Idea Bounty (www.idea Bounty.com)
- Smartsheet (www.smartsheet.com)
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CUSTOMER COMMUNICATIONS

31.1 Overview
A March 2015 study by Principal Financial Group (www.principal.com) found that consumers generally prefer communications with companies and brands via email. In lieu of email communications, consumers are open to in person, postal mail, and telephone communications when appropriate. Less than 10% of consumers prefer to be contacted via social media, online chat, and text message.

“Be wary of how far you tilt your customer service toward social media. Even among Millennials, Internet users still prefer more old-fashioned types of communication – including digital ones, of course. Email is Millennials’ channel of choice for communicating with retailers. The idea of ‘tried and true’ may be a common way of denigrating email as unsexy, but sometimes unsexy works.”

eMarketer, 3/20/15

31.2 Preferred Communications By Sector
When asked by Principal Financial Group their preferred method of contact by brands in various sectors, responses were as follows:

Financial Institutions
- Email: 43%
- In person: 22%
- Postal mail: 15%
- Telephone: 11%
• Online chat: 5%
• Text message: 3%
• Social media: 2%

Insurance Companies
• Email: 42%
• Telephone: 19%
• In person: 14%
• Postal mail: 13%
• Online chat: 5%
• Social media: 4%
• Text message: 4%

Retailers
• Email: 47%
• In person: 28%
• Postal mail: 8%
• Social media: 6%
• Telephone: 5%
• Online chat: 5%
• Text message: 2%

Wellness Centers
• Email: 43%
• In person: 28%
• Postal mail: 9%
• Social media: 9%
• Telephone: 6%
• Text message: 3%
• Online chat: 2%

31.3 Promotions
CrossView (www.crossview.com) found shoppers’ preference for delivery of retail promotions as follows:
• Email: 37%
• Mailer: 23%
• Text message: 18%
• In-store: 11%
• Social media: 9%
• Other: 3%
31.4 Customer Service

According to the 2014 Customer Service Barometer by American Express (www.americanexpress.com), the preferred channel for making customer service inquiries is as follows:

**Simple Inquiry**
- Email or company website: 36%
- Speaking with a person by telephone: 14%
- Telephone automated voice-response system: 12%
- Face-to-face: 9%
- Online chat/instant messaging: 9%
- Smartphone app: 9%
- Text message: 6%
- Social network: 5%

**More Complex Inquiry**
- Speaking with a person by telephone: 37%
- Face-to-face: 19%
- Email or company website: 17%
- Online chat/instant messaging: 12%
- Telephone automated voice-response system: 5%
- Social network: 4%
- Smartphone app: 3%
- Text message: 3%

**Difficult Inquiry**
- Speaking with a person by telephone: 48%
- Face-to-face: 24%
- Email or company website: 10%
- Telephone automated voice-response system: 5%
- Online chat/instant messaging: 4%
- Smartphone app: 3%
- Social network: 3%
- Text message: 2%
32.1 Overview

Customer relationship management, or CRM, is defined as the tools, technologies, and procedures to manage, improve, or facilitate sales, support, and related interactions with customers, prospects, and business partners throughout a company.

CRM involves the use of technology to optimize business processes through organization, synchronization, and automation. This optimization primarily involves activities related to sales, but may also involve activities related to technical support, marketing, and customer service. The primary goals of CRM are related to discovering and engaging new customers as well as maintaining relationships with established customers, restoring relationships with former customers, and minimizing resources used on marketing and serving customers.

“The universal rule of thumb in businesses, or the 80-20 rule, states that 80% of a business’s sales come from 20% of its customers; this goes to show the importance of customer relationship management. Without a CRM, a sale is just a one-time sale; you create a loyal customer and improve his buying frequency only by ensuring proper service.”

RelationshipManagement.org

Successful implementation of CRM may yield higher productivity in sales; streamlined marketing and sales processes; improved levels of service, retention and loyalty; increases in cross-selling and up-selling; higher rates of closes; increased efficiency in call centers; reductions in expenses; more accurate targeting and profiling; higher overall levels of profit; increases in market shares, and marginal costs.
32.2 CRM Software

The following are vendors of customer relationship management software:

Amdocs
• Product: Amdocs Enterprise Customer Management
• Website:  www.amdocs.com/Products/Customer-Management/Pages/Customer-Management.aspx

Attensity
• Product: Text Analytics
• Website:  www.attensity.com

Avaya
• Product: Avaya Ace CRM Integration
• Website:  www.avaya.com

GreenRope
• Product: GreenRope Complete CRM
• Website:  www.greenrope.com

Infor
• Product: Infor 10x CRM
• Website:  www.infor.com

Infusionsoft
• Product: Small Business CRM
• Website:  www.infusionsoft.com

Jive Software
• Product: Jive Software CRM
• Website:  www.jivesoftware.com

Kana
• Product: CRM Solution
• Website:  www.kana.com

Microsoft
• Product: Microsoft Dynamics CRM
• Website:  www.microsoft.com/en-us/dynamics/crm.aspx

NetSuite
• Product: NetSuite CRM+
• Website:  www.netsuite.com/portal/products/crm/main.shtml
Oracle
• Product: Oracle CRM
• Website: www.oracle.com

Oracle-PeopleSoft
• Product: PeopleSoft Enterprise CRM
• Website: www.oracle.com/us/products/applications/peoplesoft-enterprise/crm/052431.html

Pardot, a Salesforce company
• Product: Pardot Marketing Automation
• Website: www.pardot.com

Pegasystems
• Product: Pegasystems CRM
• Website: www.pegasystems.com

PhaseWare
• Product: PhaseWare CRM
• Website: www.phaseware.com/customerrelationshipmanagement/

Sage
• Product: Sage CRM Cloud
• Website: www.sagecrm.com/united_states/

Salesforce
• Product: Sales Cloud
• Website: www.salesforce.com

Salesnet
• Product: Web Based CRM
• Website: www.salesnet.com

SAP
• Product: SAP 360 Customer powered by SAP HANA
• Website: www.sap.com/pc/bp/customer-relationship-management.html

SAS
• Product: SAS Customer Intelligence
• Website: www.sas.com

SugarCRM
• Product: SugarCRM
• Website: www.sugarcrm.com
Teradata Corp.
• Product: Integrated Marketing Management Solution
• Website: www.teradata.com

VeraCentra
• Product: VeraCentra Customer Intelligence
• Website: www.veracentra.com

Vertical Solutions
• Product: Vertical Solutions CRM
• Website: www.vertsol.com

Vtiger
• Product: Vtiger CRM
• Website: www.vtiger.com

Zoho
• Product: Zoho CRM
• Website: www.zoho.com/crm/

32.3 Market Resources
CRM Directory (www.crmdirectory.com)
RelationshipManagement.org
CUSTOMER RETENTION

33.1 The Importance of Customer Retention

Researchers at The Center for Retail Management at Northwestern University (www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/research/retail/) assessed that 12% to 15% of a business’s most loyal customers comprise 55% to 70% of the company’s total sales.

Bain Consulting (www.bainllc.com) found the average company loses 20% to 40% of its customers every year. Reducing customer attrition by a mere 5% can improve a business’s bottom line profits by 25% to 85%. Similarly, increasing customer loyalty by 1% is equivalent to reducing costs by 10%.

33.2 Retention Strategies

According to a survey by Loyalty 360 - The Loyalty Marketer’s Association (www.loyalty360.org), 84% of business-to-consumer (B2C) companies use customer retention marketing strategies; 49% believe their strategies are working. Forty-nine percent (49%) of companies believe they know or have identified their best, most loyal customers.

Eighty percent (80%) of companies collect and assess data to help evaluate retention program performance. Respondents claim the most important outcomes of data insight are better understanding of customers’ attitudes and behavior (32%) and improved the customer experience (25%).

The following are the most commonly used strategies for customer retention (percentage of respondents):

- Rewards programs: 65%
- Social media: 65%
- Personal interaction; 1-on-1 marketing: 64%
- Mobile: 49%

33.3 Retention Of Online Customers

In a survey conducted by e-tailing Group (www.e-tailing.com), executives in online retail companies said they take the following measures for customer retention (percentage of respondents):

- Pricing or promotional strategies: 81%
- Site redesign or enhancements: 79%
• Easier online search relevance/options: 79%
• Right in-stock assortment: 76%
• Email on pre-established frequency: 76%
• Usability testing: 71%
• Rich media: 64%
• Editorial, expert reviews, user content: 62%
• Elevated brand differentiation: 54%
• Social media elevation: 44%

Ninety-three percent (93%) of executives said their companies use analytics to see what customer retention measures are effective.
34.1 State Of Customer Service

Annually, American Express (www.americanexpress.com) publishes the Customer Service Barometer based on surveys by Ebiquity (www.ebiquity.com). The following are findings among U.S. customers in the 2014 survey:

General Customer Service Experiences
- Exceed expectations: 62%
- Meet expectations: 29%
- Miss expectations: 5%

Influence Of The Current Economy
- Businesses pay less attention to good customer service: 38%
- Businesses have increased their focus on providing good customer service: 29%
- Businesses’ attitudes in customer service have not changed: 26%

Spending With Companies That Provide Good Customer Service
- Willing to spend >20% more: 16%
- Willing to spend 10% more: 24%
- Willing to spend 5% more: 29%
- Not willing to spend more: 14%
- Uncertain: 18%

Ways A Company Can Stand Out With Customer Service
- Deliver the promised value at the right price: 29%
- Make it easy to do business with them online and offline: 22%
- Recognize customer as an individual who deserves personalized service: 21%
- Provide products and services that meet customer needs: 19%
- Make it easy to find information about products and services: 9%

Very Important Factors In Providing An Excellent Customer Service Experience
- Provide a satisfactory answer to questions: 86%
- Connect customer with someone who is knowledgeable: 78%
- Provide thanks for being a customer: 45%
- Provide personalized service: 45%
- Follow-up regarding customer’s shopping experience: 27%
- Address customer by name: 21%
Most Important Attribute Of A Successful Customer Service Professional

• Efficient - answers questions or handles transactions quickly: 33%
• Empowered - handles requests without transfers or escalations: 29%
• Courteous - is polite and cordial: 17%
• Human - connects personally; shows empathy: 14%
• Consultative - gives relevant information about product or experience: 7%

Frequency Of Telling Others About Good Experiences

• All the time: 46%
• Sometimes: 47%
• Rarely: 6%
• Never: 1%

Frequency Of Telling Others About Bad Experiences

• All the time: 60%
• Sometimes: 35%
• Rarely: 5%
• Never: 0%

Most Likely Influences To Try A New Company

• Recommendations from a friend or family member: 42%
• Sale or promotion: 34%
• Company reputation: 15%
• Online or social media review: 5%
• Interesting advertisement: 3%
• Engaging website: 2%

Number Of Poor Service Instances Before Switching Companies

• Immediately after initial experience: 37%
• Two or three instances: 58%
• Four or five instances: 4%
• Six or more instances: 1%

Maximum Time (in minutes) Willing To Hold On Phone With A Call Center

• Less than 5 minutes: 22%
• 5 to 10 minutes: 27%
• 10 to 15 minutes: 22%
• 15 to 30 minutes: 17%
• More than 30 minutes: 12%

When asked to rank the most important factors when choosing a company with which to do business, responses were as follows:
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1. Good value for the price
2. Excellent customer service
3. Better products
4. Easy to do business online
5. Convenience

34.2 Loyalty
Good customer service can win customers and increase loyalty, this translates to increased sales.

In *Brand Loyalty Survey*, by ClickFox (www.clickfox.com), survey respondents said providing exceptional customer service is the #1 way companies can build brand loyalty. When asked in the survey to identify the top influence in building loyalty, responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Providing exceptional customer service: 34%
- Rewarding purchases, feedback, and referrals: 20%
- Sending exclusive and/or relevant offers and specials: 13%
- Providing personalized products or services: 12%
- Knowing the customer when they visit or call: 10%

In a survey by The NPD Group (www.npd.com), 56% of consumers said that customer service was an extremely important factor in deciding where they shop.

34.3 Impact By Segment
While customer service is important across all consumer sectors, the influence varies by segment. The following are some industry-specific influences:

Airlines
An assessment by Forbes found airline quality ratings (i.e., on-time arrivals, denied boardings, mishandled baggage, and customer complaints) do not seem to influence revenue.

Drugstores and Pharmacies
The *National Pharmacy Study*, conducted by J.D. Power and Associates (www.jdpower.com), found customer service, not price, was most important among consumers with respect to store loyalty at drugstores and pharmacies.

E-Commerce
Customer service ranks low among attributes most important to online shoppers.
In a survey by A.T. Kearney (www.atkearney.com), the ability to find specific products, free shipping, finding favorite brands, best prices, ease of navigation, site security, special promotions, free samples, peer reviews, and the availability of new products all ranked above customer service.
Still, many online shoppers do expect some level of customer service. In a survey by OneUpWeb (www.oneupweb.com), 32% of Internet users said they expect live chat. A survey by comScore (www.comscore.com) found 35% of online shoppers would like online retailers to improve the availability of live customer service.

**Restaurants**

Empathica (www.empathica.com) found that 20% of consumers value good service over good food at fine- and casual-dining establishments. Even in fast-food restaurants, service trumps food quality.

A Gallup Poll (www.gallup.com) found that the biggest driver of engagement in a fast-food restaurant is being treated as a valued customer. Warmth of the greeting ranked second in the survey; taste of food ranked third. Gallup found that a fully engaged customer will spend $33.90 on fast food per month, 16% more than the $29.24 spent by a non-engaged consumer.

### 34.4 Factors Contributing To Good Customer Service

A survey by Dimensional Research (wwwdimensionalresearch.com) asked consumers about recent interactions with customer service departments of mid-sized companies. Responses were as follows:

**Good Customer Service**

- The problem was resolved quickly: 69%
- The person who helped me was nice: 65%
- The problem was resolved in one interaction: 63%
- The outcome was what I was originally hoping for: 47%

**Bad Customer Service**

- I had to explain my problem to multiple people: 72%
- The person I dealt with was unpleasant: 67%
- My problem took too long to resolve: 65%
- The problem was not resolved: 51%

### 34.5 Social Networks For Customer Service

According to the American Express 2014 Customer Service Barometer, 23% of U.S. Internet users have used social media for customer services at some point. The reasons people use social media for customer service are as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Praise a company for a great service experience: 53%
- Vent frustration related to a bad customer service experience: 50%
- Share information about a service experience with a broader audience: 46%
- Seek a response from a company to help with a service issue: 40%
- Seek recommendations from others about great service establishments: 36%
“Many firms began using social media for some form of customer service just as soon as consumers started tweeting and posting complaints about their brands online – and while the decision to respond to those messages may have been a good one, transferring significant customer service functionality to social sites may not be a good idea. Even for the simplest of inquiries, the vast majority of consumers prefer other forms of communication.”

eMarketer
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DATA-DRIVEN MARKETING

35.1 Overview
Consumer marketing has evolved from a creative process into a highly data-driven process.
Data-driven marketing refers to acquiring, analyzing, and applying information about consumer wants, needs, context, behavior, and motivations.

35.2 Market Assessment
Winterberry Group (www.winterberrygroup.com) estimates spending by marketers in the United States on data and data-related services in 2015 at $11.5 billion.
The Direct Marketing Association (http://thedma.org) reported data-driven marketing plans among B2C marketers for 2015 as follows:
• Increase significantly: 9.9%
• Increase somewhat: 47.0%
• No change: 30.5%
• Decrease somewhat: 8.5%
• Decrease significantly: 4.2%

―
“Data-driven marketing spending will continue on an upward growth trajectory this year. Increased spending and usage makes sense when one considers the success marketers have had with DDM.”

eMarketer, 3/18/15

―
35.3 Measuring ROI

In theory, marketing return-on-investment (ROI) can be calculated using marketing spending and customer purchase data. In practice, however, accurately ascertaining these numbers and correlating market drivers with specific purchases is complex.

A January 2015 survey by Forbes Insights (www.forbes.com/forbesinsights) found marketing executives used analytics to measure campaign ROI as follows:

- For all marketing engagements: 21%
- For most marketing engagements: 34%
- For some, but less than half of marketing engagements: 12%
- Only for a few select projects: 13%
- Not at all: 4%

In a July 2015 survey by Millward Brown Digital (www.millwardbrowndigital.com), 74% of marketing executives said they would invest more in social media if better ROI metrics existed, an increase from 50% who responded similarly in a 2014 survey. Seventy-nine percent (79%) said they would invest more in mobile, and 78% would spend more on digital if ROI could be tracked better.

“One major point of frustration for marketers in the digital age: measurement. It’s always been a challenge to definitively attribute a customer’s purchase to an ad campaign, no matter the medium. While television offers brands massive reach, online media promises to help marketers reach target audiences more cost efficiently. The rise of digital platforms and mobile devices has made it easier to capture data about a campaign’s performance and customers’ behaviors, but online advertising is still largely measured using proxy metrics like ad impressions, clicks or store visits. As a result, marketers struggle to connect the dots and show what these measures actually mean for business, a top concern as many big marketers tighten their ad spending.”

The Wall Street Journal, 7/6/15
In a February 2015 survey by Webmarketing123 (www.webmarketing123.com), B2C marketers said they can ascertain clear ROI for campaigns in the following channels (percentage of respondents):
- Paid search: 51%
- Email: 44%
- Search engine optimization: 31%
- Social media: 27%
- Display ads: 25%

35.4 Attribution
The primary challenge in assessing ROI is attribution, or assigning credit to a particular marketing-driven interaction or other brand touchpoint.
When asked in a survey by Webmarketing123 about the attribution models used to measure ROI, marketing executives responded as follows:
- Multichannel (all influencing touchpoints): 21%
- Last touch (conversion): 19%
- First and last touchpoint (lead source and conversion): 18%
- First touch (lead source): 15%
- Don’t have an attribution model in place: 38%

"As marketers increasingly look to attribution to better understand customers, not just build their media plans and justify budgets, figuring out how to act on cross-platform attribution findings as quickly as possible is on the minds of many."

eMarketer, 3/20/15

35.5 Implementation
An April 2015 survey by Econsultancy (www.econsultancy.com) asked marketers about their ability to make improvements in their campaigns based on insights derived from customer data. Responses were as follows:
- Excellent: 5%
- Good: 29%
- Okay: 43%
• Poor: 18%
• Very poor: 5%

“Many marketers still rely on ‘gut instinct’ when determining which channels to use for marketing campaigns.”

eMarketer, 2/24/15
36.1 Direct Marketing Spending

The Direct Marketing Association (DMA, www.thedma.org) assesses that U.S. marketers spend $84 billion annually on consumer direct marketing (DM). Including an additional $79 billion for business-to-business direct marketing, total DM spending is $163 billion. These expenditures generate nearly $2 trillion in incremental sales.

Direct marketing spending by medium is as follows:

- Direct mail: $50 billion
- Telephone: $37 billion
- Online media: $31 billion
- Television: $22 billion
- Newspaper: $8 billion
- Magazine: $7 billion
- Radio: $4 billion
- Other: $4 billion

“Direct marketing continues to be an engine for U.S. economic growth: 8.7% of the U.S. gross domestic product comes as a result of direct marketing, as do nearly $2 trillion in sales and 9.2 million jobs.”

Yory Wurmser, Ph.D.
Director of Marketing & Media Insights
Direct Marketing Association

36.2 Direct Mail

The U.S. Postal Service (www.usps.com) reported that standard mail volume – a category that includes direct mail – totaled 80.3 billion pieces in 2014, a 0.7% decrease
from the previous year. Meanwhile, first class mail declined 3.3% to 63.6 billion pieces in 2014.

“Marketing mail is holding its own and, in fact, growing ever so slightly in the mix of marketing tools. Mail still captures roughly 12% of media spending across all channels.”

—Advertising Age

DMA Statistical Fact Book provides the following assessment of direct mail:

• Previous customers of an organization are much more likely to respond to direct mail offers.
• The average consumer receives 24.7 pieces of mail per week.
• Among all mail formats, postcards are the most likely to be read.
• Seventy-nine percent (79%) of households read or scan advertising mailings sent to their household.

### 36.3 Response Rate

According to Response Rate Report, by the DMA, direct marketing response rate by media is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>House List</th>
<th>Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail, letter size:</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail, oversize:</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail, postcard:</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail, catalog:</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display ad:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid search:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 36.4 Effectiveness

A survey by Target Marketing (www.targetmarketing.com) found direct marketers rate various marketing efforts for ROI with respect to customer acquisition and retention as follows (percentage of respondents):
### Acquisition and Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search engine marketing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website advertising</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogs</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search engine optimization</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct response space advertising</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct response TV</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct response radio</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert media</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile marketing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webcasts</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 36.5 Direct Marketing Agencies

According to *Advertising Age* (May 2015), the following are the largest direct marketing agencies:

- Epsilon [Alliance Data Systems Corp.] ([www.epsilon.com](http://www.epsilon.com)): $1.26 billion
- Acxiom Corp. ([www.acxiom.com](http://www.acxiom.com)): $707 million
- Wunderman [WPP] ([www.wunderman.com](http://www.wunderman.com)): $474 million
- DigitasLBi [Publicis] ([www.digitas.com](http://www.digitas.com)): $444 million
- Experian Marketing Services ([www.experian.com/marketing-services](http://www.experian.com/marketing-services)): $433 million
- Harte Hanks ([www.hartehanks.com](http://www.hartehanks.com)): $427 million
- Merkle ([www.merkleinc.com](http://www.merkleinc.com)): $425 million
- Rosetta ([www.rosetta.com](http://www.rosetta.com)): $293 million
- OglivyOne Worldwide [WPP] ([www.ogilvy.com](http://www.ogilvy.com)): $288 million

### 36.6 Direct Marketing List Providers

Direct marketing lists provide contact information for marketers. Lists are available from list brokers, list compilers, and list managers. The following are major list providers:

- Acton International ([http://acton.com](http://acton.com))
- Acxiom Corp. ([www.acxiom.com](http://www.acxiom.com))
- ALC ([www.alc.com](http://www.alc.com))
- AllMedia ([www.allmediainc.com](http://www.allmediainc.com))
- Bethesta List Center ([www.bethesda-list.com](http://www.bethesda-list.com))
- Carney Direct Marketing ([www.carneydirect.com](http://www.carneydirect.com))
- Database USA ([www.databaseusa.com](http://www.databaseusa.com))
- DataJoe (www.datajoe.com)
- Dun & Bradstreet (www.dnb.com)
- Dunhill International List Co. (www.dunhills.com)
- Every Market Media (http://everymarketmedia.com)
- Experian Marketing Services (www.experian.com/marketing-services/marketing-services.html)
- Harte-Hanks Market Intelligence (www.hartehanks.com)
- Hoovers (www.hoovers.com)
- Hugo Dunhill Media (www.hdml.com)
- IDG List Services (www.idglist.com)
- Infogroup Targeting Solutions (www.infogrouptargeting.com)
- Kompass North America (http://us.kompass.com)
- Kroll Direct Marketing (www.krolldirect.com)
- L.I.S.T. Inc. (www.l-i-s-t.com)
- Lake Group Media (www.lakegroupmedia.com)
- Leon Henry Inc. (www.leonhenryinc.com)
- Lewis Direct (www.lewismails.com)
- Lighthouse List Co. (www.lighthouselist.com)
- List Incorporated (www.list-incorporated.com)
- List Services Corp. (www.listservices.com)
- Mardevdm2 (www.mardevdm2.com)
- Marketfish (www.marketfish.com)
- Marketry Inc. (www.marketry.com)
- Mazzone Marketing Group (www.mazzonemarketinggroup.com)
- MCH Strategic Data (www.mchdata.com)
- Merit Direct (www.meritdirect.com)
- MetaResponse Group (www.metaresponse.com)
- Neustar Information Services (www.neustar.biz/infoservices)
- Noble Ventures (www.nobleventures.com)
- Oceanos (www.oceanosinc.com)
- OneSource Information Services (www.onesource.com)
- Paradysz (www.paradysz.com)
- Q Interactive (www.qinteractive.com)
- Reach Marketing (www.reachmarketing.com)
- Rickard Squared (www.rickardsquared.com)
- SMS Marketing Services (www.sms-inc.com)
- Statlistics (www.statlistics.com)
- TriMax Direct (www.trimaxdirect.com)
- V12 Group (www.v12groupinc.com)
- Valassis Lists (www.valassislists.com)
- World Innovators (www.worldinnovators.com)
- Worlddata (www.worlddata.com)
- Zoominfo (www.zoominfo.com)
36.7 Market Resources
Direct Marketing Association, 1120 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036. (212) 768-7277. (www.the-dma.org)

Direct Marketing News, 114 W. 26th Street, New York, NY 10001. (646) 638-6000. (www.dmnews.com)

Multichannel Merchant, 10 Norden Place, 2nd Floor, Norwalk, CT 06855. (203) 358-5823. (www.multichannelmerchant.com)
37.1 Overview
Direct selling is person-to-person selling of a consumer product or service away from a fixed retail location. Products and services are typically marketed to customers by independent salespeople. Depending upon the company, the salespeople may be called distributors, representatives, consultants, or various other titles. With direct selling, products are sold primarily through in-home product demonstrations, parties, and one-on-one selling.

According to the Direct Selling Association (DSA, www.dsa.org), 74% of U.S. adults have purchased products from a direct seller.

37.2 Market Assessment
According to the Direct Selling Association, U.S. retail sales in the sector in 2014 were $31.6 billion; worldwide sales were $166.9 billion. The sector employs 15.9 million people in the United States.

Sales are distributed by category as follows:
• Home/family care/home durables: 25%
• Wellness (weight loss products, vitamins, etc.): 23%
• Personal care: 22%
• Service/other: 17%
• Clothing and accessories: 10%
• Leisure/educational (books, videos, toys, etc.): 3%

Percent sales by region were as follows:
• South: 35% (South Atlantic: 19%; West South Central: 11%; East South Central: 5%)
• West: 27% (Pacific: 19%; Mountain: 8%)
• Midwest: 22% (East North Central: 14%; West North Central: 7%)
• Northeast: 16% (Middle Atlantic: 12%; New England: 4%)

Percent sales by location/medium were as follows:
• Face-to-face selling: 77%
  –in the home (includes sellers’ self consumption): 72%
  –at a temporary location (fair, exhibition, etc.): 3%
  –in the work place: 2%
Remote selling: 21%
Internet (including email): 12%
Phone: 8%

37.3 Direct-Selling Companies
The most prominent direct-selling companies include Amway, Avon, Fuller Brush Company, Herbalife, Longaberger, Mary Kay Cosmetics, NuSkin, Pampered Chef, Party Life, Shaklee, Stampin’ Up, Tupperware, and Weekenders.

Traditional brands, retailers, and catalogers are among the companies contributing to the industry’s growth. Dove Chocolate, Jones Apparel Group, and Swiss Colony, among others, have recently launched a direct-selling arm.

37.4 Market Resources
Direct Selling Association, 1667 K Street NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20006.
(202) 452-8866. (www.dsa.org)
38.1 Defining Engagement

In 2006, the Advertising Research Foundation (ARF, www.thearf.org) defined engagement as follows: Engagement is turning on a prospect to a brand idea enhanced by the surrounding context. The definition has not been universally recognized and the ARF, as well as others, has been working to refine the definition and establish metrics for measuring engagement.

In 2013, the Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB, www.iab.net), in collaboration with Radar Research (www.radarresearch.com), published *Digital Ad Engagement: An Industry Overview and Reconceptualization* to address the longstanding challenge faced by advertisers, publishers, agencies, marketers, and other interactive industry participants for whom ad engagement is an essential tactic in digital advertising.

According to the IAB report, while engagement is a prevalent buzzword without a single definition, it actually describes three distinct aspects, as follows:

• Ad engagement: reviewing whether the creative is compelling and whether a consumer interacted with the ad in some way
• Content engagement: gauging which content is most captivating on a site
• Audience engagement: identifying which viewers are paying the most attention and are contributing to the conversation

In general, most industry executives agree that engagement includes an ad’s ability to break through to capture a consumer’s attention and to drive an attitudinal change.

“Even without a universally accepted definition of engagement, there is the widely held belief that engagement is an important component of online advertising. Leave it out and you miss an important diagnostic tool.”

Scott McDonald, SVP
Condé Nast
38.2 Measuring Engagement

Engagement is historically rooted in metrics such as click-through rate. The IAB report suggests that the advertising industry can move beyond its reliance on click-through as a salient measure and consider the following measures of engagement for the following three digital mediums:

**Mobile**
- Click-to-call
- Click-to-download
- Click-to-play
- Interaction rates
- Map retail location
- Share rates

**Rich Media**
- Display times
- Expansion times
- Expansions
- Form responses
- Game play
- Interaction time/rate
- Share rates

**Video**
- Completion rates
- Median video viewing time
- Play rate
- Play-through rate
- Share rates

Social media introduces even more metrics to the engagement concept, as follows:

**Collaboration**
- Commenting
- Liking
- Rating
- Sharing
- Voting

**Consumption**
- Listening
- Reading
- Viewing
38.3 Brand Engagement

Brands face a major challenge when trying to increase customer engagement: Consumers are busy and spend little time ‘engaging’ with brands while shopping. According to a 2015 study by the Ehrenberg-Bass Institute of Marketing Science (www.marketingscience.info), the average consumer spends 13 seconds purchasing a brand in-store. Online, the average consumer spends 19 seconds purchasing, and the majority spend less than 10 seconds.

“The idea that consumers ‘engage’ with brands is no doubt true for a small set of consumers and a small set of high involvement categories and brands, but for the vast majority of brands, consumers are not engaged to or with brands. They’re just buying them. The simple truth is this: for most categories, consumers have a small repertoire of brands that are acceptable, and they spend little time thinking about purchase decisions. Their lives are already full of spouses, kids, events and other activities, and most people simply don’t have the time or energy to engage with brands in any meaningful way. Consumers most often default to making purchase decisions based on simple habit (e.g., previous purchase) or instinct.”

Randall Beard, President
Nielsen North America, 1/13/15
38.4 Brand Activation

Brand activation is a relatively new marketing buzzword with a meaning similar to engagement. It is also a term without a universally recognized definition.

In general, brand activation involves bringing the spirit of a brand to life by creating brand experience. It aims to present an authentic reflection of the brand and brand values. Brand activation focuses on building a long-term emotional connection between a brand and its customers, includes interactive activities or content, and extends a brand’s power to communicate.

Brand activation is sometimes used interchangeably with brand engagement.

38.5 Market Resources

Advertising Research Foundation, 432 Park Avenue South, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10016. (212) 751-5656. (www.thearf.org)

Brand Activation Association, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10010. (212) 420-1100. (www.baalink.org)

Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB), 116 East 27th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10016. (212) 380-4700. (www.iab.net)
39.1 Overview

According to a survey by the Association of National Advertisers (www.ana.net), 63% of marketers participate in branded entertainment projects. Marketers cite the following reasons why branded entertainment is beneficial to brands (percentage of responses; multiple responses allowed):

- The ability to make a stronger emotional connection with the consumer: 78%
- The ability to align their brand with relevant content: 75%
- The ability to build brand affinity with a desired target group or demographic: 73%

39.2 Movie Tie-Ins

Movie tie-ins are cross promotions created to promote new films as well as generate additional income for that property. The following are examples:

- *The Hollywood Reporter* observed that *Jurassic World*, which had one of the biggest box office openings of all-time in June 2015, includes almost as many brand tie-ins as it does dinosaurs. There is a Margaritaville restaurant and bar located in the Jurassic World park and Jimmy Buffett performs at the premier party for the movie. Dairy Queen restaurants introduced a Jurassic Smash Blizzard coinciding with the opening. Other tie-ins included Ben & Jerry’s, Brookstone, Hilton Hotel, Mercedes, Pandora, Samsung, Starbucks, The Tonight Show, Triumph Motorcycles, and Verizon.

- Aston Martin and James Bond is a combination which has left an indelible mark on popular culture. In unveiling *Spectre*, the 24th James Bond film which opened in July 2015, more time was spent by director Sam Mendes introducing the new DB10 sports car that Aston Martin created specifically for 007 than on the actors in the movie.

- Samsung’s teamed with Lionsgate’s *The Hunger Games: Mockingjay* to build an elaborate exhibit at Comic-Con for the film that brought its world to life through costumes, props and experiences. The tie-in put Samsung’s new tablet into the hands of thousands of fans that wanted to watch the film’s teaser trailer.

- Lego teamed with Warner Bros. to launch *The Lego Movie*, co-starring DC Comics superheroes Batman and Superman.
39.3 Music Tie-Ins

As brands increasingly develop and market their own content, many are turning to music to attract younger target audiences. Brands are launching new releases, running recording studios, nurturing underground talent, making music videos, and creating original programming.

“Brands and musicians are teaming up to create valuable partnerships with financial incentives working both ways.”

Marketing Week, 2/11/15

The following are examples of music tie-ins:

• American Express, VEVO, and YouTube are partners in Unstaged, a series that pairs musical acts with established actors and film directors for short vignettes. The Taylor Swift Experience, an Unstaged feature in 2014, let users of an American Express’ app experience her Blank Space single with a video shot using 360° cameras and featuring an interactive storyline.
• Walmart created spots that integrated songs from The Sound Of Music and Peter Pan. NBC aired the commercials during live airings of the plays, running them just after the scenes in which the tunes appeared.
• Automakers including Toyota, Mazda, Ford, and Honda have announced mobile and social-driven music tie-ins to reach buyers. One example is Toyota’s promotion of its Sienna minivan through its socially driven “Swagger Wagon 2.0” campaign, featuring hip-hop artist Busta Rhymes, Toyota also paired up with Mexican singer-songwriter Ximena Sarinana in a social media experience.
• Starbucks operates the Hear Music retail concept and record label. Hear Music manages the music that each location plays and promotes in-store CD sales and Starbucks exclusives.

39.4 Product Placement

PQ Media (www.pqmedia.com) estimates global spending on product placement in 2014 at $10.9 billion; the annual growth rate is 14.8%.

Product placement is commonplace on television, in movies, and at Broadway theatre. Now that viewers can skip commercial breaks and brands are turning to alternative ways to present their message, TV product placement is becoming more important than ever.
One of the most prominent examples of product placement is on *American Idol*, where Coca-Cola gets consistent on-air exposure in every episode with its omnipresent logo on cups that appear regularly in shots on the judges’ desks. Comcast Spectra (www.spectraexperiences.com) estimates are that Coca-Cola’s seasonal media buying and product placement investment in the show provides some $50 million to $60 million in exposure value.

Netflix’s *House of Cards* is so filled with brand cameos that *The Los Angeles Times* referred to the Emmy-winning political drama as “more like House of Product Placement.” In one scene Kevin Spacey’s character Frank Underwood picks up Sony’s latest gaming device and remarks, “Is that a PS Vita? … I ought to get one of these for the car.” In another, Underwood and his aide are monitoring police communications from his office and laid out on their desk are nine iPhones and iPads. Product placements in the series include BlackBerry, Chevrolet, Coca-Cola, Dell, Samsung, and numerous other brands.

A recent development is digital product placement that lets brands retroactively place their adverts into old TV reruns. For example, cans of Coke could be inserted into re-runs of older shows by signing a deal with the content owner and using a web dashboard to make the changes. The technology was developed by Mirriad (www.mirriad.com), which uses computer vision technology digitally embed brands into content. Companies using the concept include Coca-Cola, Procter & Gamble, and Unilever.

### 39.5 Video Mini-Series

Several brands have launched web video series to promote their products. The following are examples:

- Live entertainment firm Live Nation and automaker Ford Motor Co. launched the 18-episode web reality series *The Rider Challenge*, where contestants drive Ford Fiestas during challenges. Winners get to meet musicians and hang out backstage at shows.
- An ad campaign for Lincoln’s MKC featuring Matthew McConaughey spun off a series of comedic spoofs. With Jim Carrey on *Saturday Night Live*, and talkshow hosts Conan O’Brien and Ellen DeGeneres satirizing the campaign, the parodies generated an even larger audience for the luxury SUV brand.
- In 2014, Chipotle aired *Farmed and Dangerous*, a four-episode web series, on Hulu. The series highlighted Chipotle as the first restaurant chain to reject antibiotic-raised meat.
40.1 Overview

Event marketing, also called engagement marketing and experiential marketing, is broadly defined as live events where audiences interact with a product or a brand. Popular events include sports events, fairs and festivals, parties, and concerts.

With consumers overwhelmed by the 5,000 or so ads they are exposed to daily – many shutting out much of this promotional content – the engagement offered by event marketing can be highly effective.

“While traditional marketing is based on a volume of target audience impressions, experiential marketing involves engaging with consumers in a manner than enables them to feel the brand versus simply being exposed to it. The payoff? Marketers taking the experiential plunge find they are gaining deeper, more genuine connections with consumers.”

*Advertising Age*

40.2 Market Assessment

PQ Media (www.pqmedia.com) estimates annual event marketing spending at $37 billion. This figure reflects only consumer events where the sponsoring brand owns the event and receives top billing; sponsorships of third-party events, such as sporting events and concerts, are not included. Spending on trade shows, parties, and other such events is also excluded.

IEG (www.sponsorship.com) estimates that U.S. brands spent $3.9 billion on entertainment tours and attractions, arts events, venue naming rights, festivals, and other events in 2015.
40.3 Event Specialists

According to Advertising Age (May 2015), the following are the largest event marketing agencies:

- IN Marketing Services (www.inmarketingservices.com): $352 million
- Freeman (www.freemanco.com): $246 million
- Momentum Worldwide [Interpublic] (www.momentumww.com): $147 million
- George P. Johnson (www.georgepjohnson.com): $145 million
- Derse (www.derse.com): $ 92 million
- Marketing Werks (www.marketingwerks.com): $ 85 million
- Global Experience Specialists (www.ges.com): $ 83 million

40.4 Effectiveness

The Advertising Research Foundation (ARF, www.thearf.org) recently completed an assessment of the impact of event marketing on consumer purchasing habits. ARF studied 12 companies, including Coca-Cola, Frito-Lay, and State Farm Insurance, that hosted events. The study, conducted by Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com), polled about 5,000 consumers after they had attended sponsored events. The study found that purchase intent rose 11% to 52% among consumers who attended brand-sponsored events such as sports competitions, walk-a-thons, and theme park outings. Such purchase intent translated to sales about 50% of the time. Sports-related events were found to have the greatest impact.

A survey by Jack Morton Worldwide (www.jackmorton.com) provides the following assessment of the effectiveness of experiential marketing:

- Respondents ranked experiential marketing as the #1 medium most likely to result in purchase.
- Eighty-five percent (85%) agree they would tell others about participating in a live event.
- Eight-two percent (82%) agree that participating in experiential marketing is more engaging than other forms of communication.
- Eight-one percent (81%) agree that experiential marketing would make them more receptive to other marketing from the product/brand.
- Eighty percent (80%) agree that experiential marketing is more likely to give them information than other forms of communication.
- Over 50% sampled a product, told others via word-of-mouth, went online, or contacted the company after participating in a brand experience.
According to a February 2015 survey by Group M Next (www.groupmnext.com), 33% of concertgoers remember the show partner of the last live event they attended. Forty-four percent (44%) said music partnerships were most likely to increase positive feelings toward a sponsor brand. Forty percent (40%) said they were more likely to consider purchasing from a music event sponsor brand in the future.

40.5 Market Resources
Event Marketing Institute, 10 Norden Place, Norwalk, CT 06855. (203) 852-5693. (www.eventmarketing.com)

Experiential Marketing Forum. (www.experientialforum.com)
41.1 Overview
Gamification is the application of gaming features in real-world contexts. In marketing, gamification is used to give incentives that enhance loyalty programs, attract customers to specific products, and engage in targeted activities. Incentives include badges (a virtual representation of having accomplished an activity), discounts, rewards systems, and virtual currency.

According to a report from Loyalty 360 - The Loyalty Marketer’s Association (www.loyalty360.org), 14% of business-to-consumer (B2C) companies with loyalty programs already use gamification in their customer retention efforts; 29% have plans to do so.

“Marketers are turning to gamification techniques to drive user behavior across their brand’s websites and mobile applications. These techniques tie behavior analytics with programs that highlight user status and achievements within a customer experience. Gamification is applicable for every customer experience.”

Kris Duggan, CEO
Badgeville
Emarketing and Commerce

41.2 Marketing Applications
The following are examples of gamification applications in marketing:
Foursquare
• Foursquare rewards users with badges for activities such as checking in at stores, destinations, and restaurants. Badges such as Gym Rat (for attending a gym multiple times in a week) and NASA Explorer (for visiting the International Space Station) are awarded for specific activities.

National Football League
• The NFL Fan Rewards program lets players earn coins to “spend” on anything from a t-shirt to a souvenir, gives 15%-off coupons, and even offers a chance to win a trip to the NFL Pro Bowl in Hawaii. Coins are awarded to visitors to nfl.com for watching videos, commenting on stories, and sharing with friends.

MSN
• MSN integrated gamification throughout their coverage of the London 2012 Olympics by letting users compete against friends and other fans for their Social Games promotion. To move up the Social Games leaderboard, users could watch videos, share links, comment on stories, play trivia, and rate photos. During the eight weeks of Olympics programming, MSN’s Social Games awarded $1,000 to weekly winners and $10,000 to a grand prize winner.

Opower
• Opower awards badges to electric utility customers when they reduce their energy consumption. Customers can compare their progress with their neighbors’ and broadcast their achievements on Facebook. More than 75 utilities participate in the program.

Pepsi
• Pepsi’s Sound Off is a website where fans of Pepsi-sponsored TV events such as the Grammys and X Factor can voice opinions and connect with fellow fans. Fans can earn rewards by posting comments, sharing to social networks, and “fanning” comments left by others. Pepsi rewards the top four users with the most “fans” by featuring their comment and profile in a Pepsi advertisement during the broadcast of a sponsored event.

Popchips
• Popchips teamed up with smartphone app company Kiip to insert virtual coupons redeemable for free bags of their snacks into hundreds of mobile games. Players are rewarded when a high score is set or a level is beaten.

White Castle
• At White Castle’s CraverNation website, Cravers upload photos and participate in challenges to work their way to the top of the leaderboard. In addition to virtual rewards such as earning community status as a Lunchtime Legend, White Castle gives away weekly prizes like tablets, lifetime sliders, and bags of swag.
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“We have a tendency to be dismissive about games, but what we’re learning is that games in general are wonderfully powerful tools that can be applied in all sorts of serious contexts.”

Prof. Kevin Werbach, Ph.D.
Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

41.3 Gamified Advertising
Gamified ads look like branded minigames with gameplay or gamification mechanics. They typically feature standard gaming elements, such as core gameplay, scores, and leaderboards, and allow users to share their score on social media. Examples include players wiping away things that are blocking an image or video of a product, a standard puzzle where people can form an advertisement by placing pieces in the correct sequence, quizzes, memory challenges, and arcade games.

A study by Celtra (www.celtra.com) comparing interactive, gamified ads with banner and 30-second video spot ads found that engagement rates were 16.2% for game-like ads compared with 10.4% for traditional ads. More people took the time to view or interact with the games. Video play rates for the game-like ads were 36.4% compared to 11.7% for non-game ads. The gamified ads had a clickthrough rate of 28.8% compared with 3.9% for standard ads.

“A person looking for a challenge is potentially more open to the idea of spending 10 to 15 seconds playing something in an advertisement. This is especially true if the gamified promotion keeps track of the player’s performance over time and lets them compete on a leaderboard and move on to more difficult levels.”

Mat Klanjsek, Chief Product Officer
Celtra
Center for Media Research
Research Brief
41.4 Reward-Based Advertising

A study by Millward Brown (www.millwardbrown.com) and Session M (www.sessionm.com) tested the response to ads that offer rewards in their marketing content. The study postulated a value exchange equation to assess mobile advertising and found consumers were more likely to engage when brands offer them something for their time and attention. Comparative responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Response</th>
<th>Non-Reward-Based Advertising</th>
<th>Rewarded Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited a brand’s website:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicked/interacted with an ad:</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searched for brand online:</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered purchasing brand:</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for brand in store:</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited brand’s social page:</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Branding Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Reward-Based Advertising</th>
<th>Rewarded Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile ad awareness:</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided brand awareness:</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message association:</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View brand favorably:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intent:</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GREEN MARKETING

42.1 Impact On Consumer Spending

As more and more people “go green” – recycling, conserving energy, reducing consumption, buying eco-friendly products, etc. – companies’ green initiatives, or lack thereof, have become increasingly important.

The Green Gap Trend Tracker survey by Cone Communications (www.conecomm.com) found that 71% of American consumers routinely or sometimes consider the environment when making a purchasing decision.

In a survey by The Nielsen Company (www.nielsen.com), 34% of adults said that within the past 30 days they had purchased a product because they perceived it as environmentally responsible.

_________________________________________________________________

“Any way you cut it, green is big business. Sales of environmentally friendly products in the U.S. exceeded $40 billion last year. This includes $29.2 billion for organic food, more than $10 billion for hybrid, electric, and clean-diesel vehicles, more than $2 billion on energy-efficient light bulbs, and $640 million on green cleaning products.”

Advertising Age

_________________________________________________________________

According to Mintel (www.mintel.com), 12% of the U.S. population are True Greens, consumers who seek out and regularly buy green products; an additional 68% are Light Greens, or consumers who buy green sometimes.

While consumers are increasingly purchasing products with an environmental benefit, they are more reluctant to pay a premium for these items than they were a few years ago. Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com) found consumers’ willingness to pay more for green products as follows:
42.2 Green Initiatives

Nothing speaks more for a company’s eco-conscious commitment that its actions. Some operations have programs to purchase electric power generated by renewable sources, such as wind or solar, or to purchase credits that offset their carbon footprint. Others are focused on use of green materials and waste reduction.

Big-box retailers such as Target and Walmart have begun to require their private-label suppliers to reduce oversized and over-wrapped packaging. Everything from laundry detergent to cardboard boxes used for shipping cereal is being packaged in smaller containers. PVC packages have been replaced with recyclable material or eliminated entirely for some products. Walmart also has set a goal of producing “zero waste” by 2025, including all waste flowing through its stores and offices.

Companies also demonstrate their environmental concerns through the design and operation of their facilities. The most recognized designation for efficient buildings is the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC, www.usgbc.org). To be LEED-certified, buildings must earn points in five categories: sustainable sites, water efficiency, energy, materials and resources, and indoor environmental quality. As of July 2015, there were 53,900 LEED-certified and registered buildings in the U.S.

42.3 Credibility Of Green Marketing Claims

A survey by GfK (www.gfk.com) found that many consumers are confused by green marketing. Twenty-two percent (22%) of survey respondents said they don’t know if companies’ claims are accurate, and 10% said they don’t know how well businesses fulfill their responsibility to the environment. Among consumers who weren’t confused, more than 40% thought green claims were inaccurate.

In 1992, the Federal Trade Commission issued Green Guides (www.ftc.gov/news-events/media-resources/truth-advertising/green-guides) to help marketers ensure that the claims they make about the environmental attributes of their products are truthful and non-deceptive. The Green Guides have been revised four times, most recently in 2012.

The FTC has brought several actions in recent years related to deceptive recyclability, biodegradable, bamboo, and environmental certification claims as part of its overall effort to ensure that environmental marketing is truthful and substantiated.
42.4 Green Ad Agencies

Marketers are increasingly partnering with ad agencies who share philosophies on social changes, and larger companies looking to shift focus on new efforts are also using Green Teams to help develop ad campaigns.


A niche among advertising agencies just a few years ago, green agencies are increasing in number.

42.5 Market Resources


Green Marketing Coalition, c/o Hacker Group, 1215 4th Avenue, Suite 2100, Seattle, WA 98161. (www.greenmarketingcoalition.com)
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HISPANIC- & LATINO-AMERICAN MARKETING

43.1 Overview
The terms ‘Hispanic-American’ and ‘Latino-American’ are typically used interchangeably. Technically, however, Hispanic is a narrower term which mostly describes persons of Spanish-speaking origin or ancestry. Latino is used to refer more generally to anyone of Latin American origin or ancestry, including Brazilians.

Census 2010 counted 50.5 million people, or 16% of the total U.S. population, of Hispanic or Latino origin, a 43% increase from 10 years prior; the non-Hispanic population increased 5% during that period. The Hispanic-American population is projected to grow 167% from 2010 to 2050, compared to 42% for the total U.S. population.

43.2 Spending
2014 Annual Social and Economic Supplement, by the U.S. the Census Bureau (www.census.gov), reported median income among Hispanic or Latino households at $54,644; the median for all U.S. households was $72,641.

The Selig Center for Economic Growth at the University of Georgia (www.selig.uga.edu) estimated Hispanic-American buying power in 2014 at $1.33 trillion, or 10.2% of total U.S. spending.

According to the Consumer Expenditure Survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (www.bls.gov), Hispanic households spend more than the average non-Hispanic household on telephone services, men’s and boys’ clothing, children’s clothing, and footwear. Also, Hispanics spend a higher proportion of their money on food (groceries and restaurants), housing, utilities, and transportation. Hispanics spend about the same as non-Hispanics on housekeeping supplies, furniture, appliances, women’s and girls’ clothing, and personal care products and services. Compared to non-Hispanics, they spend substantially less on alcoholic beverages, healthcare, entertainment, reading materials, education, tobacco products, cash contributions, and personal insurance and pensions.

43.3 Multicultural Agencies
According to Advertising Age (May 2015), the following are the agencies with the highest revenue in Hispanic-American marketing:
• Lopez Negrete Communications (www.lopeznegrete.com): $42.3 million
• LatinWorks [Omnicom] (www.latinworks.com): $36.0 million
• Conill [Publicis] (www.conill.com): $34.5 million
• Bravo Group [WWP] (www.thinkbravo.com): $32.0 million
• Commonground/MGS (www.commongroundmgs.com): $28.5 million
• Alma DDB [Omnicom] (www.almaddb.com): $28.4 million
• GlobalHue (www.globalhue.com): $26.2 million
• Grupo Gallegos (www.grupogallegos.com): $26.0 million
• Dieste [Omnicom] (www.dieste.com): $21.2 million

### 43.4 Use Of Media

Weekly media consumption among Hispanic-Americans and, for comparison, non-Hispanics is as follows (source: comScore [www.comscore.com]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet (all screens)</td>
<td>8.7 hours</td>
<td>11.6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>8.3 hours</td>
<td>10.9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td>4.1 hours</td>
<td>3.6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio (including in-car)</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>3.9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>1.9 hours</td>
<td>2.0 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>1.7 hours</td>
<td>1.6 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pew Research Internet Project (www.pewinternet.org) found that 60% of Hispanic mobile Internet users go online mostly using their smartphone; 34% of the overall U.S. population do so.

“A look at Hispanics’ Internet access preferences ... found that the demographic’s device of choice for Internet usage was shifting to mobile. While the laptop was still the No. 1 device used to access the Internet among U.S. Hispanic Internet users, its share of users fell from 41% to 34% between 2013 and 2014. During the same timeframe, those who preferred mobile phones and smartphones rose from 22% to 26% – pushing the device type past desktop computers to second place.”

eMarketer, 3/12/15
A survey by comScore found that Hispanics are more receptive to online advertising than are non-Hispanics. Responses of each group are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to remember the brands I see advertised on my tablet than on offline media:</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to remember the brands I see advertised on my smartphone than on offline media:</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital customer reviews and posts from friends or fans have compelled me to further inquire about the product being discussed:</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If online advertising speaks to me, I am inclined to visit the website of the advertised brand:</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet ads have motivated me to visit a retail store for the product or service being advertised:</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually remember the brands I see advertised online, across all devices:</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think brands that advertise on digital platforms are more innovative than those that advertise offline:</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I remember the brands advertised on a viral video:</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 43.5 Hispanic Media Spending

Based on data from Kantar Media (www.kantarmedia.com), Advertising Age reported Hispanic major media spending in 2014 as follows:

- **Network TV:** $5.57 billion
- **Spot TV:** $1.39 billion
- **Newspapers:** $780 million
- **Internet:** $686 million
- **Spot radio:** $435 million
- **Magazines:** $331 million
- **Cable TV:** $252 million

The largest spenders in Hispanic media were as follows:

- Procter & Gamble: $371.6 million
- Genomma Lab International: $352.0 million
- Dish Network: $146.6 million
- McDonald’s: $130.9 million
- L’Oréal: $114.9 million
- AT&T: $109.6 million
- T-Mobile: $105.1 million
- Verizon: $101.9 million
- Guthy-Renker: $99.2 million
- General Motors: $98.6 million
- Walmart: $94.4 million
- Nissan: $92.5 million
- State Farm Mutual: $87.0 million
- Mars: $85.9 million
- Toyota: $85.0 million
- Sprint: $77.6 million
- SABMiller (MillerCoors): $72.3 million
- Anheuser-Busch InBev: $70.3 million
- Johnson & Johnson: $69.7 million
- Comcast: $68.6 million
- Univision: $60.8 million
- Church & Dwight: $59.9 million
- Constellation Brands: $59.8 million
- Allstate: $57.9 million
- Target: $55.5 million

### 43.6 Top Hispanic Media

Media usage among Hispanic households is as follows (sources: *Advertising Age* [August 2015], Arbitron, Cision, comScore, Media Economics Group, Nielsen):

#### Magazines
- *People en Español*: 923 ad pages
- *Latina*: 616 ad pages
- *TV y Novelas*: 397 ad pages
- *Vanidades*: 373 ad pages
- *Cosmopolitan en Español*: 272 ad pages
- *Cosmopolitan for Latinas*: 240 ad pages
- *Ser Padres*: 214 ad pages
- *Siempre Mujer*: 214 ad pages

#### Newspapers
- *El Nuevo Dia*: 190,099 circulation
- *Primera Hora*: 129,700 circulation
- *La Opinion*: 92,289 circulation
- *El Nuevo Herald*: 71,318 circulation
- *El Visitante Catolico*: 65,000 circulation
- *Hoy*: 62,000 circulation
- *El Bravo - Brownsville Edition*: 55,000 circulation
- *El Diario/La Prensa*: 52,780 circulation
- *El Mexicano*: 50,000 circulation
- *Diario Las Americas*: 47,390 circulation
Radio Stations
- KIIS-FM (Los Angeles): 2.06 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KBIG-FM (Los Angeles): 1.80 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KLVE-FM (Los Angeles): 1.76 million weekly cumulative listeners
- WSKQ-FM (New York): 1.66 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KAMP-FM (Los Angeles): 1.63 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KPWR-FM (Los Angeles): 1.61 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KOST-FM (Los Angeles): 1.59 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KLYY-FM (Los Angeles): 1.50 million weekly cumulative listeners
- WXNY-FM (New York): 1.46 million weekly cumulative listeners
- KSCA-FM (Los Angeles): 1.44 million weekly cumulative listeners

Social Networks
- Facebook: 32.43 million unique monthly visitors
- Google+: 18.14 million unique monthly visitors
- Twitter: 16.10 million unique monthly visitors
- LinkedIn: 16.02 million unique monthly visitors
- Tumblr: 12.58 million unique monthly visitors
- Pinterest: 10.13 million unique monthly visitors
- Goodreads: 2.88 million unique monthly visitors

Spanish-Language Cable Networks
- Galavisión: 69.4% of all Hispanic TV households
- NBC Universo: 50.2% of all Hispanic TV households
- Univision Deportes: 47.2% of all Hispanic TV households
- Fox Deportes: 41.3% of all Hispanic TV households
- ESPN Deportes: 38.6% of all Hispanic TV households
- BeIN Sport Español: 32.0% of all Hispanic TV households
- Discovery en Español: 28.3% of all Hispanic TV households
- Discovery Familia: 26.3% of all Hispanic TV households
- National Geographic Mundo: 23.2% of all Hispanic TV households
- Fox Life: 18.9% of all Hispanic TV households

TV Networks
- Univision: 1.37 million households
- Telemundo: 938 million households
- ABC: 384 million households
- NBC: 316 million households
- UniMás: 271 million households
- CBS: 286 million households
- Fox: 229 million households
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“Fifty-seven million Latinos are a mighty market for media.”

The Economist, 3/14/15

43.7 Market Resources
Center for Hispanic Marketing Communications, Florida State University, 3127, Building C, FSU University Center, Tallahassee, FL 32306. (http://hmc.comm.fsu.edu/)


The Multicultural Economy, The Selig Center for Economic Growth at the University of Georgia, 2015. (www.terry.uga.edu/selig/buying_power.html)
44.1 Market Assessment

BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com) forecasts total local media advertising and marketing spending to reach $139.3 billion in 2015, up 1.6% from $137.0 billion in 2014. Revenues for online/digital are expected to grow from $31 billion in 2014 to $35 billion in 2015, representing a 13.1% growth rate and accounting for 25.2% of total local media spending.

Borrell Associates (www.borrellassociates.com) assesses local ad spending in 2015 at $114.9 billion, distributed as follows:

- Digital: $47.8 billion
- Newspaper: $14.6 billion
- Broadcast TV: $11.0 billion
- Radio: $10.9 billion
- Direct mail: $8.1 billion
- Magazines: $7.3 billion
- Directories: $6.4 billion
- Cable TV: $3.8 billion
- Cinema: $3.7 billion
- Outdoor: $1.3 billion

Digital ad spending has been as follows:

- 2010: $12.8 billion
- 2011: $15.4 billion
- 2012: $18.7 billion
- 2013: $24.5 billion
- 2014: $33.6 billion
- 2015: $47.8 billion

Local digital ad spending is distributed as follows:

- Paid search: 33%
- Display, run-of-site: 27%
- Display, targeted: 21%
- Streaming video: 15%
- Email: 3%
- Streaming audio: 2%
“According to research from Borrell Associates ... digital advertising at the local level will grow 42% this year [and will] account for $2 out of every $5 spent by local advertisers. It’s grown to the level of dominance that newspapers enjoyed for years, until the late 1990s.”

Center for Media Research, 2/12/15

44.2 Local Online Directories

According to Search Engine Land, the top 30 local online directories received approximately 160 million visits monthly during the first five months of 2015. Yelp (www.yelp.com) saw approximately one-half of this traffic. There was a 35% decline in traffic to the top online directories between January 2013 and January 2015, in large part due to the efficiency of searches using Yelp.

“Yelp’s visit numbers are almost the same as the other 29 sites combined. This really shows the impact of Yelp’s investment in its service. Yelp has grown and nurtured a loyal review-writing audience, which has allowed it to build the most comprehensive set of online reviews for local businesses. In turn, it has secured significant distribution deals with Yahoo and Apple Maps. This, along with establishing itself as a household name brand, has meant its user numbers have remained high and growing while those around it flounder.”

Search Engine Land, 6/30/15
Quantcast (www.quantcast.com) reported the number of visitors to local directory websites in April 2015 as follows:

- yelp.com: 79,265,872
- whitepages.com: 25,855,412
- mapquest.com: 14,407,229
- yellowpages.com: 13,930,973
- bbb.org: 7,999,419
- local.com: 6,007,765
- angieslist.com: 2,857,398
- superpages.com: 2,535,330
- manta.com: 1,830,585
- switchboard.com: 644,418

### 44.3 Top Local Search Categories

The July 2015 *Local Media Tracking Study* by the Local Search Association (www.thelsa.org) ranked the most-searched categories as follows:

- Restaurants
- Supermarkets
- Physicians
- Beauty salons
- Pizza
- Clothing
- Auto repair
- Food products
- Pharmacies
- Auto parts
- Banks
- Discount stores
- Plumbing contractors
- Auto dealers
- Service stations
- Shoe stores
- Electrical equipment
- Internet
- E-merchant services
- Dentists
- Hardware stores
- Department stores
- Furniture
- Hotels
- Theaters
- Tire dealers
- Home Improvement
44.4 Local Marketing By National Brands

According to Balihoo (www.balihoo.com), 88% of national brands in North America spend some portion of their budget on local marketing. The percentage of marketing budgets allocated to local marketing is as follows:

- None: 12%
- 1% to 5%: 29%
- 6% to 10%: 14%
- 11% to 15%: 8%
- 16% to 20%: 7%
- 21% to 25%: 8%
- 25% or more: 21%

BIA/Kelsey estimates national brands will spend $50.5 billion on local media in 2015, growing to $68 billion by 2018.

“The rapid rise of mobile, geotargeting and marketing automation has made it possible for local marketing to scale in unprecedented ways for national brands, franchises and multi-location businesses.”

Peter Krasilovsky, Vice President
BIA/Kelsey, 2/10/15

44.5 Market Resources

Local Search Association, 820 Kirtts Boulevard, Suite 100, Troy, MI 48084.
(248) 244-6200. (www.thelsa.org)
LOYALTY PROGRAMS

45.1 Participation

According to 2015 Colloquy Loyalty Census, by Colloquy (www.colloquy.com), there are 3.3 billion loyalty memberships in the United States. The average American household holds memberships in 29 loyalty programs spread among the retail, financial services, travel, and various other sectors – but is active in only 12 of them. The number of memberships by sector are as follows:

Retail
- Specialty retail: 433.5 million
- Drug store: 267.6 million
- Department store: 229.6 million
- Grocery: 169.7 million
- Mass merchant: 164.3 million
- Fuel & convenience store: 24.5 million

Travel & Hospitality
- Airline: 355.9 million
- Hotel: 288.7 million
- Gaming: 156.5 million
- Restaurant: 54.8 million
- Cruise and car rental: 44.9 million

Financial: 577.9 million

2015 Loyalty Report, by Bond Brand Loyalty (https://bondbrandloyalty.com), reported that U.S. consumers participate in an average of 6.7 loyalty programs.
“Consumers have a finite capacity in terms of the number of programs and brands with which they can actively engage.”

2015 Loyalty Report
Bond Brand Loyalty

Promo Magazine estimates annual spending for loyalty program development and implementation at $2.0 billion. This figure does not include the value of program rewards.

45.2 Customer Incentives

Technology Advice (www.technologyadvice.com) found in its survey of loyalty program members reasons for participation as follows (percentage of respondents):
- Save money: 58%
- Receive rewards: 38%

When asked their preference for type of program, responses were as follows:
- Card-based: 37%
- Digital: 33%
- Either: 30%

Pulse Of The Online Shopper, published in March 2015 by UPS (www.ups.com), reported the most valuable loyalty benefits as follows (percentage of respondents):
- Free product, gift certificate, or cash back for frequent purchases: 61%
- Product discounts: 58%
- Free shipping: 57%
- Exclusive access to sales, promotions, and new products: 30%
- Low-cost one- or two-day shipping: 15%
- Convenience or higher priority service: 8%
- Elevated status: 7%
- Personalization - knowing customer upon sign-on: 7%
- Customized recommendations based on shopping preferences: 6%
45.3 Effectiveness

According to Bond Brand Loyalty’s 2015 Loyalty Report, 86% of consumers feel that loyalty programs are worth participating in. Eighty-three percent (83%) say that programs make them more likely to continue doing business with certain companies and 49% say they spend more with brands than before their loyalty program membership.

In a survey by the Chief Marketing Officer Council (www.cmocouncil.org), 69% of respondents said most of their experience with loyalty programs has been “pretty good,” and 10% said they’ve been “very satisfied.” Half said a program membership either “strongly motivates my repeat business or visits” (21%) or is “usually a big factor in my decision-making” (30%). The survey also found that 32% of respondents felt that program participation held little to no value, and 37% felt individual rewards had even less to offer by way of value.

Loyalty Programs: A Cross-Industry Analysis of Usage and Effectiveness, a report by the Direct Marketing Association (www.the-dma.com), provides the following assessment of loyalty programs:

- Seventy percent (70%) of loyalty programs offer free enrollment to their customers; 16% tier their fee structure and rewards program.
- The use of loyalty programs in the financial services sector is on the rise, due in part to the expanded range of premium reward card products designed to build loyalty among affluent consumers. These card products provide extensive experiential reward benefits and are often co-marketed with other luxury brands.
- Among retail and department store loyalty programs, member upgrades are the rewards most likely to be redeemed.
- Seventy-four percent (74%) of supermarket and grocery store loyalty programs use face-to-face interactions to invite customers into loyalty programs, making it the most used channel in that segment.
- Sixty-five percent (65%) of hotel and restaurant loyalty programs have a proprietary loyalty program in place, rewarding customers with their own products/services.
- Sixty-seven percent (67%) of catalog merchants offer their loyalty programs for free; one quarter charge different membership fees depending on the level of the program, and less than 10% charge a one-time nominal fee to customers who join.

Among the most popular loyalty programs is Amazon Prime, which guarantees free two-day shipping on most orders with no purchase minimum and streamed access to tens of thousands of TV shows and movies. Amazon Prime had 50 million members at year-end 2014; annual membership is $99.
“How important are loyalty programs to regular customers of the ecommerce giant? If their purchasing habits are any indication, then very. Prime members spend more. While non-Prime customers said they had purchased items with prices below $25 and between $25 and $100, Prime members are throwing down money for bigger ticket values. The disparity between the two groups’ purchasing habits showed most starkly beginning at the $201 mark, where 18% of Prime members compared with only 8% of non-Prime customers.”

eMarketer, 12/15/14

45.4 Sector Assessment

By sector, Bond Brand Loyalty’s 2015 Loyalty Report reported the following percentages of members were very satisfied with loyalty programs:

- Casual dining restaurant: 52%
- Retail: 45%
- Entertainment: 45%
- Quick-service restaurant: 41%
- Consumer packaged goods: 31%

According to WSL Strategic Retail (www.wslstrategicretail.com), loyalty programs targeting high-income consumers see greater participation. Compared with 58% of those with incomes below $50,000, 93% of shoppers with household incomes above $100,000 participate in loyalty programs.

Many retailers are restructuring their loyalty programs with tiered membership levels. By exceeding spending thresholds members achieve elite status and associated perks. The highest reward level for Sephora’s Beauty Insider program, for example, gives free shipping, early access to new products and sales, and VIP event invites for shoppers who spend $1,000 or more in a year. At Nordstrom, making it into the upper tiers requires $2,000, $5,000, or $10,000 in annual spending. At Best Buy, Premier Silver status goes to those spending at least $2,500 in a year.
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NAMING RIGHTS

46.1 Overview
Naming rights for venues is a relatively modern concept, an idea conceived to help facilities raise new capital for construction and operations. The concept was developed with the naming of professional sports venues during the late 1980s. It has spread over the past decade to venues of all types, such as college sports venues, performing arts and concert venues, convention centers, and other facilities. Deal-makers include banks and financial institutions – which maintain about a third of naming-rights deals – energy companies, insurers, airlines, telecoms, auto companies, quick-service restaurants, brewers, and software makers.

46.2 Sports Stadiums And Arenas
According to *SportsBusiness Journal*, $6.7 billion has been committed to naming-rights deals for new facilities of the NBA, NFL, NHL, MLB, and MLS. An additional $500 million is committed for college and minor league venues. Many of the deals have 20-year and 30-year terms.

The following are the largest naming-rights deals among stadiums and arenas (source: *SportsBusiness Journal*):

- Barclays Center (Brooklyn): $400 million; 20 years ending 2031
- Citi Field (New York City): $400 million; 20 years ending 2028
- Reliant Stadium (Houston): $300 million; 30 years ending 2032
- SunTrust Park (Atlanta): $250 million; 25 years ending 2042
- Gillette Field (Foxboro, Massachusetts): $240 million; 15 years ending 2031
- FedEx Field (Landover, Maryland): $207 million; 27 years ending 2025
- Philips Arena (Atlanta): $185 million; 20 years ending 2019
- American Airlines Center (Dallas): $195 million; 30 years ending 2030
- Minute Maid Park (Houston): $178 million; 28 years ending 2029
- University of Phoenix Stadium (Glendale, AZ): $154 million; 20 years ending 2025
- Bank of America Stadium (Charlotte): $140 million; 20 years ending 2023
- Lincoln Financial Field (Philadelphia): $140 million; 20 years ending 2022
- Nationwide Arena (Columbus, Ohio): $135 million; indefinite
- Invesco Field at Mile High (Denver): $120 million; 20 years ending 2027
- Lucas Oil Stadium (Indianapolis): $122 million; 20 years ending 2027
- TD Garden (Boston): $119 million; 20 years ending 2025


- Staples Center (Los Angeles): $116 million; 20 years ending 2019
- Prudential Center (Newark, New Jersey): $105 million; 20 years ending 2027
- Citizens Bank Park (Philadelphia): $ 95 million; 25 years ending 2029
- Toyota Center (Houston): $ 95 million; 20 years ending 2023
- FedEx Forum (Memphis): $ 90 million; 22 years ending 2024

46.3 Municipal Facilities

Faced with financial shortfalls during the economic downturn, cities throughout the United States increasingly turned to naming-rights deals as a means to generate extra revenue.

“Dozens of financially struggling cities, transit systems, and school districts around the country are trying to weather the economic downturn by selling ads, naming rights, and sponsorships to raise money. Such marketing schemes have long been used by sports teams and some arts organizations. But now, straphangers in Philadelphia buy fare cards blazoned with ads for McDonald’s and ride the Broad Street Line to AT&T Station (formerly Pattison Station), where the turnstiles bear the company’s familiar blue and white globe. Such naming deals have grown more popular with advertisers as they try to reach consumers who have grown more adept at tuning out commercials, whether with remote controls or digital video recorders.”

The New York Times

The following are examples of naming-rights deals implemented or considered by some U.S. cities:
- KFC became a pioneer in unconventional ad placement early in the economic downturn by putting its logo on manhole covers and fire hydrants in several cities in Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee after paying to fill potholes and replace hydrants.
As a growing number of states allow school districts to sell ads, pizza chains have advertised on some school buses.

After announced plans to close three fire companies in Baltimore and at the urging of the firefighter’s union, the Baltimore City Council passed a resolution urging the administration to explore ads on the city’s fire trucks.

The police department in Littleton, Massachusetts, launched an “advertise with the good guys” program that raised money from a local supermarket chain to pay for new police cars in exchange for ad space on their fenders and trunks.

The town of Tyngsborough, Massachusetts, considered selling ads to raise money for its fleet of police cars. The proposal was ultimately rejected.

Minneapolis, Minnesota, ran anti-smoking ads on the hose covers of some fire trucks.

In Phoenix, Arizona, local healthcare providers sponsor safety messages on several fire trucks, with proceeds going to a charity run by the firefighters’ union that help the victims of fires, local children, and the poor.

The sale of naming rights for public spaces has its pundits.

“We are bombarded by ads everywhere we go, and these are public spaces meant to be reflective of the values of our society, co-opted by the private sector.”

Elizabeth Ben-Ishai, Coordinator
Public Citizen’s Commercial Alert
The New York Times

46.4 Transit Systems
Faced with shrinking state support and budgetary shortfalls, increasing ridership, and an estimated $77.7 billion shortfall just to get to a state of good repair, transit systems across the nation are selling the naming rights of systems, facilities, and stations. The following are some examples:

- Cleveland named its new Bus Rapid Transit system the HealthLine after it received $6.25 million (over 25 years) from the Cleveland Clinic and University Hospitals.
- In Brooklyn, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority is being paid $4 million over 20 years for naming rights to the Atlantic Avenue subway stop.
- The Chicago Transit Authority sold the naming rights of 11 “L” stations.
“All we’re ever looking for is not only to do something good for the community, but to find another place for eyeballs to be looking at things.”

Jody Berg, Principal
Media Works
The New York Times
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PERSONALIZATION

47.1 Marketing Priority

In a survey by Ecoconsultancy (www.ecoconsultancy.com), marketing executives ranked “making the shopping experience as personalized as possible” as the #1 area of focus for 2015.

_________________________________________________________________

“Personalization is the name of the game this year.”

eMarketer, 2/13/15

_________________________________________________________________

Ecoconsultancy found that 95% of campaigns that had implemented personalization via offline channels experienced an increase in conversion rates. Still, just 23% of marketers personalized offline channels, compared with 88% who personalized emails and 44% who did so for websites.

47.2 Personalization Tactics

In a survey by Forrester Consulting (www.forrester.com), marketers reported using the following personalization tactics (percentage of respondents):

- Use personalization based on broad segmentation and simple clustering techniques to execute campaigns across digital channels: 86%
- Use personalization based on simple business rules and execute campaigns across digital channels: 83%
- Personalize products, offers, and content based on the collective insights of users with similar preferences: 81%
- Use real-time, self-learning analytics to drive personalization across digital channels: 71%
- Use artificial intelligence algorithms to personalize interactions across digital channels: 57%
47.3 Implementation

In a survey by Conversant (www.conversantmedia.com), senior-level marketers identified the top benefits of personalized media programs as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Increased repeat purchases: 60%
- Improved response rate: 56%
- Stronger brand perceptions: 56%
- Increased sales: 55%
- Increased product trials: 46%

The following are the top challenges:

- Higher media costs: 54%
- Increased marketing/management complexity: 50%
- High creative development costs: 50%
- Creative issues: 41%
- Difficulty measuring campaign effectiveness: 34%

According to a survey by Infogroup (www.infogroup.com), 12% of marketers always customize messaging for each channel based on data insights, 42% do so often, and 46% rarely or never customize messaging for each channel.

Marketers are executing personalized marketing campaigns in the following channels:

- Email: 65%
- Direct mail: 64%
- Website: 40%
- Social media: 27%
- Telemarketing: 19%
- Print: 18%
- Display ads: 17%
- Mobile ads/apps: 13%
- Text messaging: 11%
- None: 6%
“Personalization is one of the key goals of data-driven marketing, but despite large uptake, marketers still aren’t taking full advantage of customer information. Marketers are most likely to personalize email and direct mail campaigns, each used by nearly two-thirds. However, popular channels such as websites and social media are used far less frequently, and display and mobile ads didn’t even break one-fifth of respondents.”

eMarketer, 3/18/15

47.4 Customer Response To Personalization

In a February 2015 survey by MyBuys (www.mybuys.com), consumers reported the following responses to cross-channel personalization (percentage of respondents):

- Likely to engage with a new brand and purchase when they saw online ads for products they were interested in based on current and past purchases: 52%
- Purchased more from retailers that served personalized ads promoting offers and products from past website visits: 49%
- Purchased more from retailers that served personalized emails based on past browsing and buying behavior: 48%
- Feel that receiving a consistently personalized shopping experience from one channel to the next is an important omnichannel retail capability: 47%

The following are attitudes toward cross-channel personalization retailers (percentage of respondents):

- Willing to allow retailers to use personal information gleaned from in-store purchases to provide a more personalized experience: 78%
- Feel that retailers who factor in-store purchases in their marketing deliver a superior shopping experience: 53%
- Want retailers to take into account in-store purchases in their marketing to deliver a more personalized shopping experience online and in-store: 49%
• Expect retailers to take into account shopping interests and behaviors from every channel to deliver the best overall shopping experience: 45%

“Advertisers need to go the distance with personalization. This means bridging the online-offline gap. Respondents [to the MyBuys survey] expressed a desire for retailers to apply data gathered in-store to every channel so that they receive a personalized experience no matter their shopping location.”

eMarketer, 3/12/15
PRICING

48.1 Overview

Along with product, promotion, and place, pricing is one of the Four Ps of the classic marketing mix.

A recent survey by The NPD Group (www.npd.com) asked consumers what factors they considered extremely important in deciding where to shop. Responses were as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Price: 85%
- Sales and special deals: 75%
- Convenience of location: 60%
- Ease of shopping: 60%
- Customer service: 56%

_________________________________________________________________

"Price trumps sales and special deals, customer service, and convenience as a factor in deciding where to shop for the majority of U.S. consumers. Eighty-five percent of consumers say the price needs to be right before they shop."

The NPD Group

_________________________________________________________________

In a survey of Millennials (ages 18-to-34) by IRI (www.iriworldwide.com), item price ranked as the #1 influencer of brand selection, ahead of previous usage and trust of brands, shopper loyalty cards, and advertising. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of survey respondents said price was among the two top influencers.

Retailers must strike a balance between offering prices that are attractive to customers, yet still provide themselves with a reasonable margin. Underpricing can drastically cut into a company’s bottom line.
“Companies leave millions of dollars on the table every year through sub-optimal pricing practices. The current abundance of customer data, in the context of increased global competition and the instant information sharing made possible by the Internet, requires companies to not only set the right prices, but to continually monitor and refine pricing.”

UC Berkeley Pricing for Profitability

Brands hurt their profits the most when deals that should be targeted just to price-sensitive shoppers also reach others who would pay full price without them.

48.2 Consumer Price Sensitivity

Dunnhumby USA (www.dunnhumby.com) has found that about 60% of consumers are price sensitive. Dunnhumby identifies price-sensitive shoppers based on how frequently they use coupons, how much they consistently purchase lower-price items, and how often they buy items on promotion. Income is only slightly correlated to price sensitivity.

The Electronic Retailing Association (www.retailing.org) estimates 70% of consumers are price sensitive.

“According to the Electronic Retailing Association blog, collecting and synthesizing research from several respectable sources, 70% of the U.S. population will not buy your brand without a discount simply because they cannot afford to do so.”

Center for Media Intelligence
Research Brief, 6/29/15
Time reported that 40% of items purchased by consumers are at some discount, an increase from 10% of sales in 1990 that were discounted.

“There’s not a weekend where an average specialty retailer in the mall is not offering some kind of 30% to 40% off deal. It certainly feels like the consumer is not shopping unless there’s some kind of deal attached to it. And it’s very hard to pull back when the consumer gets used to buying things on sale.”

_Bloomberg Businessweek_

48.3 In-Store Vs. Online Pricing

Since 2011, Anthem Marketing Solution (www.anthemedge.com) has conducted semiannual analyses of in-store and online pricing trends.

In the first 2015 assessment, 71% of items reviewed were found at the same price online and offline. Where pricing differed, 65% of online prices were lower; 35% of in-store prices were lower.

In the Hardware/Home Improvement category, 90% of items had the same price both offline and online. The Beauty category had highest proportion of items priced lower online. Office/School Supplies was the only category with an offline price edge. Pharmacy retailers had lowest level of pricing consistency across channels.

48.4 Dynamic Pricing

Dynamic pricing, also called market-based pricing and variable pricing, adjusts prices based on demand. It was introduced by airlines in the 1980s when carriers began shifting capacity by offering discounts on full fare prices. Most travelers today are aware that fares fluctuate with demand. The dynamic pricing model is also popular in professional sports ticketing. Most MLB, NBA, NFL, and NHL teams adjust single-game ticket prices – up or down – as late as game day.

Dynamic pricing took hold in online retail in 2012 when Amazon and online sites for Best Buy, Kmart, Kohl’s, Sears, Target, Walmart, and other major retailers began regularly changed pricing based on demand and competitors’ discounting. The most aggressive sellers adjust prices in 10-to-15-minute windows.
“Retail price wars online have entered a new era of speed and precision, creating a confusing landscape for shoppers in which prices leap and plummet on short notice. In the old days, merchants sent employees into competitors’ stores to check on pricing, and days later ‘sale’ signs reflected new markdowns. Now, sophisticated computer programs accomplish the same goal online within hours, and even minutes.”

The New York Times

A host of monitoring services and software tools is available to guide online retailers in their pricing. Providers of these services and tools include the following:

- 360pi (www.360pi.com)
- Competitor Monitor (www.competitormonitor.com)
- Dynamite Data (www.dynamitedata.com)
- Mercent (www.mercent.com)
- Monzenda (www.monzenda.com)
- OpSec (www.opsecsecurity.com)
- PriceManager (www.pricemanager.com)
- Profitero (www.profitero.com)
- Upstream Commerce (www.upstreamcommerce.com)
- WisePricer (www.wisepricer.com)

48.5 Price Matching

DealScience (www.dealscience.com), a company that ranks online deals from thousands of retail brands, found that at least 20% of big-box retailers have price-matching policies, though many do not advertise them. The practice is commonplace for home and sporting goods and electronics, but even higher-end merchants like Nordstrom have price-matching guidelines. Some retailers including Best Buy, Home Depot and Lowe’s let managers go a step better than price matching by offering 10% below a competitor’s price.

While retailers dislike price matching, once one retailer offers to do it, rivals feel compelled to follow. Because price equivalences are not always simple to ascertain, matching policies vary. Best Buy, for instance, lets customers match prices if the rival
store is within a 25-mile radius, while Walmart lets store managers decide how far and wide price-matching applies.

BDO USA (www.bdo.com) found that 18% of retailers considered price matching to be their most successful promotional strategy in 2015, an increase from 10% who said this in 2014.

_________________________________________________________________

“Price-matching policies make sense when one considers how easy digital has made it for consumers to check prices.”

emarketer, 3/13/15

_________________________________________________________________

A survey by PricewaterhouseCoopers (www.pwc.com) found making price comparisons to be the second most popular shopping-related digital activity among consumers, trailing product research by only one percentage point.

Recognizing that their strongest competition is online retailers, not nearby stores, some retailers have expanded their price-matching. During the holiday season, for example, Best Buy matched the prices of any online competitor if customers showed proof of the lower price. With such bold policies, price-matching is morphing into pricing negotiations with customers.

The New York Times reported that when a shopper asked at Nordstrom and Bloomingdale’s if the retailers were open to bargaining, sales representatives and managers at both stores said yes without hesitation. And, at Kohl’s, when a shopper asked for a 15% discount, the answer was yes.

According to Alison Kenny Paul, vice chairwoman and leader of the retail and distribution practice at Deloitte (www.deloitte.com), some retailers are training employees on the rules of bargaining. While it is mainly department or floor managers who are given the authority to make deals, other employees are now being coached to recognize when a consumer needs to negotiate and to spot the consumer getting ready to walk out the door.
“Armed with increasingly sophisticated price-tracking tools on their smartphones and other devices, consumers have become bolder, and they know that they often have the upper hand during a tough season for retailers. Recognizing the new reality, some retailers, desperate for sales and customer loyalty, have begun training their employees in the art of bargaining with customers.”

_The New York Times_

---

### 48.6 Personalized Pricing

Using customers’ buying profiles, either from their online purchase history or loyalty program in-store purchases, retailers are able to make intelligent guesses about what customers will want to buy next, when they will want it, and how much they will be willing to pay. Retailers, particularly in the supermarket sector, are using customers’ buying history logged with their loyalty program purchases to customize coupon promotions for individuals. Promotions are then tailored to the customer profiles.

---

“For the past decade, e-commerce sites have altered prices based on your Web habits and personal attributes. What is your geography and your past buying history? How did you arrive at the e-commerce site? What time of day are you visiting? An entire literature has emerged on the ethics, legality and economic promise of pricing optimization.”

_Scientific American_
Supermarkets offer personalized prices via smartphone apps and loyalty card swipes. A mobile app identifies shoppers when they scan products through their frequent shopper number or phone number and creates special e-coupons on the spot. The apps also use a shopper’s location in store aisles to personalize offers.

“As more supermarkets experiment with personalized pricing, the more likely it becomes that you and the shopper standing next to you will pay two different prices for the same quart of milk. Same store, same milk, different prices.”

ABC News

A survey by RetailWire (www.retailwire.com) found that marketers rank personalized pricing/promotion as the #1 pricing strategy in combating problems caused by pricing transparency.

48.7 Pricing Market Research

Market research companies offer two general types of pricing studies: those which determine acceptance of a product or service sold at a specified price, and those which determine the possible effect on demand of different price levels (i.e., elasticity).

A directory of companies that provide pricing consulting studies is available online at www.greenbook.org/market-research-firms/price-research.

48.8 Pricing Research Centers

Columbia University, Center for Pricing and Revenue Management, Uris Hall, Room 408, New York, NY 10027. (212) 851-5815. (http://www7.gsb.columbia.edu/cprm/)

Fordham University Pricing Center, Graduate School of Business, 113 West 60th Street, New York, NY 10023. (212) 636-6296. (www.fordham.edu/cba/pricecenter/)

Rochester University Center for Pricing, Simon Business School, Schlegel Hall, Rochester, NY 14627. (585) 276-3381. (www.simon.rochester.edu/about-simon/centers-for-excellence/the-center-for-pricing/index.aspx)
49.1 Market Assessment
Overall spending on consumer promotions is estimated at $50 billion annually.
This chapter provides a review of types and methods of promotions and identifies leading agencies serving this field. Specific types of promotion are assessed elsewhere in this handbook, as follows:
• Coupons (Chapter 29)
• Loyalty programs (Section 25)
• Shopper marketing and in-store promotions (Chapter 51)

49.2 Types of Promotions
Promotions involve the use of incentives designed to stimulate the purchase or sale of a product, usually in the short term.
Types of premium promotions include the following (source: Promotional Products Association International [PPMI, www.ppai.org]):
Account opener
• Premium given to customers as a reward or thank you for opening an account.
Advance premium
• Premium given to new customers on condition they will earn it by later purchases.
Award
• Recognition merchandise, often personalized, used to acclaim performance or milestones; may be useful objects (e.g., paperweights, clocks) or for display only (e.g., plaques, trophies).
Bonded premium
• Point-of-purchase premium attached to a product.
Collectibles
• Premiums designed to have inherent value based upon their perceived collectibility.
Commemorative
• A merchandise keepsake used to mark a ceremony, anniversary, event, or milestone.
Container premium
• A product container, which when empty, may be used as a container for other items. These items are usually partially or completely self-liquidating since the consumer pays for the product.

Continuity premiums
• A series of related premiums offered over a period of six to eight weeks.

Direct premium
• An item given free with a purchase at the time of the purchase. These include on-packs, in-packs, and container premiums as well as those given separately.

Door opener
• An item of value offered by a salesperson to persuade potential buyers to listen to a sales presentation or to initiate interest in a product or service for a sales call follow-up.

Giveaway
• Direct premium given free of charge or obligation to generate awareness and goodwill.

Incentive
• Reward for a purchase or performance.

In-pack
• A premium offered inside a product package.

Keeper
• A premium offered in direct-mail marketing for accepting a free trial of the merchandise and to be kept by the consumer even if the trial item is returned.

On-pack
• A direct premium attached to the exterior of a product package or sometimes riding with it in a special sleeve, carton, or film wrap.

Premium
• A product or service offered free or at a reduced price if the recipient performs some task, such as purchasing an item.

Prize
• Reward given to winner in a contest, sweepstakes, or lottery, sometimes referred to as a sales incentive award.
Referral premium
• A premium offered to customers for helping to sell a product or service to friends or associates.

49.3 Methods of Promotions
The PPMI classifies promotional methods as follows:

Bounce back
• An advertisement sent along with an already ordered self-liquidating premium to sell other premiums on a self-liquidating basis.

Combination sale
• A tie-in of a premium with a purchase at combination prices; sometimes self-liquidating; often an on-pack.

Contest
• A competition based on skill, in which prizes are offered.

Continuity program
• An offer of products over time.

Direct mail
• A mailing of a package, other print collateral, or materials that are targeted directly to a predefined list of customers.

Marketing mix
• Combining marketing elements, including advertising, promotional products, direct mail, and public relations into one cohesive marketing program.

Perceived value
• What someone believes merchandise to be worth. To successfully sell premiums, the consumer must be convinced the proposed premium is worth putting forth the extra effort required to earn the item.

Traffic builder
• A promotional product or premium designed to get consumers to come to a store or a trade show.

49.4 Promotions Agencies
According to Advertising Age (May 2015), the following are the largest promotions agencies:
• IN Marketing Services (www.inmarketingservices.com): $352 million
• Freeman (www.freemanco.com): $246 million
• MarketStar [Omnicom] (www.marketstar.com): $216 million
• Geometry Global (www.geometry.com): $190 million
• Catapult [Epsilon] (www.catapultrpm.com): $171 million
• The Marketing Arm [Omnicom] (www.themarketingarm.com): $165 million
• Integer Group [Omnicom] (www.integer.com): $158 million
• Momentum Worldwide [Interpublic] (www.momentumww.com): $147 million
• George P. Johnson (www.georgepjohnson.com): $145 million
• GMR Marketing [Omnicom] (www.gmrmarketing.com): $138 million

49.5 Market Resources
Brand Activation Association, formerly the Promotion Marketing Association, 650 First Avenue, Suite 2-SW, New York, NY 10016. (212) 420-1100. (www.baalink.org)

Promotional Products Association International (PPMI), 3125 Skyway Circle North, Irving, TX 75038. (888) 426-7724. (www.ppai.org)
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SAMPLING

50.1 Overview

The Communications Industry Forecast, by Veronis Suhler Stevenson (www.vss.com), estimates total annual spending on sampling at $2.2 billion.

“\text{The food and beverage industry alone spends upward to $1 billion annually on product sampling. In the end, it’s all about getting the right sample in the right person’s hands – or mouth.}”

\textit{USA Today}

It is estimated that about 70 million consumers every quarter receive some type of sample while shopping, with one-third of those who have sampled buying the product during the same shopping trip.

50.2 Cost-Effectiveness

Advocates of sampling point to a simple reason for the sampling boom: It works. According to Scott Thurston, president of Street Sampling (www.streetsampling.com), a giveaway of 50,000 samples typically requires about 250 man hours, or about $15,000 to $20,000 in labor. This translates to a cost of 30¢ to 40¢ per sample, a relatively low cost considering the level of engagement which is achieved.

Still, marketers are craftily tailoring sampling programs more tightly these days with more narrowly focused markets.
“Long gone are the days when a brand is doling out three million to five million samples at a time. It’s become more expensive to get a sample out [so marketers are looking to maximize results.]”

Cindy Johnson, President
Sampling Effectiveness Advisors

Research by Arcature (www.arcature.com) has found that 80% of consumers prefer a free sample to a coupon, and one-third would be willing to come back and pay for something they had sampled and liked.

50.3 Venues
Sampling is most commonly associates with food samples offered in supermarkets and mall food courts. Sampling of beauty products and fragrances in retail stores is also popular. A recent trend is to offer samples at out-of-store venues. The following are some examples (source: PromoWorks [www.promoworks.com]):
• Cinemas
• Concerts and music performances
• Direct-to-door sampling
• Festivals
• Night clubs
• Office intercept sampling
• Parking lot events
• Sidewalk and street locations
• Social networks
• Sports events at stadiums and arenas

SoBe Lifewater promoted its zero-calorie drink at three nightclubs in Miami’s South Beach on New Year’s Eve. Users of valet service at the clubs returned to their vehicles to find full-size bottles of the beverage along with branded floor mats. Each beverage came with a message card from SoBe reminding people to hydrate themselves after a busy night on the town.

Splenda debuted through Facebook a new mist-spray sweetener in a unique campaign blending interactive engagement with sampling. Facebook users were directed to the Spenda Mist page where they provided their name, address, and email to be able to receive a “first look” at the new product. In addition to the contact info,
metrics such as age and gender were also available to Splenda. An added boost in the campaign came when people became a fan of the product, which triggered a feed that was then viewable by each user’s Facebook friend.

Events where products are sampled at home are on the rise. Firms like House Party, which partners brands with pre-screened hosts who throw in-home sampling parties, are doubling their event bookings year-over-year. A relatively new spin on the in-home experience is meal-assembly parties that pair meal prep with samples of food products. Brands like Juicy Juice, Tabasco, General Mills, and Martha Stewart have each become partnered with meal-assembly programs.
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SHOPPER [IN-STORE] MARKETING

51.1 Overview
Shopper marketing is the study of how shoppers behave in the store – to which marketers respond with various efforts aimed at influencing decision-making and buying.

Booz & Co. (www.booz.com) estimates annual manufacturer investment in shopper marketing at $45 billion. Spending is increasing 15% annually.

“Shopper marketing is both a new discipline and an old practice. Marketers have long used the in-store environment to make that last-ditch effort to influence a purchase. But until a decade or so ago, that messaging was often largely disconnected from the brand-building outside the store that dominated marketing campaigns and budgets.”

Advertising Age

51.2 In-Store Decision-Making
A long-standing theory based on a 1995 study by Meyers Research Center (www.meyersresearch.com) for the Point of Purchase Advertising Institute (POPAI, www.popai.com) has held that 70% of buying decisions take place in-store. More recent studies, however, hold a different view.

A study by OgilvyAction (www.ogilvyaction.com) found that only 39% of U.S. shoppers wait until they’re in the store to decide what brand to buy – about 10% change their minds about brands in the store, 29% buy from categories they didn’t intend to buy from, and almost 20% leave a product they’d planned to buy on the shelf. In all, the study found that 72% of shoppers make one of four major purchase decisions in the
store. While significantly lower than the POPAI estimate, the OgilvyAction assessment still confirmed that customers do a lot of decision-making in-store.

In even starker contrast to the findings by POPAI and OgilvyAction, IRI (www.iriworldwide.com) found that more than three-quarters (76%) of consumers were making their purchase decisions at home.

In spite of the newer reports, or perhaps because of them, marketers are making hard drives toward integrating campaigns as they aim to bridge the gap between in-store and out-of-store pitches.

51.3 In-Store Promotions

According to a survey by Prosper Insights & Analytics (www.goproper.com), the following percentages of consumers are influenced by these select in-store promotions:

- Product sample: 52%
- Product labels: 43%
- Shelf coupons: 40%
- Special displays: 36%
- Store loyalty/card: 33%
- Coupon on register tape: 28%
- In-store events/contests: 28%
- Parking lot/sidewalk events: 18%
- Floor graphics: 12%
- In-store TV: 11%
- In-store radio: 8%

One of the most basic in-store marketing techniques is shelf coupons. According to NCH Marketing Services (www.nchmarketing.com), the redemption rate for instant on-pack coupons is 23%, the highest rate among all categories of coupons.

Stores now use a wide range of technology in their in-store promotions, from shelf-talkers to digital end-aisle displays to in-store video networks. Even the most distracted shopper has a difficult time ignoring some of the newest gadgets, like floors that talk, messages that swoop down from the ceiling, and motion sensors that trigger on-shelf light shows. Among the most recent innovations are apps that allow shoppers to request information via their cellphone or mobile device.

51.4 In-Store TV

TV-like monitors along aisles and near checkout are used by retailers to broadcast in-store promotions, shopping suggestions, and product-supported advertising.

Walmart TV, the largest in-store network, boasts more than 125,000 screens in over 3,000 of its U.S. stores, with a potential audience of more than 127 million shoppers per week. Other retailers using in-store networks include 7-11, Albertsons, BJ’s Wholesale Club, Costco, Fresh Market, Meijer, Pathmark, Sam’s Club, and Target,
among others. Several restaurant chains including Arby’s, Denny’s, KFC, Taco Bell, and Wendy’s also use in-store networks.

Research from IZ-ON Media (www.izonmedia.com), the largest in-store network provider, shows that in-store TV marketing generates 56% average recall, compared with 21% for regular TV spots.

51.5 Market Resources
Path to Purchase Institute, 8550 W. Bryn Mawr, Suite 200, Chicago, IL 60631 (773) 992-4450. (www.p2pi.org)

Point of Purchase Advertising Institute, 440 N. Wells Street, Suite 740, Chicago, IL 60654. (312) 863-2900. (www.popai.com)
52.1 Overview

Definitions of small- and medium-sized businesses (SMBs) vary. One of the most common assessments is by employee counts: small businesses are those with fewer than 20 employees and a cut-off of 500 employees for medium-sized businesses. The U.S. Census Bureau (www.census.gov) and the Small Business Administration (www.sba.gov) report the number of businesses by employee count as follows:

- No employees: 22.11 million
- 1-to-19 employees: 5.16 million
- 20-to-499 employees: 557,000
- 500 or more employees: 17,000

The Small Business Administration’s Table of Small Business Size Standards (www.sba.gov/content/small-business-size-standards) defines small businesses based on both number of employees and revenue by sector.

The National Center for the Middle Market (www.middlemarketcenter.org) at Ohio State University defines a medium-size company as one with average annual revenue of between $10 million and $1 billion. Approximately 197,000 U.S. companies comprise this range.

In a poll by the National Small Business Association (www.nsba.biz), 72% of SMBs are somewhat or very confident in the financial future of their companies and 51% of SMBs pointed to new advertising and marketing strategies as the primary growth strategy to be used in 2015.

__________________________________________________________

“SMBs are feeling more confident in their future and for the first time in seven years, the majority of SMBs are pointing to a specific growth strategy. That strategy is new advertising and marketing initiatives.”

LSA Insider, 3/10/15

__________________________________________________________
In a survey by Gallup (www.gallup.com), attracting customers and finding new business was the top challenge among U.S. small business owners.

52.2 Market Assessment
BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com) estimates 2015 spending by SMBs for advertising and marketing at $28 billion. The compound annual growth rate is 12%. Distribution is as follows:
- Traditional advertising: 53%
- Digital/online media: 24%
- Customer retention business solutions: 16%
- Performance-based commerce and transaction platforms: 8%

According to BIA/Kelsey, established SMBs have an average annual spend of $23,331 on advertising and promotion; newly established SMBs spend $17,360.
Ad-ogy Research (www.ad-ology.com) reported small business marketing budget distributed as follows:
- Advertising (use of local media and signs, including ad production): 25%
- Digital marketing (website, video, online and mobile marketing): 20%
- Event, cause and sports marketing (including trade shows and sponsorships): 11%
- Content marketing (PR, blogs, podcasts, white papers): 7%
- Social media marketing (ads, social contests, social apps/widgets, reputation management services): 6%
- Fees for marketing consultants/agencies: 4%
- Market research: 4%
- Other (flyers, collateral, catalogs, telemarketing): 24%

52.3 Most Effective SMB Marketing
In a 2015 study by Thrive Analytics (www.thriveanalytics.com), SMBs reported their most effective marketing methods as follows (percentage of respondents):
- Company website: 45%
- Facebook and other social media sites: 39%
- Print yellow pages: 26%
- Internet yellow pages: 15%
- Email marketing: 15%
- Paid search: 15%
- Direct mail: 14%
- Traditional newspapers: 11%
- Event marketing: 11%
- Search engine optimization: 9%
- Outdoor ads: 9%
• Online video: 8%
• Online display ads: 8%
• Mobile ads/marketing: 7%
• Magazine ads: 7%
• TV: 6%
• Radio: 6%
• Press releases: 4%
• Blogging: 3%

In a survey by Huzzah Media (www.huzzahmedia.com), small business owners said the following were their most successful marketing tools (percentage of respondents):
• Friend referrals: 52%
• Advertising: 33%
• Local marketing (e.g., Chamber of Commerce): 10%
• Coupons: 4%
• Press articles: 1%

52.4 Digital Marketing
In an April 2015 poll by the Local Search Association (www.thelsa.org), SMB owners and marketing managers reported their top three marketing channels as social media, email marketing, and search engine optimization.

According to the April 2015 Local Commerce Monitor by BIA/Kelsey (www.biakelsey.com), 72.2% of SMBs use social media to promote their business. The following are the top media used for advertising and promotion (percentage of respondents):
• Facebook page: 53%
• LinkedIn: 31%
• Twitter: 18%
• Facebook ad: 15%
• YouTube: 13%

SMBs consider the following social media as providing the highest ROI (percentage of respondents):
• Facebook ad: 37%
• Instagram: 31%
• Twitter ad: 30%
• Facebook page: 24%
• Other social media: 31%

In a survey by BrightLocal (www.brightlocal.com), SMBs reported their approach to digital marketing as follows (percentage of respondents):

CONSUMER MARKETING 2016-2017
• 253 •
• Understand digital marketing and do it in-house: 29%
• Learning and want to do it in-house: 28%
• Would like to do it but don’t have the budget: 17%
• Would like to do it but don’t have the time: 10%
• Prefer to hire outside expert for digital marketing: 10%
• Don’t understand digital marketing: 4%
• Don’t think digital marketing works; no interest: 2%

In a 2015 study by Thrive Analytics, 40% of SMBs cited not having enough time as a challenge to digital marketing, 37% pointed to a lack of knowledge, and 33% reported budget limitations.

“SMBs are strapped for skills, time and money when it comes to digital marketing.”

eMarketer, 5/26/15

Endurance International Group (http://enduranceinternational.com) found in its March 2015 survey that 71% of small businesses felt that having a mobile solution or app would have a positive impact on their business, yet 78% did not have one. Among respondents who didn’t have a mobile solution or app, half blamed it on the fact that they didn’t know how to build one, and one-quarter said they were too busy running their businesses to maintain an app. A similar percentage said creating a mobile app cost too much.

A March 2015 survey by Borrell Associates (www.borrellassociates.com) found that only 3% of SMBs were engaged with beacons or other proximity devices.

52.5 SMB Marketing Priorities

The Local Search Association reported SMBs planned to grow their marketing in 2015 as follows (percentage of respondents):

- Company website: Increase 36%, Same 59%, Decrease 5%
- Social media sites: Increase 35%, Same 62%, Decrease 4%
- Mobile marketing: Increase 34%, Same 60%, Decrease 6%
- Online display advertising: Increase 33%, Same 60%, Decrease 7%
- Paid search advertising: Increase 33%, Same 58%, Decrease 8%
- Search engine optimization: Increase 32%, Same 62%, Decrease 6%
- Online video: Increase 32%, Same 62%, Decrease 6%
- Email marketing: 31%  64%  5%
- Event marketing: 30%  61%  9%
- Direct mail: 29%  62%  9%
- Blogging: 29%  65%  6%
- Outdoor advertising: 27%  66%  7%
- Newspaper advertising: 26%  64%  10%
- Television advertising: 25%  65%  10%
- Magazine advertising: 24%  66%  10%
- Press releases: 23%  68%  8%
53

SPONSORSHIPS

53.1 Market Assessment
Companies that support activities and events do so, in part, to gain exposure for their brand.

According to IEG Sponsorship Report (www.sponsorship.com), sponsorship spending by companies based in North America has been as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):

- 2008: $16.6 billion (11.4%)
- 2009: $16.5 billion (-0.6%)
- 2010: $17.2 billion (3.9%)
- 2011: $18.1 billion (5.5%)
- 2012: $18.9 billion (4.4%)
- 2013: $19.8 billion (4.7%)
- 2014: $20.6 billion (4.0%)
- 2015: $21.4 billion (3.9%)

53.2 Spending By Sector
IEG Sponsorship Report assesses sponsorship spending by sector in 2015 as follows:

- Sports: $14.98 billion
- Entertainment tours/attractions: $2.13 billion
- Causes: $1.92 billion
- Arts: $938 million
- Festivals/fairs/annual events: $859 million
- Associations/membership organizations: $590 million

53.3 Sports Sponsorships
Approximately 70% of sponsorship spending is for sports events. The following are 2015 sponsors for major sports:

Breeders’ Cup
- 14 Hands Winery, Claiborne, Coolmore, Daily Racing Form, DraftKings, Equibase, Fenwick Equestrian Products, John Deere, Keeneland, Kroger, Lane’s End, Las Vegas Convention & Visitors Authority, Longines, Sentient Jet, Stella Artois, The Hampton Classic, Three Chimneys, Unver Armout, WinStar Farm, Zpressbet
IndyCar

Major League Baseball
• Alka Seltzer, Anheuser-Busch, Bank of America, Bayer Advanced Aspirin, Church & Dwight, Firestone, Frito-Lay, Gatorade, General Motors (Chevrolet), Gillette, Head & Shoulders, Kellogg’s, MasterCard International, Nike, Pepsi-Cola, Scotts, SiriusXM, T-Mobile, Taco Bell

Major League Soccer

NASCAR
• 3M, 5.11 Tactical, Bank of America, Camping World, Canadian Tire, Chevrolet, Coca-Cola, Coors Light, Exide Batteries, FDP Friction Science, Featherlite Trailers, Ford, Freescale, Freightliner Trucks, Goodyear, Growth Energy, HP, Ingersoll Rand, Janssen, K&N Filters, M&Ms, McLaren, Mobil 1, Nabisco (Kraft), National Corn Growers Association, Nationwide Insurance, New Holland, Prevost, Safety-Kleen, Sherwin Williams, Sirius XM Satellite Radio, Sprint (title sponsor), Sunoco, Toyota, Universal Technical Institute, Visa, Whelen Engineering, Xfinity, Zak

National Basketball Association
• 2K Sports, American Express, adidas, Anheuser-Busch InBev, AutoTrader.com, BBVA, Cisco, Coca-Cola, Diageo, Foot Locker, Gatorade, Harman, Kaiser Permanente, Kia Motors, Kumho Tire, Nike, Samsung, SAP, Spalding, Sprint, State Farm, Taco Bell

National Football League
• Anheuser-Busch InBev, Barclays, Bose, Bridgestone, Campbell Soup, Casterol, Dairy Management, Dannon, Extreme Network, FedEx, Frito-Lay, Gatorade, General Motors, Lenovo, Marriott, Mars Snackfood, McDonald’s, Microsoft, National Guard, Nationwide, NetApp, Papa John’s, Pepsi, Procter & Gamble, Quaker, SAP, TD Ameritrade, USAA, Verizon, VISA, Xbox

National Hockey League
• Amp Energy, ANCO, Bridgestone, Canadian Tire, Captain Morgan Rum, Compuware, Constellation, Coors Light, Crest, Discover, Draft Kings, EA Sports, Enterprise, Frito-Lay, Gatorade, Geico, GoPro, Hershey’s, Honda, Kellogg’s Frosted
Flakes, Kraft, L’Oreal, Las Vegas Convention & Visitors Authority, McDonald’s, Molson, Mondelez International, Oral-B, Panini, Pepsi, Prime Sport, Reebok, Rogers, Samsung, SAP, Scotiabank, Sheraton, Sirius XM Satellite Radio, Ticketmaster, Tim Horton’s, Upper Deck, Visa, York Heating & Air Conditioning

**Olympic Games - Worldwide Top Sponsors**
- Atos, Bridgestone, Coca-Cola, Dow, General Electric, McDonald’s, Omega SA, Panasonic, Procter & Gamble, Samsung, Toyota, Visa

**Olympic Games - U.S. Olympic Committee**
- 24 Hour Fitness, Allstate, Anheuser-Busch, Deloitte, Hilton Worldwide, Jet Set Sports, McDonald’s, Nike, Procter & Gamble, Tyson Foods, United Airlines, Visa

**Women’s National Basketball Association**
- adidas, American Express, BBVA, Boost Mobile (marquee partner), Bud Light, Coca-Cola, Diageo, EA Sports, Gatorade, Nike, Procter & Gamble, Samsung, SAP, Spalding

**53.4 Market Resources**
*IEG Sponsorship Report* and *IEG Sponsorship Sourcebook*, published by IEG, 350 North Orleans Street, Suite 1200, Chicago, IL 60654. (800) 834-4850. (www.sponsorship.com)
54.1 Turning Shoppers Into Buyers

A survey by Deloitte & Touche (www.deloitte.com) concluded that the best way to turn a shopper into a buyer is not through marketing and advertising, but through the store experience. The study suggested that redirecting resources to improving the customer experience and building multichannels can help retailers increase sales and earnings.

The following is a summary of the findings from the Deloitte survey:

- Eight out of 10 respondents said their most recent store visit was not prompted by advertising or marketing.
- Consumers who went to a store intending to buy an item but did not said it was because they couldn’t locate the item, it was out of stock, or help was not available to find it. Of the consumers who said they received service in the store (31%), the majority (55%) did so to get help locating an item.
- Among those surveyed, online shoppers were frequently more satisfied than were in-store shoppers. More than half (55%) of online shoppers said their experience was better than store shopping, compared with 25% of store shoppers stating that their experience was better than online shopping.

54.2 Store Atmospherics

According to a survey by Shapiro+Raj (www.shapioraj.com), 63% of consumers remember occasions when the store atmosphere caused them to buy more or spend more time at a store. Among those who said they were influenced, 45% reported that they spent more money in the store, not just more time. The survey found that certain customers are more likely than others to be impacted by store atmospherics, in particular higher-income shoppers (83%) and younger shoppers (66%).

In conjunction with Chain Store Age, Shapiro+Raj conducted The Store Atmospherics study which included customer interviews. Of 13 atmospheric elements examined in the study, cleanliness (90%) ranked as the most important in deciding where to shop. In-store TV was rated as least important (9%) in deciding where to shop. The study found that consumers divide the elements of store atmospherics into the following three tiers:

- The basic condition of the store (how clean and well kept it is)
- Passive atmospherics (the essential but relatively static aspects of the store, such as lighting, temperature, and aisle width)
• Active atmospherics (the more interactive or stimulating elements such as music and in-store TV)

The key for retailers is to blend all three tiers in a deliberate, strategic way. Active atmospherics like loud music, for example, might divert certain shoppers from making purchases.

54.3 Convenience Shopping
For years, big-box retailers kept building bigger and bigger stores, figuring the combination of low prices and huge assortment trumped other considerations. The result, however, is that shoppers all too often spend much of their time trudging from department to department to find elusive items on their shopping list, often giving up without finding them. Major retailers are now focusing on convenience in an effort to speed up the shopping process for customers.

Shoppers, it seems, tend to allocate a certain amount of time to shopping, and inefficient store layouts often result in their leaving a store before they purchase all intended items. At a Walmart supercenter, for example, the average shopper spends 21 minutes in the store but finds only seven of the 10 items on his or her shopping list.

Retailers are aiming to make their stores less overwhelming for shoppers, with changes ranging from brighter light bulbs to personal assistants who cater to customers.

Checkout is critical because consumers consider waits the biggest time-wasting part of the shopping experience. According to How Checkout Really Works, by Shapiro+Raj, the following checkout practices are preferred by customers:
• Baggers at every checkout counter: 65%
• A 10-items-or-fewer express line: 65%
• A special line for customers with large shopping baskets: 54%
• Self-checkout: 51%
• Baggers only at counters for customers with large shopping baskets: 33%
• A TV screen at checkout promoting products within the store: 20%
• Display of attractively priced impulse items at checkout counter: 19%

54.4 Self-Service
In a survey by Synqera (www.synqera.com), 73% of shoppers say they find waiting in the checkout line to be their least favorite aspect of in-store shopping.

An April 2015 survey by Retale (www.retale.com) reported that 85% of consumers have used in-store self-checkout kiosks; 91% of Millennials have done so. Reasons for using self-checkout are as follows (percentage of respondents):
• Limited number of items: 72%
• Shorter line: 55%
• Prefer to keep transactions private: 13%
• Don’t like interacting with cashiers: 12%
“When it comes time to purchase in-store, shoppers want the speediest checkout possible, and many are taking matters into their own hands.”

eMarketer, 5/28/15

A survey by Buzzback Market Research (www.buzzback.com) found that 66% of shoppers feel that self-service technology creates a more positive perception of the deployer’s brand.

According to IHL Group (www.ihlservices.com), consumers made $292 billion in purchases through self-checkout lanes in 2014; transactions at self-service kiosks of all types were $1.1 trillion. Self-service transactions are growing at 7% per year.

A survey by Shapiro+Raj found consumers divided on the benefits of self checkout. Only 43% said it shortens checkout time, while 38% feel it lengthens checkout. Still, given a choice, 39% say they prefer self-checkout over a cashier.

54.5 In-Store Smartphone Use

According to a July 2015 survey by SessionM (www.sessionm.com), 90% of smartphone users said they have used their device while shopping. Smartphone use for in-store activities are as follows (percentage of respondents):

• Price comparisons: 54%
• Look up product information: 48%
• Check reviews: 42%

A study by Deloitte found that smartphone shoppers were 14% more likely than non-smartphone shoppers to convert in-store, even when those smartphone shoppers used a mobile app or site not belonging to the retailer. Seventy-two percent (72%) of shoppers who used their smartphone on their most recent in-store trip made a purchase while there, compared with 63% of shoppers who did not use a smartphone to assist in making a purchase during their last in-store trip.

54.6 Wearables

An April 2015 survey by PowerReviews (www.powerreviews.com) found that 82% of adults who own or plan to buy a wearable device are interested in using it to enhance their in-store experience. Half of this group say that they expect wearables to
In a survey by Motorola Solutions (www.motorolasolutions.com), 74% of retail executives said they believe that developing a more engaging in-store experience will be critical to their business. Survey participants foresee the following technological developments occurring in the retail marketplace over the next five years:

- All transactions will be completed via mobile POS, self-checkout at terminal, or on shopper’s mobile device: 56%
- Sales will come from online, mobile, and commercial sites: 42%
- Will send coupons based on customer location in the store: 42%
- Will provide personalized product details to shopper’s smartphone based on previous behavior: 41%
- Will recognize customer in store with geofencing or presence technology: 35%

Consumers’ cross-channel shopping behaviors will change retailers’ marketing strategies. Retail USA: What’s In Store for 2016, a study from Nielsen, forecasts the retail marketplace will change in the following ways:

- Store footprints either will get supersized for one-stop-shop convenience or downsized into smaller stores for quick grab-and-go trips.
- For people who view shopping as entertainment that engages all the senses, lifestyle outlets will blur the line of demarcation between traditional formats, merging restaurants with food markets, serving up food and wine tastings, providing live music and movies, and creating places for friends and co-workers to gather and socialize.
- Technology will bring consumers into the shopping experience via options such as touchscreen ordering, QR code advertising, mobile coupons, and shopping lists.
- Store brands will mushroom to include super premium offerings joined by an increasing number of restaurant and celebrity-chef brands, while a few consumer packaged goods brands will transition onto restaurant menus.
- The Big Four technology companies (i.e., Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google) will establish beachheads outside the tech world, challenging conventional players to re-think their business models and forge new alliances or chance seeing themselves become less relevant.
- Deep discounters will continue to keep the cap on operating costs in order to maintain their price edge, but low prices alone have not been enough to guarantee sales success.
- Retailers will expand designated stores-within-a store spaces, pulling together related items that fulfill a consumer need into a discrete space such as a cosmetics department complete with expert consultants, occasion-based home meal solution
centers, or dedicated pet care areas.

- Mobile and online technologies will enable one-to-one marketing, customized shopping lists, menu plans, coupons, and other content to reflect user interests and consumption patterns.
- Online avatars and in-store service agents will assist consumers with meal management, entertainment, health and wellness monitoring, and fashion selections.
- In-store shelf-talkers will take on a new, interactive dimension with QR codes that connect directly to robust websites offering discounts and cross merchandising suggestions such as wine pairings.
- The chasm between income and wealth strata will enable retailers at both the high and low ends of the price spectrum to prosper by merchandising to niche audiences.
55.1 Overview
In a survey by the IBM Institute For Business Value (www.ibm.com), one-half of shoppers said they preferred shopping online. Preference for online shopping appears to be on the rise. While only 23% of shoppers thought highly of online purchase delivery in 2011, 36% preferred it in 2014.

“Shoppers are getting used to – and growing fond of – the online shopping experience. They enjoy the feeling of going to a favorite retailer’s webpage and opening tabs of different items to compare as they scroll down the page. They like the 1-2-3 browse, click and purchase experience.”

eMarketer, 2/5/15

55.2 Expectations Online
According to Future Of Retail Study, published in May 2015 by Walker Sands (www.walkersands.com), the following features make customers more likely to shop online (percentage of respondents):

- Free shipping: 83%
- Free returns: 65%
- One-day shipping: 62%
- Easier online returns: 51%
- Payment security: 48%
- Same day shipping: 42%
- Easier in store returns: 39%
- Entire order shipped together: 33%
- Visual try-on capability: 30%
According to a survey by OneUpWeb (www.oneupweb.com), Internet users expect the following from e-commerce sites (percentage of respondents):

- Pricing/shipping information clearly stated: 96%
- Site looks credible and trustworthy: 76%
- Product displayed on homepage: 71%
- Visually appealing: 67%
- Total cost calculator: 59%
- Search function: 48%
- Privacy statement: 46%
- Onsite customer reviews: 41%
- Online customer service (live chat): 32%
- Links to social networks (Facebook, Twitter): 23%

According to a survey by A.T. Kearney (www.atkearney.com), the following attributes are important to consumers when shopping online (percentage of respondents):

- Finding specific products: 96%
- Free shipping: 93%
- Finding favorite brands: 92%
- Best price: 90%
- Ease of navigation: 88%
- Site security: 87%
- Special promotions: 78%
- Free samples: 67%
- Peer reviews: 59%
- New products: 55%

A survey by comScore (www.comscore.com) asked online shoppers the factors driving them to shop with an online retailer. Responses were as follows (two responses per survey participant):

- The ability to buy online and then make returns at the store: 62%
- The push of a coupon/promotion to my smartphone: 47%
- The ability to buy online and pick up in store: 44%
- The availability of an application designed specifically for a tablet: 41%
- The option to conduct one-click check-out online: 40%
- The ability to complete a purchase in store using mobile device: 37%
- The availability of a mobile application for a smartphone: 36%
- The availability of an in-store kiosk to browse products: 25%
- The ability to start a purchase online and then complete the purchase in store: 23%
- The ability to make an appointment for an in-store consult after researching online: 18%
55.3 Buy Online, Pick Up In-Store

A May 2015 survey by King Retail Solutions (www.kingrs.com) found that among adults who shop online, 78% find the buy-online, pick up in-store option appealing; 40% have used the option. By demographic, attitudes toward buying online and picking up in-store were reported as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Have Used</th>
<th>Appealing But Not Used</th>
<th>Not Appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Have Used</th>
<th>Appealing But Not Used</th>
<th>Not Appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-to-34:</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-to-49:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-to-68:</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Have Used</th>
<th>Appealing But Not Used</th>
<th>Not Appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families with children:</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children:</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Have Used</th>
<th>Appealing But Not Used</th>
<th>Not Appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban:</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural:</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a 2015 survey by Blackhawk Engagement Solutions (www.bhengagement.com), 86% of online shoppers said they would consider the option to save $10 on a $50 item; 78% would do so to receive an item three days earlier.

Accenture (www.accenture.com) found that 50% of online shoppers now expect retailers to offer the service.

As retailers have increased their focus on creating an omnichannel experience, buy online, pick up in-store has emerged as one way to bridge the physical-digital divide. Based on research, consumer demand for such services is huge, meaning retailers that don’t provide this purchase option risk getting left behind.”

eMarketer, 6/8/15
55.4 Same-Day Delivery

A survey by PricewaterhouseCoopers found 61% of Internet users would be willing to pay for same-day delivery for an item they urgently needed. LoyaltyOne (www.loyalty.com) found similar interest, reporting that 65% of online shoppers would pay an additional fee for same-day home delivery under certain circumstances.

“According to recent research, same-day delivery offerings are still rare, despite consumer willingness to pay for the service.”

eMarketer, 5/5/15

Same-day delivery became an option for some online shoppers when Amazon launched the service for Amazon Prime Now customers in select cities in 2014. In 2015, the service was expanded to additional cities in 2015.
56

WORD-OF-MOUTH

56.1 Overview

Word-of-mouth (WOM) is one of the strongest influences on consumers. While
buzz about products is typically generated by consumers based on their experience
with a product, the buzz can be set off by a marketer’s efforts.

PQ Media (www.pqmedia.com) estimates that U.S. companies spend almost $2
billion annually to enhance word-of-mouth promotions for their brands.

56.2 Influencers

Americans mention specific brands 56 times a week in conversation, according
to an online survey conducted by Keller Fay Group (www.kellerfay.com). Of those
shared opinions about brands and products, 72% come from family and friends, 13%
from co-workers, and 7% from professionals or experts. One significant finding of the
survey is that 92% of brand conversations take place offline, rather than via email,
blogs, IMs, and social networks. Also, most word-of-mouth marketing is mostly positive,
with positive mentions outweighing negative mentions by a ratio of 6-to-1. Negative
mentions occur most often online.

Surveys consistently show that recommendations from family, friends, and peers
are a stronger influence on purchasing decisions than advertising. In a survey by
Opinion Research Corp. (www.opinionresearch.com), for instance, consumers said
their buying decisions are influenced by the following (percentage of respondents):

- Personal advice from friends or family members: 59%
- TV news or other broadcasts: 40%
- Search engines: 39%
- Ads on TV: 36%
- Newspaper and magazine articles: 33%
- Newspaper and magazine ads: 31%
- Articles seen online: 28%
- Radio news or other broadcasts: 25%
- Direct mail: 24%
- Ads heard on the radio: 20%
- Emails from retailers or manufacturers: 20%
- Ads seen online: 19%
- Messages or posts on social media: 18%
- Billboards: 15%
In a survey by Bridge Ratings (www.bridgeratings.com), consumers rated trusted sources of information as follows (rated on a scale of 1-to-10):

- Friends, family, and acquaintances: 8.6
- Strangers with expertise: 7.9
- Teachers: 7.3
- Religious leaders: 6.9
- Newspapers and magazines: 6.1
- Favorite radio personality: 5.5
- TV news reporters: 5.2
- Bloggers: 2.8
- Advertising: 2.2
- Telemarketers: 1.4

Among the strongest influencers are peers. A study by Babycenter (www.babycenter.com) found that moms are great at engaging other moms, with 59% of moms saying they’ve responded to a recommendation from other moms on parenting sites.

Similarly, college students are most often influenced by other students. In a survey by Concentric Marketing (www.getconcentric.com), 40% of college students said they buy brands that were recommendations by other students.

56.3 WOM Programs

JWT (www.jwt.com) estimates that 85% of the top 1,000 marketing firms now use some form of word-of-mouth marketing.

Procter & Gamble, a pioneer in WOM marketing, has an in-house buzz team known as Tremor (www.tremor.com) that focuses on injecting brand names and branded products into the conversations of ordinary teens.

BzzAgent (www.bzzagent.com), a firm that specializes in word-of-mouth marketing, has its 260,000 volunteers submit detailed profiles about their habits and interests, which BzzAgent uses to match them to word-of-mouth campaigns for products made by companies such as Arby’s, BP, Kraft, Nestlé, and Philips. The agents are provided with information about the clients’ products and in return give detailed feedback about the conversations they have.

Companies such as Mr. Youth (www.mryouth.com) and Youth Marketing Connection (www.youthmarketing.com) specialize in college peer-to-peer programs. Mr. Youth, which charges corporate clients $10,000 to $48,000 a campus per semester for brand-ambassador programs, has developed on-campus campaigns for dozens of brands, including Ford, Hewlett-Packard, and Microsoft. The company employs more than 5,000 college students as brand ambassadors.
“Consider word-of-mouth as not just ‘nice to have’ but a game-changing element of today’s marketing mix. Creating a strategy to embrace it will be the way marketers win in coming years.”

Ed Keller, CEO
Keller Fay Group
Advertising Age

56.4 WOI Analytics
The Net Promoter Score (NPS), introduced in 2003 by Bain & Company (www.bain.com), is the most popular measure of customer recommendations and loyalty. The NPS is derived in surveys that ask participants the following question: On a zero-to-10 scale, how likely are you to recommend a particular product/service/brand to a friend or colleague. A follow-up question asks the consumer the reason for his or her score.

In 2013, ForeSee (www.foresee.com) introduced the Word of Mouth Index (WoMI, www.wordofmouthindex.com), a metric that measures both likelihood to recommend and likelihood to detract from a specific brand. WoMI builds on the NPS by adding an additional question: How likely are you to discourage others from doing business with this company?

“Just because a consumer doesn’t recommend a product or brand doesn’t mean that he or she is a detractor or unsatisfied. For instance, you could be very loyal to the brand of paper towel you use but not feel the need to actively promote it. When you ask consumers about their likelihood to recommend and their likelihood to discourage, companies get a much more accurate picture of the customer experience.”

Larry Freed, CEO
ForeSee
56.5 Marketing Guidelines

According to Kristen L. Smith, Executive Director of the Word of Mouth Marketing Association (WOMMA, www.womma.org), the following are keys to leveraging WOM marketing:

**Be Transparent And Disclose**

- For a company or a brand to become and remain a credible source of information, communication must be transparent. Traditional communications are not as trusted as they once were. Customers and the public favor and trust friends and peer-to-peer recommendations over ads. Participate openly in online blogs and discussions. Encourage two-way conversations with interested parties. Don’t engage in stealth marketing, and do not shill – that is, do not pay people to talk about or promote your product without disclosing their relationship to you.

**Employ Online and Offline WOM**

- Over 90% of all WOM conversations that take place in the U.S. are offline; and an estimated 35 million WOM conversations take place in the U.S. daily. Three-quarters take place face-to-face and another 17% are on the phone. Only 7% take place online via instant/text messaging, chat rooms, email, and blogs. This means that offline tactics to encourage conversations cannot be ignored.

**Encourage An Enterprise-Wide WOM Culture**

- Company infrastructure must be in place to promote a successful WOM culture. Encourage and enable conversations to develop. Be certain to train employees about ethical WOM. Often, there are WOM activities being conducted by individual employees in different departments. Encourage inter-company communications so that WOM efforts are not at cross purposes with the overall marketing strategies.

**Evaluate ROI Continually**

- The ease of qualifying the results of online activities has made measuring the ROI of WOM easier and faster, allowing a company to be more nimble in changing tactics and even strategies. Track online and offline conversations by supporters, detractors, and neutrals. The approach need not be scientifically rigorous. Simply using internal goals, making them measurable and reasonable, is the way to start.

**Listen, Speak, Listen Some More**

- By listening, a company can align with its audience. Engage customers in open, unfiltered conversations. When concerns are raised, respond promptly and honestly. It is essential to value customer opinion, whether that opinion is positive, negative, or neutral. However, avoid unethical WOM tactics such as using fake identities in an online discussion to promote a product or company.
**Spread The Word**

- WOM is the most honest form of marketing, building on people’s natural desire to share their experiences with family, friends, and colleagues. However, it is imperative that the information shared by marketers is accurate and that it respects the communities to which it is directed. Everyone knows that sending bulk or unsolicited emails without clear, voluntary permission is wrong. Also, avoid using automated software to post unrelated or inappropriate comments to blogs or other online communities.

To address ethical issues, the WOMMA has developed a Code of Ethics centered around the following principles:

- Consumer protection and respect are paramount
- The Honesty ROI: Honesty of Relationship, Opinion, and Identity
- We respect the rules of the venue
- We manage relationships with minors responsibly
- We promote honest downstream communications
- We protect privacy and permission

**56.6 Online Follow-up To WOM**

According to a June 2015 survey by Yodle (www.yodle.com), even if they hear about a local business offline, 27% of consumers still visit the website to research the business. The primary reasons for online follow up are to validate word-of-mouth and obtain additional information.

The survey also found that a quarter of local business website visits are influenced by offline recommendations.

_________________________________________________________________

“Nielsen found that the most trusted form of advertising was word-of-mouth with 84% of consumers saying they trust the recommendations from the people they know. Taking this one step further, new data shows that for some consumers offline word-of-mouth leads to online research. The takeaway here is the valuable interaction that is taking place between offline conversations and online research.”

Local Search Association, 6/24/15

_________________________________________________________________
56.7 Market Resources
Word of Mouth Index, ForeSee, 2500 Green Road, Suite 400, Ann Arbor, MI 48105. (800) 621-2850. (www.wordofmouthindex.com)

Word of Mouth Marketing Association, 200 E. Randolph Street, Suite 5100, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 577-7610. (www.womma.org)
PART V: PSYCHOGRAPHIC SEGMENTATION
COMMUNITY-BASED SEGMENTATION

57.1 Overview
Patchwork Nation (www.patchworknation.org), a reporting project of the Jefferson Institute (www.jeffersoninst.org), uses demographic and cultural data to cluster and organize communities into ‘types of place,’ categorizing America’s 3,141 counties into 12 community types based on characteristics such as income level, racial composition, employment, and religion.

57.2 Segmentation Categories
Patchwork Nation categories are as follows:

Boom Towns
• Fast growing communities with rapidly diversifying populations

Campus and Careers
• Cities and towns with young, educated populations; more secular than other American communities

Emptying Nests
• Home to many retirees and aging Baby Boomer populations; less diverse than the nation at large

Evangelical Epicenters
• Communities with a high proportion of evangelical Christians, found mostly in small towns and suburbs; slightly older than the U.S. average

Immigration Nation
• Communities with large Latino populations and lower-than-average incomes, typically clustered in the South and Southwest

Industrial Metropolis
• Densely populated, highly diverse urban centers; incomes trend higher than the national average
Military Bastions
• Areas with high employment in the military or related to the presence of the military and large veteran populations

Minority Central
• Home to large pockets of black residents but a below average percentage of Hispanics and Asians

Monied ‘Burbs
• Wealthier, highly educated communities with a median household income $15,000 above the national county average

Mormon Outposts
• Home to a large share of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and slightly higher median household incomes

Service Worker Centers
• Midsize and small towns with economies fueled by hotels, stores, and restaurants and lower-than-average median household income by county

Tractor Country
• Mostly rural and remote smaller towns with older populations and large agricultural sectors

Patchwork Nation also breaks the nation’s 435 congressional districts into nine categories, as follows:

Booming Growth
• High population growth districts in the West primarily, with rising incomes and large shares of residents moving in from elsewhere

Christian Conservative
• White Evangelical Christian populations; lower and middle income with sizable elderly concentrations

Established Wealth
• High income districts principally in larger cities and their suburbs; many family-aged residents employed in white collar jobs

New Diversity
• Middle income districts largely on the West Coast, with significant Asian-American and immigrant populations
Old Diversity
• Lower income big city and some small town Southern districts with large African-American populations

Small Town America
• Rural and small town districts; aging and declining populations with Evangelical and Mainline Protestant presence

The Shifting Middle
• Middle income districts in established suburbs and midsized cities; mixed ethnic populations and a growing Latino presence

Wired and Educated
• Highly educated, youthful districts with single householders, employment in information industries; ethnically diverse and secular

Young Exurbs
• Districts with many new fringe suburbs and mid-sized towns; growing Latino populations and many college grads

The Patchwork Nation website provides demographic data for each of the community and district types.

57.3 Market Resources
58.1 Overview
ELoyalty (www.eloyalty.com), a help-line service, categorizes consumers by temperament. This segmentation is used to guide customer service representatives in handling each customer appropriately.

“ELoyalty has spent $50 million [over] six years perfecting complex software that not only can define a specific complaint but also decode a caller’s personality. The technology sniffs out two million speech patterns that categorize people into one of six personality types; other telltale phrases clue the algorithms into what the specific complaint might be. ELoyalty has analyzed 600 million conversations; its 1,000 servers store 600 terabytes of customer data (for comparison, the Library of Congress’ print stash would require 10 terabytes). Based on all of that intelligence, callers are routed to the service rep best equipped to handle that combination of problem and personality. Result, say clients: up to 20% lower call center operating expenses, thanks to shorter, more productive calls.”

Forbes
58.2 Segmentation Categories
Eloyalty classifies consumers into six types, as follows:

Emotions-Driven
• 30% of the population
• They forge relationships with agents before diving directly into the problem.

Thoughts-Driven
• 25% of the population
• They want facts and analysis and don’t waste time on pleasantries.

Reactions-Driven
• 20% of the population
• They either love something or hate it. “This product is so cool,” they might say.

Opinions-Driven
• 10% of the population
• Their language is full of imperatives, and their minds are resolute.

Reflections-Driven
• 10% of the population
• These introverts live in their own worlds, prefer silence to banter and often skip personal pronouns in speech.

Actions-Driven
• 5% of the population
• This group craves movement and progress ... think Donald Trump.

58.3 Market Resources
Eloyalty, 6500 River Place Boulevard, Building 2, Suite 301, Austin, TX 78730. (512) 391-7700. (www.eloyalty.com)
ECONOMIC-BASED SEGMENTATION

59.1 Overview
Nielsen Claritas (www.claritas.com) licenses three segmentation systems (www.claritas.com/MyBestSegments/Default.jsp) to clients for use as customer development tools.

59.2 Segmentation Categories
The three segmentation systems are as follows:

ConnecXion
- The ConnecXion system classifies households into 10 life-stage groups and further segments them by ‘technodoption,’ or their estimated willingness to adopt new technology. Four categories of technodoption are used.

PRIZM
- The PRIZM social and lifestyle segmentation system classifies consumers into 67 categories based on census data, leading consumer surveys and compiled household data, and other public and private sources of demographic and consumer information.
- PRIZM operates on the principle that “birds of a feather flock together.” In general, people with similar economic and cultural backgrounds and family households typically gravitate toward one another. They choose to live in neighborhoods offering affordable advantages and compatible lifestyles. For instance, many young career singles and couples choose dynamic urban neighborhoods, while families with children prefer the suburbs which offer more affordable housing, convenient shopping, and strong local schools.
- The demonstration webpage www.claritas.com/MyBestSegments/Default.jsp, sponsored by USA Today, provides the PRIZM assessment for any ZIP Code.

P$YCLE
- The P$YCLE system classifies households into 10 life-stage groups and further segments them by estimated income-producing assets (IPA). P$YCLE uses seven IPA classes.
59.3 Market Resources
(800) 234-5973. (www.claritas.com)
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HOUSEHOLD-BASED SEGMENTATION

60.1 Overview
Cohorts, a household-based segmentation system developed by IXI Corporation (www.ixicorp.com), identifies 30 distinct segments of the population based on the demographic and lifestyle makeup of each individual household.

Cohorts divides virtually all U.S. households into cohesive, homogeneous groups of people who share distinct demographic, lifestyle, and consumer behavior characteristics. It does not assume that neighbors are in all cases similar or characterize households by the average characteristics of their neighborhood.

Clusters are associated with four major age breaks: under age 35 (Young), 35-to-54 (Working Years), 55-to-64 (Pre-Retirement), and 65 or older (Retired). Life-cycle/life-stage, marital status, and presence of children are also considered.

60.2 Segmentation Categories
Cohorts has three segmentation applications, as follows:

Economic Cohorts
• IXI’s Economic Cohorts is a household segmentation system that differentiates households based on measures of total income, spending, ability to pay, and credit usage in combination with life-stage, urbanicity, and demographics. Credit information from Equifax, anonymized and aggregated, is factored into the cluster construction.

Financial Cohorts
• Financial Cohorts is based on IXI’s direct measurement of the approximately $10 trillion in consumer financial assets. Customers are segmented based on their financial profiles, behaviors, and characteristics, as well as demographics, age, and urbanicity.
• Households are grouped into 61 clusters based on the following framework:
  - Financial capacity: assets, income, spending, and credit
  - Investment style: complexity of investment mix, risk, advice orientation, and credit usage
  - Additional behaviors and characteristics: age, demographics, and urbanicity
Hispanic Cohorts
  • IXI's Hispanic Cohorts identifies 19 Hispanic segments that collectively offer marketers the ability to understand the demographics, lifestyles, attitudes, and behavioral characteristics of Hispanic consumers in the United States.

60.3 Market Resources
IXI Corp., 7927 Jones Branch Drive, Suite 400, McLean, VA 22102. (703) 848-3800. (www.cohorts.com)
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LIFESTYLE-BASED SEGMENTATION

61.1 Overview
Considering that 61% of U.S. adults are sports fans, according to the Marist College Institute for Public Opinion (www.maristpoll.marist.edu), sports-based segmentation can provide valuable insight into the American consumer.

Team Epic (www.anepiccompany.com), which classifies consumers by lifestyle, provides a tool for marketers to better evaluate sports fans’ emotional motivations, their purchasing and social media behavior, and their lifestyle habits both within and outside of sports. The methodology segments sports fans into five distinct clusters based on characteristics such as avidity, engagement with sponsors, socioeconomic status, and personal outlook on life.

While the Team Epic assessment focuses on sports, the methodology is applicable to a broader range of consumer assessments because the segmentation is based on lifestyle attributes rather than specific sport preferences.

61.2 Segmentation Categories
Team Epic classifies consumers into five categories as follows:

Older, Affluent Fans
- Older, affluent sports fans, predominantly male, are generally heavily involved in college sports. They are influenced by sponsor/advertiser programs, although not as much as Super Jocks. Consumers in this category are more likely than most fans to have children at home and are likely to have interacted at a live sponsor event.
- Marketers are more likely to find a higher concentration of these fans among college football and basketball, the PGA Tour, and the NBA fan bases.
- Twenty percent (20%) of sports fans are classified in this segment.

Super Jocks
- Highly social and active, consumers in this category are the most likely to identify themselves as outdoor enthusiasts. They seek live events and are heavily into tailgating and fantasy sports. They exceed all groups in their level of participation in sponsor programs. This male-dominated group has the second-highest average household income among the five groups.
• The Super Jocks category includes fans who are relatively young (average age: 33.5 years) and ethnically diverse (30% are non-white). They have the most positive outlook on their lives: 59% of Super Jocks say they are “extremely” or “very happy,” 13 percentage points above the average among all sports fans. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of consumers in this group have interacted with sponsors online by participating in a promotion of some sort, the highest rate of any group of fans.
• Thirteen percent (13%) of sports fans are classified in this segment.

Receptive and Limited
• A mix of male and female sports fans, this category is the second-oldest of any segment and has a below-average income. Consumers in this group are much more likely to follow professional sports and motorsports. They are highly receptive to sponsors/advertisers but, given their lower levels of disposable income they are more conscious about spending money.
• The Receptive and Limited group is the least diverse ethnically of the five groups (91% are white), has the lowest average household income ($46,100 annually), and its group members are more likely to be fans of NASCAR than any other sport.
• Twenty-two percent (22%) of sports fans are classified in this segment.

Fitness Edge
• Consumers in this category are younger and more physically active than other segments and have average income levels. They are likely to follow professional sports and the Olympics. They have a positive view of sponsors/advertisers but are selective about how they get involved in promotions and sponsor programs.
• Two-thirds of the Fitness Edge segment are female, the highest ratio of any of the five fan clusters. This group is the most active in social media and has a generally positive outlook on their future.
• Twenty-two percent (22%) of sports fans are classified in this segment.

Inactive Lifestyles
• Consumers in this category prefer watching sports at home rather than participating or watching at sports venues or sports bars. They are generally the least optimistic about the future among the segment categories and are the least receptive to sponsor/advertiser programs.
• Dubbed “Couch Curmudgeons,” these consumers are the oldest (average age: 49.8 years) and least physically active. They are more likely to be fans of the NFL than any other sport.
• Twenty-three percent (23%) of sports fans are classified in this segment.

61.3 Market Resources
Team Epic, 230 East Avenue, Norwalk, CT 06855. (203) 831-2100. (www.anepiccompany.com)
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MILLENNIAL SEGMENTATION

62.1 Overview

Fizziology (www.fizziolo.gy) segments millennial adults (ages 18-to-34) into four groups. This assessment focuses on Millennials’ media use and social activities and is used by advertisers to guide ad placement.

62.2 Segmentation

Characteristics of the four millennial adult groups are as follows:

Confident Connected
- Knowledge seeking
- Sociable
- Hardworking
- Happy with their standard of living, but feel they can change when or if they want to

Creatures of Comfort
- The simple life
- Unmotivated
- Easy-going
- Unhappy with their standard of living, but can do little to change it

Indie Dreamers
- Ambitious
- Creative
- Individualistic
- Unhappy with their standard of living, but feel that they can change it when or if they want to

Youthful Pursuits
- Image seeking
- Live in the now
- Embrace youth
- Happy with their standard of living, but not much chance of changing it
62.3 Comparative Analysts

Fizziology provides the following comparison of the four millennial segments:

Social Media Use
• Confident Connecteds use social to share relevant news and information.
• Creatures of Comfort use social to talk to friends and interact with entertainment.
• Indie Dreamers use social to laugh-off life’s aggravations.
• Youthful Pursuits use social to complain and obtain self-confirmation.

Social Media Conversations
• Confident Connecteds are defined by a positive tone, sharing with others, and a focus on current events and community.
• Creatures of Comfort are the ultimate digital media couch potatoes.
• Indie Dreamers are more creative, individualistic, and inwardly focused with a sardonic wit.
• Youthful Pursuits continually demonstrate their youthful spirits in both tone and content.

Sharing Content
• Confident Connecteds share positive and uplifting content and memes, some of which is original.
• Creatures of Comfort share other people’s memes and content.
• Indie Dreamers create memes and original content.
• Youthful Pursuits share dramatic, negative jokes and memes.

Social Life
• Confident Connecteds are widely active in various interests and hobbies.
• Creatures of Comfort are content to stay at home with friends.
• Indie Dreamers go to cool places with friends; share on social.
• Youthful Pursuits talk about partying with friends, YOLO, etc.

Outlook on Life
• Confident Connecteds have a positive and motivating outlook; ready to help and enrich others.
• Creatures of Comfort are content with stagnation and few ambitions; just need a couch and some screens.
• Indie Dreamers are optimistic, though snide; have a sense that they make a difference.
• Youthful Pursuits are melodramatic with a pessimistic outlook on life; feel they are entitled to attention and praise.

Interaction with Brands
• Confident Connecteds talk most actively about brands and share promotions as a sense of pride.
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• Creatures of Comfort will interact with commercials on social media, but complain of over-saturation of ads.
• Indie Dreamers share positive and negative experiences with brands; ridicule things out of style.
• Youthful Pursuits consider brands as status symbols and mock those considered cheap.

62.4 Market Resources
Fizziology, 342 E. St Joseph Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202. (323) 476-1823.
(www.fizziolo.gy)
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SOCIOECONOMIC SEGMENTATION

63.1 Overview
Acxiom (www.acxiom.com), a database marketing company, developed the PersonicX Classic segmentation schema that categorizes households by socioeconomic metrics into 21 life-stage groups and 70 clusters. PersonicX Classic places each U.S. household in one of the segments based on financial, consumer behavior, and demographic characteristics.

63.2 Life-Stage Groups
The PersonicX life-stage groups and clusters within each category are as follows:

Beginnings
• Beginnings include many of those in the first generation to grow up in a wired world, with intensive use of cellphones, computers, and the Internet. They rank in the top 10 for short residential tenure, with low household income and minimal net worth.
• Clusters:
  - Early Parents
  - First Digs
  - Collegiate Crowd
  - Young Workboots
  - Rolling Stones

Taking Hold
• The big leap into this life-stage group is fueled by wealth, as these clusters have already made it into the middle and upper-middle income brackets. As a group, they share college education level, top 20 home value, and short residential tenure.
• Clusters:
  - Married Sophisticates
  - Children First
  - Career Building
  - Spouses and Houses
**Transitional Blues**
- After coasting through their 20s working relatively undemanding jobs and partying in their off-hours, this group is now transitioning to a more settled lifestyle, with some getting married and some starting families. They have a mix of white- and blue-collar jobs with mid-scaled household income and minimal net worth.
- Clusters:
  - Outward Bound
  - Trucks and Trailers
  - Home Cooking

**Gen X Singles**
- These single households without children share several key characteristics, including low-middle to lower socioeconomic levels, peak indices for lower white-collar occupations, and a high incidence of apartment living. With few investments, the members of this group seem to be supporting several educational loans and rank low on all measures of household income and net worth.
- Clusters:
  - First Mortgage
  - Still Landlorded
  - Low-Rent Digs

**Gen X Parents**
- Though the income levels within this group vary, it is evident that members of this life-stage group focus family resources toward meeting the needs of their children. It’s not surprising that they appear to put their children first, with both clusters in this group showing a high incidence of shopping for toys, children’s clothing, and children’s products.
- Clusters:
  - Cartoons and Carpoolls
  - Kids and Rent

**Mixed Singles**
- Concentrated in somewhat more urban areas, members of this group struggle with little more than minimal savings or investments and occupy the lowest rungs of the socioeconomic ladder. They have few children and tend to depend on low echelon white- and blue-collar jobs.
- Clusters:
  - Urban Scramble
  - Mortgage Woes
  - On the Edge

**Cash and Careers**
- Led by affluence of the Shooting Stars cluster, this group is one of the more affluent, with high household income and home value as well as a higher percentage of
households with a college education. Childless and relatively mobile, this group is just beginning to engage in the market and seems committed to enjoying the good life.

- Clusters:
  - Shooting Stars
  - Hard Chargers
  - Dynamic Duos
  - Savvy Singles

**Jumbo Families**

- Falling into the top 10% for average number of children per household, this group is the most prolific of all the life-stage groups. These clusters share above average college education and household income and also have a uniformly high incidence of working women.

- Clusters:
  - Kids and Clout
  - Toys and Tots
  - Country Comfort
  - Soccer and SUVs

**Boomer Singles**

- All unmarried (including those divorced and not remarried), the members of this group have no children living at home, which allows them to spend their disposable income on themselves. Their incomes are somewhat varied, from low to middle to upper-middle.

- Clusters:
  - City Mixers
  - Solo and Stable
  - Modest Wages

**Mixed Boomers**

- Managing on limited income and education, Mixed Boomers tend to exemplify the price of divorce in America. Of predominantly clerical white-collar and blue-collar occupations, these cohorts reside in different population densities and range across the socioeconomic scale.

- Clusters:
  - Rural Parents
  - Metro Parents
  - Rural Rovers

**Boomer Barons**

- Three of the wealthiest clusters are grouped into this life-stage group, where big money is made, traded, or banked. Characteristics of this group include peak education level, upper white-collar jobs, working women, and dual incomes.
• Clusters:
  - Summit Estates
  - Skyboxes and Suburbans
  - Leveraged Lifestyles

Flush Families
• Parents of older, school-aged children, the members of this group are well educated with upper-middle income and net worth. Typically owners of a home in the metro fringes and suburbs, these households are commonly absorbed in the lifestyles dictated by traditional parental roles.
• Clusters:
  - Solid Single Parents
  - Apple Pie Families

True Blues
• The last two dominating blue-collar bastions in America, the members of this group were born when the term ‘blue collar’ identified those who make and build things with hands and tools, a label that once was applied to over one-third of the workforce. In favor of big families and pickup trucks, these members tend to be married homeowners with children.
• Clusters:
  - Blue Collar Bunch
  - Farmland Families

Our Turn
• A mix of singles and married couples, these middle-aged households represent a cross-section of education, population density, and net worth. They share in common focused spending on themselves because there are no children present in the household.
• Clusters:
  - Country Single
  - Fun and Games
  - Mid Americana
  - Downtown Boomer Couples
  - Urban Tenants

Mature Wealth
• Mostly between the ages of 46 and 65, the members of this group share affluence and spending habits. Buying and doing most everything their money can afford, these cohorts tend to be concentrated in the most costly MSAs in New England, Mid-Atlantic, and Pacific regions.
• Clusters:
  - Established Elite
  - Corporate Clout
**Aging Upscale**

- One of the last groups of cohorts to marry young, the members of this group are now in the “empty nest” phase of their lives. Education varies, with none being extremely low, and incomes are considered upper-middle and affluent.
- Clusters:
  - Career-Centered Singles
  - Country Ways
  - Acred Couples

**Modest Means**

- Mostly homeowners with above average residential tenures, these clusters fall into the low-mid and lower socioeconomic strata. With below-average college education, the members of this group tend to have clerical white-collar and blue-collar occupations that limit household income.
- Clusters:
  - Work and Causes
  - Community Singles
  - Humble Homes
  - Single City Struggles
  - Penny Pinchers

**Mature Rustics**

- Strikingly similar in their rustic locales and lifestyles, this group tends to be concentrated in small cities throughout the Central and Southern regions of the U.S. Though their income may be below average, residing in an area with a lower cost of living allows these cohorts to be well positioned with relatively high net worth, with their home often being one of their primary assets.
- Clusters:
  - The Great Outdoors
  - The Greatest Generation
  - Still Truckin’

**Golden Years**

- Well enough off to enjoy the option of early retirement, many of the members of this group tend to work, often in upscale, white-collar occupations. Sharing rankings in the top 10 for education and net worth, the members of this group often share investment and spending patterns in items such as real estate, luxury cars, and foreign travel.
- Clusters:
  - Sitting Pretty
  - Full Steaming
  - Platinum Oldies
Active Elders
• Comfortably retired, these homeowners tend to reside in their home for much longer than average, granting them high ration of available equity to home values. A mix of widows and widowers, these homeowners tend to be health conscious, conservative in nature, and members of several social and church groups.
  - Clubs and Causes
  - Suburban Seniors
  - Raisin’ Grandkids

Leisure Buffs
• With an advanced age range of 71-to-83 years, members of this group are somewhat limited in their retirement by lower income and lower level of education. Their homes are central to their lives, with longer than average tenure. Many home-based activities such as gardening, collecting, and needlework take up their leisure time.
• Clusters:
  - Sedentarians
  - Family Matters
  - Rural Antiques
  - Thrifty Elders
  - Timeless Elders

63.3 Market Resources
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CUSTOMER ANALYTICS

64.1 Overview

Customer analytics involves the collection of multiple data points about consumers, assessments of the data using market segmentation and predictive analytics, and development of complementary marketing.

“Collecting data about customers is virtually as old as marketing itself, but the trillions of data points now available online make it a sophisticated piece of weaponry. Marketers can map a consumer’s journey across the Web and potentially even augment their findings with Facebook data collected by apps that will tell people’s leisure activities. Advertisers can enlist services to follow users on their mobile devices and tablets. Traditional data brokers sell offline data culled from public records and survey results to marketers, who can then overlay it with their purchase data and the data they’ve already mined online.”

Advertising Age

Consumer analytics and consumer tracking have dramatically changed the field of consumer marketing. Marketers are beginning to find that it is more effective to identify the right people who are ready to buy a particular product than to try to persuade people to buy a product they may, or may not, need through advertising.
“Is consumer tracking the new advertising? Has the ad industry finally reached the point where it’s no longer necessary for marketers to motivate consumers to buy their products? Has the business evolved to the point of being able to track down pre-sold consumers at the precise time when they’re ready to buy? Do marketers no longer need to waste money trying to motivate uninterested buyers into trying their products? Is the concept of advertising no longer applicable to today’s marketplace, and should we call what marketers do now consumer tracking?”

Advertising Age

64.2 Customer Databases

According to the CMO Council (www.cmocouncil.org), 65% of corporate marketers use customer profiles in their marketing programs.

Retailers and their suppliers are constantly analyzing sales data, which is linked to shoppers through loyalty programs, email registrations, and other in-house databases.

One example is Target, which for decades has collected vast amounts of data on customers. Target assigns each shopper a unique code – known internally as the Guest ID number – that records and monitors purchases.

Linked to each Guest ID is demographic information like the customer’s age, whether they are married and have kids, which part of town they live in, how long it takes them to drive to the nearest Target location, their estimated salary, whether they have moved recently, what credit cards they carry, and what websites they visit.

According to The New York Times, Target can buy data and link to each Guest ID information about a customer’s ethnicity, job history, the magazines they read, if they’ve ever declared bankruptcy or gotten divorced, the year they bought (or lost) their house, where they went to college, what kinds of topics they talk about online, whether they prefer certain brands of coffee, paper towels, cereal or applesauce, their political leanings, reading habits, charitable giving, the number of cars they own, and more.
“If you use a credit card or a coupon, or fill out a survey, or mail in a refund, or call the customer help line, or open an e-mail we’ve sent you or visit our website, we’ll record it and link it to your Guest ID. We want to know everything we can.”

Andrew Pole, Group Manager
Guest Marketing Analytics
Target Corporation
The New York Times

64.3 Sharing Customer Data
A January 2015 survey by Forrester Research (www.forrester.com) asked digital marketers the extent to which they share data about their customers. Responses were as follows:

- We use customer data and analytics results only internally: 63%
- We make some data or analytics results available to our business partners: 38%
- We make some data or analytics results available to our customers: 34%
- We are considering selling data or data services in the future to our business partners and/or customers: 10%
- We sell data and data services to our business partners and/or customers: 9%

Forrester Consulting also found that 93% of digital marketers use third-party data in their digital marketing strategy; 58% do so extensively.

“Data is critical for any marketer looking to effectively reach an audience. More than one-third ... share or sell customer data. The majority of digital marketers ... are also mixing their data with that of outside sources.”

eMarketer, 5/6/15
64.4 Data Brokers

Data brokers, also called database marketing companies, collect and sell data about consumers’ financial, shopping, and leisure activities. Brokers provide large-scale data mining and analytics that is primarily based on information available in public records and consumer surveys, among other sources.

Forrester Research estimates annual spending for third-party data from database marketing companies at more than $2 billion.

Advertising Age (May 2015) estimates annual marketing-related revenue for the largest data brokers as follows:

- Epsilon (Alliance Data Systems Corp.): $1.79 billion
- Acxion Corp.: $707 million
- Experian Marketing Services: $433 million
- Merkle: $425 million

“With more than 23,000 computer servers collecting, collating, and analyzing consumer data ... Acxiom Corp. is the quiet giant of a multibillion-dollar industry known as database marketing. Analysts say it has amassed the world’s largest commercial database on consumers – and that it wants to know much, much more. Its servers process more than 50 trillion data transactions a year. Company executives have said its database contains information about 500 million active consumers worldwide, with about 1,500 data points per person. That includes a majority of adults in the United States. In a fast-changing digital economy, Acxiom is developing even more advanced techniques to mine and refine data. It has recruited talent from Microsoft, Google, Amazon.com, and Myspace and is using a powerful, multiplatform approach to predicting consumer behavior that could raise its standing among investors and clients.”

The New York Times
Credit reporting agencies Equifax, Experian, and TransUnion have consumer analytics divisions. Datalogix, LexisNexis Data & Analytic Solutions, Nielsen Claritas, and Rapleaf are other major brokers of consumer data (see 64.9.1).

64.5 Consumer Valuation Scores

Consumer valuation scores, also called buying-power scores and e-scores, measure consumers’ potential value to marketers.

“What’s your e-score? You’ll probably never know. That’s because scores are largely invisible to the public. But they are highly valuable to companies that want – or in some cases, don’t want – to have you as their customer. Online consumer scores are calculated by a handful of start-ups, as well as a few financial services stalwarts, that specialize in the flourishing field of predictive consumer analytics. It is a Google-esque business, one fueled by almost unimaginable amounts of data and powered by complex computer algorithms. The result is a private, digital ranking of American society unlike anything that has come before. A growing number of companies, including banks, credit and debit card providers, insurers, and online educational institutions are using these scores to choose whom to woo on the Web. These scores can determine whether someone is pitched a platinum credit card or a plain one, a full-service cable plan or none at all. They can determine whether a customer is routed promptly to an attentive service agent or relegated to an overflow call center.”

The New York Times
Consumer valuation scores can take into account facts like occupation, salary, home valuation, spending on luxury goods, and more. Unlike credit scores, consumer valuation scores are unregulated and data is not available to consumers for review.

The largest e-score data providers include eBureau, Neustar, and TruSignal (see 64.9.2). eBureau scores about 20 million adults each month and provides data primarily to financial businesses. TruSignal scores about 110 million consumers monthly for advertisers seeking select audiences for online ads.

64.6 Product Use Insight

Any Internet-connected device can transmit product usage data that can be tracked and assessed. One example is e-readers. Over 20% of U.S. adults own either a tablet or an e-reader. Those who own the devices read about 65% of their books in digital form; few are aware that their digital-format books are also reading them.

The major players in e-book publishing – Amazon, Apple, and Google – can track which search terms readers use to find books, how long they spend reading, and how far they get into the books they have read. Book apps for tablets like the iPad, Kindle Fire, and Nook record how many times readers open the app and how much time they spend reading. Retailers and some publishers are sifting through the data and gaining unprecedented insight into how people engage with books.

Start-ups Smashwords (www.smashwords.com) and Entitle (www.entitle.com), among others, are using tracking technologies to provide insight for writers that will help them produce more of what readers want.

“The move to exploit reading data is one aspect of how consumer analytics is making its way into every corner of the culture. Amazon and Barnes & Noble already collect vast amounts of information from their e-readers but keep it proprietary. Now the start-ups ... are hoping to profit by telling all.”

The New York Times

The diversity of products and applications for assessing consumers through their personal smart devices is vast.

A unique product with sensor-based tracking capabilities is the Beam Brush (www.beamtoothbrush.com), launched in 2013. This toothbrush syncs with a user’s
smartphone to record brushing time; data can be shared with dentists and insurance companies on an opt-in basis. Similar to Beam Brush, the Kolibree toothbrush was unveiled in early 2014 at the International Consumer Electronics Show in Las Vegas. Users download a mobile app and connect via Bluetooth, and the Kolibree documents every brushing via three sensors that record 1) how long you brush, 2) whether you brush all four quadrants of your mouth, and 3) whether you brush up and down (good) instead of just side to side (bad). And Oral-B recently launched the SmartSeries electric toothbrush that also links to a smartphone app via Bluetooth.

Other data-producing products include Internet-synced bathroom scales and calorie-and-exercise systems like Fitbit and Nike+ FuelBand.

__________________________________________________________

“Beyond fitness and healthcare, the data mined from sensor-equipped products could hold huge advantages for marketers. The biggest opportunity could be in more simple product categories, such as consumer packaged goods, in which general data-gathering technology helps marketers test ideas and could eventually guide everything from product positioning to distribution.”

Advertising Age

__________________________________________________________

Ad agencies are becoming involved in the field. SapientNitro, for instance, launched Iota Partners (www.iota-partners.com), a consumer research agency that equips products with sensors that monitor consumer activities.

64.7 Data Integration

In a survey by McKinsey & Company (www.mckinsey.com), 32% of marketing executives said the ability to generate and leverage deep customer insights was the most important digital challenge they faced.

A survey by DataXu (www.dataxu.com) found that just 30% of U.S. executives reported that their company had the ability to leverage the value of their customer data.

To analyze customer data and segment their audiences for personalized marketing, companies often turn to specialty software companies like Monetate, MyBuys, RichRelevance, and SmartFocus (see 64.9.3).
Among large companies, the integration of customer databases is advancing rapidly. According to Internet Retailer, over 50% of the 500 largest online retailers in the U.S. use customer databases for personalized marketing.

“The latest frontier for marketers is taking offline data such as income, credit rating, home value, savings, past purchases, number of children living at home, and other data, and merging that with the blooming online data stream. The offline data – including extremely sensitive, personally identifiable information – has been used by the direct-marketing industry for decades. But only recently have marketers begun to connect that trove to online behavior.”

Advertising Age

64.8 Regulatory Oversight
The Fair Credit Reporting Act requires that consumer reporting agencies, the companies that compile credit data, show people their credit reports and allow them to correct errors. Personal data that falls outside of the Act is largely unregulated. Although the Federal Trade Commission has issued a consumer privacy report urging companies that collect and share customer information to give people more notification and control over the proliferation of their personal details, the recommendations don’t have the force of binding regulations.

Data brokers, for their part, are beginning to offer some transparency of the data they collect. Acxiom, for example, launched a website that gives consumers a glimpse of some of the data the company has collected about them. Visitors who log in to Aboutthedata.com may review data about themselves – ranging from their pet ownership to their leisure activities.
“They’re the lifeblood of a marketing industry bent on efficiency and accurate targeting, but data-mining companies have for decades operated under a shroud of mystery and are not so easily trusted when it comes to consumers and privacy activists. Data giant Acxiom is aiming to quell concerns with a little transparency in the hopes it will pacify lawmakers threatening to curb the industry’s practices and preempt heightened consumer concern about data security and privacy.”

*Advertising Age*

64.9 Key Players

64.9.1 Data Brokers


Datalogix, 10075 Westmoor Drive, Westminster, CO 80021. (303) 327-1600. (www.datalogix.com)

Epsilon, 6021 Dallas Connection Drive, Irving, TX 75039. (800) 309-0505. (www.epsilon.com)

Equifax, 1550 Peachtree Street NE, Atlanta, GA 30309. (866) 816-8573. (www.equifax.com)

Experian Marketing Services, 475 Anton Boulevard, Costa Mesa, CA 92626. (844) 747-1667. (www.experian.com/marketing-services/about.html)

LexisNexis Data & Analytic Solutions, 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4500, Los Angeles, CA 90013. (800) 869-0751. (www.lexisnexis.com)

Merkle, 7001 Columbia Gateway Drive, Columbia, MD 21046. (443) 542-4000. (www.merkleinc.com)
64.9.2 Consumer Valuation Data Sources

eBureau, 25 6th Avenue North, St. Cloud, MN 56303. (320) 534-5000. (www.ebureau.com)

Neustar, 21575 Ridgetop Circle, Sterling, VA 20166. (571) 434-5400. (www.neustar.biz)


64.9.3 Data Integration Software

Monetate, 951 E. Hector Street, Conshohocken, PA 19428. (877) 666-3828. (www.monetate.com)

MyBuys, 411 Borel Avenue, Suite 100, San Mateo, CA 94402. (650) 544-2400. (www.mybuys.com)


SmartFocus Inc., 18 West 18th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10011. (646) 356-1169. (www.smartfocus.com)

64.9.4 Trade Associations

Chief Marketing Officer [CMO] Council, 1494 Hamilton Way, San Jose, CA 95125. (408) 677-5300. (www.cmocouncil.org)


Direct Marketing Association, 1120 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036. (212) 768-7277. (www.the-dma.org)

64.9.5 Privacy Advocacy Groups

Future of Privacy Forum, 919 18th Street NW, Suite 901, Washington, DC 20006. (877) 842-2226. (www.futureofprivacy.org)

United States Public Interest Research Group, 218 D Street SE, First Floor, Washington, DC 20003. (202) 546-9707. (www.uspirg.org)

64.9.6 Federal Agencies
65.1 Overview

Behavioral targeting (BT), also called interest-based advertising, is the practice of seeking out consumers based on where they go and what they do as indicators of what their interests are most likely to be. BT is mostly being applied in online ad-targeting, where a consumer's behavior on a website is tracked to determine his or her interests and ads are served relevant to those interests. The practice has become an integral part of most online marketing campaigns.

Forrester Research (www.forrester.com) defines online behavioral targeting as the aligning of ads with users whose online behavior implies interest in a particular product or service. Advertisers apply behavioral targeting when they buy media on sites that attract users who have shown target behaviors, even if the site is not contextually relevant to their ad. For example, a user who has frequented Kelley Blue Book, General Motors' FastLane blog, and cars.com may see an ad for a new Toyota Highlander the next time he or she logs onto a general site.

Over 150 tracking entities routinely collect information about users of websites, and social network apps correlate to profiles of individuals' browsing behavior across multiple Web pages, according to PrivacyChoice (www.privacychoice.org).

The BT online approach was pioneered in the early 2000s by small specialist firms like Advertising.com (www.advertising.com), Revenue Science which rebranded as Audience Science (www.audiencescience.com), Tacoda which is now AOL Networks (www.aolnetworks.com), and Adknowledge (www.adknowledge.com). Two multibillion-dollar acquisitions in the online advertising market expanded the growth of BT. Internet giants entered the field in 2007 when Google acquired Internet-ad broker DoubleClick and Microsoft Corp. acquired aQuantative.

According to the Network Advertising Initiative (www.networkadvertising.org), behaviorally targeted advertising is more than twice as effective compared with conventional advertising at converting users who click on the ads into buyers (6.8% conversion vs. 2.8% for run-of-network ads).

65.2 Advertiser Spending

According to eMarketer (www.emarketer.com), spending on display ads delivered based on behavioral targeting has been as follows (change from previous year in parenthesis):
65.3 Retargeting

One form of BT is retargeting, where Internet users are shown display ads about specific products they have looked at online. A person that looks at a pair of shoes on an e-commerce site, for example, may see display ads for that specific product for several days while visiting various other websites.

A study by comScore (www.comscore.com) and ValueClick (www.valueclick.com) found that compared with run-of-network ads, retargeted display ads give a 1,046% lift in searches on brand terms within four weeks after exposure. This is more than twice as high as the second most effective targeting method, audience targeting. Retargeting also brings a 726% lift in website visitation within four weeks after exposure. The study found retargeting to be the most effective among all types of online ad placement strategies.

65.4 BT Email

An offshoot from behavioral targeting is behaviorally triggered email, which marketers can designate as a tool to boost customers’ recency, frequency, average order value, and retention. Examples of behaviorally targeted email campaigns include the following (source: Multichannel Merchant):

- Thank you or welcome messages
- Abandoned shopping cart emails
- First-time buyer emails
- Second-time buyer emails
- Birthday and anniversary triggers

65.5 Privacy Concerns

The 2014 U.S. Consumer Confidence Privacy Report, by Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com), found that 92% of U.S. Internet users worry about their privacy online. Seventy-four percent (74%) say they are more concerned about their privacy that they were a year prior.

In a survey by the Pew Research Internet Project (www.pewinternet.org), 59% of Internet users said they themselves have noticed targeted advertising online – specifically, they have noticed advertisements online that are directly related to things they had recently searched for or sites they had recently visited.
By demographic, the percentage who noticed this is as follows:

**Gender**
- Female: 56%
- Male: 62%

**Age**
- 18-to-29: 62%
- 30-to-49: 62%
- 50-to-64: 56%
- 65 and older: 47%

**Education**
- Some high school: 38%
- High school graduate: 44%
- Some college: 64%
- College graduate: 73%

Sixty-eight percent (68%) of Internet users view online targeted advertising negatively, saying that they do not like their online behavior tracked and analyzed. By age, those that feel this way are as follows (source: Pew Research Internet Project):
- 18-to-29: 59%
- 30-to-49: 65%
- 50-to-64: 78%
- 65 and older: 72%

Seventy-three percent (73%) of Internet users say they are not okay with search sites collecting user information to personalize search results. By age, those that feel this way are as follows (source: Pew Research Internet Project):
- 18-to-29: 69%
- 30-to-49: 68%
- 50 and older: 83%

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of Internet users say they are generally aware of ways they themselves can limit how much information about them is collected by a website. Among this group, one common strategy people use to limit personal data collection is to delete their Web history; 81% of those who know ways to manage the capture of their data do this. Seventy-five percent (75%) of this group use the privacy settings of websites to control what is captured about them; 65% change their browser settings to limit the information that is collected.


**65.6 ‘Do Not Track’ Options**

Responding to pressure from privacy advocates and the possibility of regulatory limits on online tracking, the leading companies in the BT sector have agreed to provide Internet users with ‘do not track’ options.

AdChoices ([www.youradchoices.com](http://www.youradchoices.com)) was launched in 2011 to protect online users’ privacy by providing an opt-out option for BT ads. AdChoices is managed by the Digital Advertising Alliance ([www.digitaladvertisingalliance.com](http://www.digitaladvertisingalliance.com)), an alliance formed by American Association of Advertising Agencies (4As, [www.aaaa.org](http://www.aaaa.org)), the Association of National Advertisers (ANA, [www.ana.org](http://www.ana.org)), the American Advertising Federation (AAF), the Direct Marketing Association (DMA), the Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB, [www.iab.net](http://www.iab.net)), the Better Business Bureau (BBB, [www.bbb.org](http://www.bbb.org)), and the Network Advertising Initiative.

AdChoices was expanded to mobile apps in 2013.

The 93 members of the Network Advertising Initiative, which include virtually all of the major BT companies, comply with consumer opt-out requests made on the NAI website ([www.networkadvertising.org/choices/](http://www.networkadvertising.org/choices/)). The website displays member tracking policies and features a display tool where Internet users can see in real-time which companies are tracking them.

Despite the best intentions, AdChoices has had limited success in curtailing unwanted online targeting. A March 2015 survey by ORC International ([www.orcinternational.com](http://www.orcinternational.com)) found that 74% of adult Internet users were not familiar with the campaign.

_________________________________________________________________

“In response to consumer concerns about ads based on online activity, the advertising industry introduced the AdChoices button to provide targeting transparency and allow users to opt out of tracking options. But has it worked? Based on recent research, awareness has a long way to go before consumers know their options and feel more positive about targeted ads.”

eMarketer, 6/18/15

_________________________________________________________________
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SHARING INFORMATION ON SOCIAL MEDIA

66.1 Overview
Most personal data in the hands of marketers is that which consumers have willingly (or naively) shared. Millions of people share the most intimate details of their personal life on social-networking websites.

“People often dole out all kinds of personal information on the Internet that allows such identifying data to be deduced. Services like Facebook, Twitter, and Flickr are oceans of personal minutiae – birthday greetings sent and received, school and work gossip, photos of family vacations, and movies watched. Computer scientists and policy experts say that such seemingly innocuous bits of self-revelation can increasingly be collected and reassembled by computers to help create a picture of a person’s identity, sometimes down to the Social Security number.”

The New York Times

66.2 Information Shared On Social Media
The Social Media Habits And Privacy Concerns Survey, published by uSamp (www.usamp.com), found that social network users, by gender and age, are willing to share various types of personal information on social media sites as follows (percentage of respondents in each group):
### Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-to-24</th>
<th>25-to-34</th>
<th>35-to-49</th>
<th>50 and Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity:</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brands I like:</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status:</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping preferences:</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level:</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation:</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliation:</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation:</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal photos:</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthdate:</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location:</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address:</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-to-24</th>
<th>25-to-34</th>
<th>35-to-49</th>
<th>50 and Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brands I like:</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status:</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity:</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level:</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping preferences:</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliation:</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation:</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation:</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthdate:</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal photos:</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location:</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address:</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 66.3 Sharing Information With Trusted Companies

A survey by Pitney Bowes (www.pitneybowes.com) asked Internet users what types of personal information they may be willing to share with trusted companies they deal with. The survey assessed four categories of information.
Transactional Data
• This data is often part of a basic transaction such as subscribing to a website, adding themselves to a mailing list, or joining a social media community. Few consumers say they would withhold transactional data from a brand or organization. Internet users are willing to share personal information as follows:
  - Date of birth: 90%
  - Physical address: 87%
  - Email: 86%
  - Banking details: 78%

Physical Data
• Contrary to assumptions about vanity, consumers rather willingly share their physical data. Internet users are willing to share physical data as follows:
  - Height: 78%
  - Weight: 76%

Secure data
• This data increases vulnerability to identity theft and is held closely by many consumers. Internet users are willing to share secure data as follows:
  - Income: 64%
  - Mobile phone number: 62%
  - Credit card numbers: 60%

Beliefs and Personal Attributes
• This data has a virtual lock and key around it and brands should be aware of the sensitivity that consumers feel about them. Internet users are willing to share their beliefs and personal attributes as follows:
  - Sexual preference: 55%
  - Ethnicity: 46%
  - Religion: 29%
  - Political persuasion: 24%

66.4 Enticements for Sharing Information
In a survey by Etailing Solutions (www.etailing-solutions.com), 41% of adults said they are willing to sometimes use their personal data in exchange for discounts on goods and services.

Several social sites offer incentives for consumers to share information about themselves. The following are examples (source: The New York Times):
• Aprizi, a shopping-focused social site, asks users to enter information about preferences, then selects products for them from throughout the web. Registered users receive offers from online retailers for free shipping, half-price discounts, and other specials.
• Dopplr, a free social networking service launched in 2007, allows users to create itineraries of their travel plans and to share personal and business travel plans privately with people they designate.
• Location-based services like Foursquare and Gowalla ask users to volunteer their location in return for rewards like discounts on Pepsi drinks or Starbucks coffee.
• Mint.com, a budgeting site, displays discount offers from cable companies or banks to users who reveal their personal financial data, such as bank and credit card information.

“As concern increases about the amount of private data online ... many Web startups are pursuing a more reciprocal approach – saying, in essence: give us your data and get something in return. These efforts are predicated on a shift in the relationship between consumer and company. Influenced by consumers’ willingness to trade data online, the sites are pushing to see how much information people will turn over.”

*The New York Times*

Some social networks entice members to reveal details about their spending simply for the enjoyment of sharing their shopping experiences. On Swipely (www.swipely.com), for example, whenever site members make a purchase using their registered credit or debit card, the transaction is posted. “Turn purchases into conversations” is Swipely’s mantra.

**66.5 Privacy Issues**

In the previously cited survey by uSamp, 28.2% of social network users said they are somewhat or very uncomfortable with privacy protection on social media sites. By gender and age, those with such concerns are as follows (percentage of respondents):

**Female**
- 18-to-34: 24.3%
- 25-to-34: 25.3%
- 35-to-49: 36.9%
- 50 and older: 28.5%
Male
- 18-to-34: 22.7%
- 25-to-34: 19.0%
- 35-to-49: 36.0%
- 50 and older: 37.1%

A survey by Gallup (www.gallup.com) found that concern about social network privacy diminishes among those who are on the sites regularly. By frequency of use, those that are very concerned about privacy on social networks are as follows (percentage of respondents):
- Less than once per week: 39%
- At least once per week: 35%
- Daily: 26%

In a survey by Harris Interactive (www.harrisinteractive.com), only 32% of Facebook users felt they completely understood the site’s privacy controls.

When asked in a survey by Zogby (www.zogby.com) how recently they had changed their social network privacy settings, social network users responded as follows (percentage of respondents):
- This week: 22%
- This month: 22%
- Within the past six months: 17%
- Within the last year: 18%
- Never or uncertain: 21%

For Facebook, the largest social network, there is confusion, even among experts, about the extent of targeted information that is made available to advertisers.

_________________________________________________________________
“What [Facebook] knows depends on who you ask. The social network says one thing, its advertisers another. A Facebook spokeswoman said precisely targeted audiences are created solely on what users have added to their profiles as likes or interests.”

Advertising Age

_________________________________________________________________
There are no legal requirements that websites reveal what they know about users or the details about their privacy controls. Consumers’ concerns about privacy are also sometimes difficult to gauge because they are self-contradictory about marketer’s use of their information.

“There may claim to worry about privacy issues but look at what they actually do online... willingly surrendering personal information for a coupon or in a Facebook discussion. The disconnect between what people say and do shows that policymakers and academics misjudge the extent to which the public really cares about the use of data about them by marketers.”

Mark Dolliver, Analyst
The Digital Privacy Dilemma
eMarketer
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MOBILE TRACKING

67.1 Overview

In 2010, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC, www.fcc.gov) ordered mobile providers to implement capabilities for emergency 911 (E911) location tracking. The requirement was promulgated because of the more than 180 million emergency calls received by 911 centers nationwide each year from mobile handsets. While the FCC order did not explicitly require GPS tracking, virtually all cellphones and smartphones sold since 2010 have GPS tracking technology embedded.

Several mobile services and mobile apps offer tools that let smartphone users report their physical location, or check-in. Among the most popular check-in platforms are Facebook Places, Foursquare, GetGlue, Google, Gowalla, Loopt, and Shopkick.

“Location-based targeting has evolved far beyond geofencing (serving an ad to a mobile device detected within a predetermined perimeter of a physical location) and geoconquering (serving an ad to mobile devices within close proximity of a competitor’s location) to become a method for identifying and serving ads to unique audience segments.”

eMarketer, 5/15/15

67.2 Location Tagging

According to the Pew Research Internet Project (www.pewinternet.org), there is notable growth in the number of social media users who have set their accounts to include their location in their posts. Among adult social media users ages 18 and older, 30% said in a Pew survey that at least one of their accounts was set up to include their location in their posts, an increase from 14% who said they had ever done this in 2011.

The following are demographics of social media users who use location tagging:
Gender
• Female: 30%
• Male: 30%

Age
• 18-to-29: 32%
• 30-to-49: 34%
• 50-to-64: 26%
• 65 and older: 18%

Pew found that 12% of adult smartphone owners use a geosocial service to “check in” to certain locations or to share their location with friends. Among those who use geosocial service, 39% check into places on Facebook, 18% use Foursquare, and 14% use Google Plus.

Consumers’ willingness to let retailers track their location varies by sector. In a survey by PunchTab (www.punchtab.com), those who are willing to share their in-store location said they would do so for the following categories of retailers (percentage of respondents):
• Superstores: 84%
• Department stores: 78%
• Grocery stores: 74%
• Home improvement stores: 60%
• Coffeehouses: 38%
• Sports stores: 32%
• Drug stores: 30%
• Convenience stores: 11%

67.3 Mobile Device Tracking
Mobile phones can be tracked even if the user has not opted to check-in. The following are two services that provide such tracking:
• Path Intelligence (www.pathintelligence.com) has developed a system that registers a phone’s cellular signal and monitors the user’s location. The company says its technology records the paths of more than one million customers every day. One application is the assessment of foot traffic in a mall to guide site selection. Another use is for determining the geographic mix of visitors to a venue by using the cellphone number area code.
• Tapad (www.tapad.com), which specializes in mobile-retargeting, supplements cookie-tracking with device signatures to track users as they travel from mobile browsers to apps and vice versa.

Facebook has long recorded the GPS coordinates of users when they post status updates or check into a venue.
According to CBS Interactive (www.cnet.com), Verizon Wireless sells information about its customers’ geographical locations, app usage, and Web browsing activities. Verizon offers reports to marketers showing what subscribers are doing on their phones and other mobile devices, including what iOS and Android apps are in use and in which locations. Verizon may link the data to third-party databases with information about customers’ gender, age, and leisure activities, according to CBS.

Verizon Wireless says that its initiative is legal because the information is aggregated and doesn’t reveal customers’ identities. The company also says its customers can opt out at any time.

Verizon’s program, called Precision Market Insights, was described at a conference at the Paley Center for Media (www.paleycenter.org).

“We’re able to view just about everything that they do. And that’s really where data is going today. Data is the new oil. [Verizon has] created a very sophisticated system, so advanced it can predict what customers will want. We’re able to identify what that customer likes not by filling out a form, but by analyzing what they do on a day-to-day basis. We’re able to serve them products that we know they like because we’ve seen that they’ve gone through and downloaded products like it. One potential [application] for the Precision program is a sports arena that wants to know more about who’s attending a game. We’re able to analyze what people are viewing on their handsets. If you’re at an MLB game, we can tell if you’re viewing ESPN, we can tell if you’re viewing MLB, we can tell what social networking sites you’re activating, if you’re sending out mobile usage content that’s user-generated on video.”

Bill Diggins, Program Leader
Precision Market Insights
Verizon Wireless
Paley Center for Media
67.5 Contextual Tracking

Marketeters are leveraging location data to better understand people through the places they visit.

One example is Factual (www.factual.com), which aggregates location tracking data over several weeks to recognize patterns. Factual derives profiles of consumer behaviors and lifestyles with observations such as whether consumers are going to nightclubs, traveling, etc.

To ascertain that someone is a business traveler, it is not necessary to locate them at an airport. By observing one location data point and then a few hours later see another data point from that same device thousands of miles away from the first location infers that the person has been on an airplane. That pattern occurring several times during the week suggests that they likely fall into the business traveler category.

Data from the U.S. Census aggregates information in block groups, or areas of one or more city blocks. Assumptions about ethnicity and household income can be derived with moderate accuracy by determining from location data where a smartphone user lives.

“Location data not only signals where you are, it signals who you are.”

eMarketer, 5/15/15

Further behavioral profiling of consumers can be ascertained by trackers who monitor what apps users have on their smartphone.

67.6 Privacy Concerns

According to the Pew Research Internet Project, 54% of mobile app users have decided not to install an app due to concerns about personal information; 30% have uninstalled an app because of such concerns. The demographics of those who have taken these actions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Did Not Install</th>
<th>Uninstalled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age
• 18-to-29: 49% 29%
• 30-to-49: 55% 31%
• 49 and older: 57% 27%

Household Income
• Less than $30,000: 50% 38%
• $30,000 to $49,999: 46% 29%
• $50,000 to $74,999: 59% 30%
• $75,000 or more: 57% 26%

Education
• High school graduate or less: 45% 25%
• Some college: 57% 32%
• College graduate: 60% 33%

According to a survey by the e-tailing Group (www.e-tailing.com), 34% of smartphone users find it somewhat undesirable to be geo-targeted on their mobile device, 24% have no concerns or find it desirable, and 42% have mixed feelings.

In a survey by TRUSTe (www.truste.com), an online privacy management services provider, 60% of adults said they have privacy concerns about mobile app use.

PunchTab found that just 27% of U.S. smartphone users would allow mobile in-store tracking in order to receive relevant, real-time information and offers. Among those who would not allow in-store tracking, 63% cited privacy or intrusiveness as their primary concerns.
68

IN-STORE TRACKING

68.1 Observational Customer Research

The science of analyzing customers while in stores in order to understand their shopping habits dates to the mid-1990s, when Envirosell (www.envirosell.com) used video cameras to observe shopping patterns as shoppers navigated various retail environments. The 1999 book *Why We Buy*, authored by Paco Underhill, the founder of Envirosell, is the classic book on observational customer research.

The expanded use of in-store tracking technologies is, in part, an effort by bricks-and-mortar retailers to catch up with their online competitors.

“While physical stores know how many customers visit and what they buy, e-commerce sites know which section customers head to first, how long they look at each product, and who browses but doesn’t make a purchase. So several technology startups are trying to find ways to provide them with e-commerce-level data.”

*Bloomberg Businessweek*

A variety of software products is available to assist retailers and mall operators implement observational research studies. The following are examples:

- 3VR (www.3vr.com), a maker of security systems, developed a camera-based system that retail stores can use to track how people move around, how long they stand in front of displays, and which items they pick up and for how long. Another 3VR software system uses facial recognition that can identify shoppers’ gender and estimate their approximate age, providing retailers with insight into customer demographics.
• Prism Skylabs (www.prismskylabs.com) uploads and analyzes video from in-store surveillance cameras to track customer movement and the effectiveness of promotions. Prism’s software develops heat maps of customer activity while stripping out images of actual shoppers to protect their privacy. The technology is being used by about 30 U.S. retailers.

• Nomi (www.nomi.com) uses Wi-Fi to track customers’ behavior in a store, but goes one step further by matching a phone to an individual.

“When a shopper has volunteered some personal information, either by downloading a retailer’s app or providing an e-mail address when using in-store Wi-Fi, Nomi pulls up a profile of that customer – the number of recent visits, what products that customer was looking at on the website last night, purchase history. The store then has access to that profile.”

The New York Times

68.2 Influencing Shopping Behavior

The goal of observational customer research is to identify which variables affect a purchase, then to deploy more salespeople, alter displays, change store layouts, or adjust inventory to maximize customer spending. Tracking technologies support observational research with detailed information about customers.

Tracking studies sometimes refute conventional wisdom. For instance, many food manufacturers pay a premium for their products to be displayed at the end of an aisle. But RetailNext (www.retailnext.com) found that customers actually pay greater attention to products placed in the center of an aisle.

Using video analytics at its Miami store, Montblanc was able to identify which parts of the store were best-trafficked. That information was used to guide placement of merchandise, design elements, and salespeople. The result was a 20% boost in sales.

Martin Lindstrom, a consultant and author of Brainwashed: Tricks Companies Use To Manipulate Our Minds And Persuade Us To Buy (2011, Crown Press), describes how a retailer installed a quality parquet floor in one aisle that caused carts to make a clickety-clack sound instead of gliding quietly across the usual linoleum tiles.
Tracking of customers on video found that they spent 75% more time in the aisle after the new flooring was installed.

**68.3 Mobile Panels**
Retailers have long used customer purchasing data to guide their marketing campaigns, but broader data on shopper spending and how people respond to promotions has been harder to come by. A relatively recent advance is the use of panels of smartphone users who track the intricacies of their in-store experience, from what they buy to what products are on shelves, how they’re merchandised, and how they respond to what they see.

“The mobile panel industry has grown fast enough that it’s hard to recall just how difficult it was to track what was happening in stores only six years ago.”

*Advertising Age, 3/28/15*

Major retailers are also supplementing their own loyalty programs with mobile shopper panels.

**68.4 Facial Recognition**
Facial recognition technology is in the early stages of development. Commercial systems are now being used by retailers to determine general characteristics like age range, gender, ethnicity, and level of attention. This information is used to personalize display ads, optimize the placement of displays, and match sales staff to the customer mix.

Almax (www.almax-italy.com) has developed SeeEye, a mannequin with a camera embedded in one eye used to log customers. The $5,000 device is used by several U.S. retailers. The mannequin prompted one retailer to change its window displays after observing differences in the gender mix of customers. The mannequin at another store observed that one-third of customers using a particular entrance after 4 p.m. were Asian; Chinese-speaking salespeople were moved to that location.

Brickstream (www.brickstream.com) uses a stereoscopic camera to separate adults from children and counts people in different parts of a store to determine which aisles are most popular.
Synqera (www.synqera.com) sells software for checkout devices that tailors marketing messages to a customer’s gender, age, and mood as measured by facial recognition.

Realeyes (www.realeyes.com) analyzes facial cues for responses to ads and monitors shoppers’ so-called happiness levels in stores and their reactions at the register.

_________________________________________________________________

“Cameras have become so sophisticated, with sharper lenses and data-processing, that companies can analyze what shoppers are looking at, and even what their mood is.”

The New York Times

_________________________________________________________________

Fast-food restaurant chains have used facial recognition to tailor promotions to customers while they view the menu board based on their age and gender.

To dispense food samples in supermarkets, Kraft Foods uses a kiosk that can qualify shoppers by age or gender before providing a sample. Only when an adult is detected is a sample dispensed.

68.5 RFID Tracking

Some large retailers are implementing systems that involve RFID tags attached to the merchandise. Although not yet implemented nationwide by any major U.S. retailer, such systems are envisioned as a way to provide automated checkout by detecting every item in a shopping cart and debiting customers’ accounts so they avoid conventional checkout lines. The systems also allow precise inventory control by sending information on each shoppers’ purchases to the retailer and product manufacturers. The tags also will allow retailers to track merchandise back to the point of manufacture in case of a recall, or to make sure it isn’t counterfeit.

Walmart, which for many years has used RFID tags to track pallets of merchandise traveling through their supply chains, began installing on a trial basis ‘smart tags’ on apparel at some stores.

JCPenney has also announced plans to install RFID tags on inventory storewide and to replace traditional cash-wrap stations with automated self-checkout.

RFID inventory systems will provide retailers with a wealth of information beyond inventory control. Retailers will gain insight into which items are typically purchased together, track shopping navigation patterns, and more. Retailers could even track
individual customers’ purchases for those who identify themselves through a location-based smartphone app, loyalty program registration, or digital coupon use.

Retailers can take steps to insure customer privacy when RFID tags are used. Walmart, for instance, requires that suppliers add the tags to removable labels or packaging instead of embedding them into clothes, to minimize fears that they are being used to track shopper’s movements.

### 68.6 Privacy Issues

While privacy issues about research that simply observes but does not identify customers as they shop are minimal, there are concerns about the next step that retailers might take as observational technologies advance.

_________________________________________________________

“Privacy advocates are troubled by the array of video cameras, motion detectors, and other sensors monitoring the nation’s shopping aisles. While taping shoppers is legal, critics say it is unethical to observe people as if they were lab rats. They are concerned that the practices will lead to an even greater invasion of privacy.”

_The New York Times_

_________________________________________________________

Katherine Albrecht, founder of the advocacy group Consumers Against Supermarket Privacy Invasion and Numbering (www.nocards.org), believes that it is inevitable that some technologies such as facial recognition will advance to the point that data and shopping behaviors can be linked to individuals.

Privacy advocates also have raised issues about the expanded use of RFID technology, such as identifying customers through their personal ID cards. Several states, including Washington and New York, have begun issuing enhanced driver’s licenses with embedded RFID tags and retailers could theoretically scan customers’ licenses as they make purchases, combine this identification with their credit card data, and then know the person’s identity the next time they step into the store.

### 68.7 Key Players

3VR, 814 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 941037. (415) 495-5790. (www.3VR.com)
Almax, Via Boaresco 44, P.O. Box 97, 22066 Mariano Comense, Italy. Tel.: +39 031 74 98 52. (www.almax-italy.com)

Catalina Marketing, 200 Carillon Parkway, St. Petersburg, FL 33716. (877) 210-1917. (www.catalinamarketing.com)

Envirosell, 907 Broadway, 2nd Floor, New York, NY 10010. (212) 673-9100. (www.envirosell.com)

Kairos, 2200 NW 2nd Avenue, Miami, FL 33127. (www.kairos.com)

IMRSV, 86 Chambers Street, Suite 704, New York, NY 10007. (347) 391-2727. (www.imrsv.com)

Prism Skylabs, 799 Market Street, 8th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. (415) 704-8762. (www.prismskylabs.com)

RetailNext, 845 Market Street, 10th Floor, San Jose, CA 95113. (408) 884-2162. (www.bviretailnext.com)

ShopperTrak, 233 South Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 529-5300. (www.shoppertrak.com)
69.1 Overview
Marketers have been tracking consumers online for more than 20 years, since the invention of the ‘cookie’ by Netscape, and on mobile devices for more than a decade. But, until recently, data was not correlated as consumers moved from online to their mobile device to in-store. Marketers are now beginning to track customers across channels. This will allow, for example, consumers to be served ads on their smartphone based on their laptop or PC browsing activities.

“Cross-linking everything across screens and devices is the biggest and most important trend this year. Linking allows you to target across devices and measure whether an ad on a mobile device or PC drove an in-store sale. These types of insights will be important for advertisers.”

eMarketer, 2/20/15

69.2 Priority And Implementation
In a survey by Econsultancy (www.econsultancy.com), 67% of marketers said that integrating all marketing across channels, or cross-channel marketing, was their top priority. However, the survey found that most marketers have not yet achieved their goal of seamless cross-channel tracking. Just 10% said their messaging, execution, and delivery are aligned across touchpoints. Only 7% of respondents said their organizations were prepared to execute cross-channel marketing.

The following are cross-channel marketing capabilities reported in the Econsultancy survey (percentage of respondents):
We understand our customers’ journeys and adapt our channel mix accordingly: 43%
We have cross-functional/cross-silo teams to facilitate integrated marketing: 30%
We have measured the financial results of conducting cross-channel/integrated marketing: 19%
We have measured the customer retention benefits of conducting cross-channel/integrated marketing: 14%

“As consumers bounce from device to device throughout the day, marketers are trying to figure out how to track them across platforms. As a result, cross-channel marketing is a top priority for the majority of client-side marketers queried in a study by Econsultancy in association with Oracle. However, a look at the other cross-channel capabilities cited by respondents showed that just because cross-channel was a priority didn’t mean they were actually doing it.”

eMarketer

69.3 Beyond Cookies
Tracking using cookies has the limitation that they are device specific. New protocols for identifying customers extend beyond devices. Some programs track users by their IP addresses; others look at users’ operating systems and other factors.

One such tracking methodology is ‘canvas fingerprinting,’ developed by AddThis (www.addthis.com). The technique creates a unique image of visiting computers and devices. Researchers at Princeton University found over 5,000 sites monitoring users with canvas fingerprinting; most do not mention this in their privacy policies.

Google uses Advertising ID, a unique number that corresponds to a particular customer, linking mobile browser activity to app use. As of August 2014, publishers of new or updated Android apps in Google’s online store were required to catalog...
customers with Advertising ID. Apple’s system, Identifier for Advertising, performs similarly.

Facebook can track user activity on any website that has a Like button. Facebook also uses Atlas, an ad-serving service acquired from Microsoft. Atlas lets advertisers target ads to people based on data that Facebook gathers, including Facebook activity and web-browsing activity. Facebook associates all of this activity with a unique Facebook ID.

_________________________________________________________________

“Atlas tracks consumers online and offline via Facebook IDs. Advertisers can track ad performance across devices and publishers without having to rely on cookies.”

eMarketer, 12/5/14

_________________________________________________________________

While controls are in place for consumers to block cookies to protect their privacy, cookie alternatives are nearly impossible to spot or disable because they don’t have built-in consumer controls or an ability to be turned off.

69.4 Tracking Services

AppLovin (www.applovin.com), BlueCava (www.bluecava.com), Drawbridge (www.drawbridge.com), LiveIntent (www.liveintent.com), Magnetic (www.magnetic.com), and Tapad (www.tapad.com), among others, sell tracking services and software that can link smartphones, tablets, PCs, and even Internet-connected televisions to a distinct though nameless person. The companies’ algorithms sift the details of each device’s Web use based on factors such as IP address, browsing patterns.
“We’ve all grown accustomed to the intrusive practice of ‘retargeting’ – online ads that follow you from site to site. But if you have comforted yourself with the thought that you can always escape by logging off your computer, think again. Not with players like Tapad in the game. Tapad gives advertisers the power to follow consumers not just from site-to-site but from device-to-device, stalking users as they switch from PC to tablet to smartphone. The company does it by collecting and processing data to determine which devices are shared by a person or household.”

Forbes, 2/9/15
APPENDIX A

ACADEMIC CENTERS

A.C. Nielsen Center For Marketing Research
University of Wisconsin - Madison, Wisconsin School of Business, 975 University Avenue, Madison, WI 53706. (http://bus.wisc.edu/centers/ac-nielsen-center-for-marketing-research)

Academy of Marketing Science
Louisiana Tech University, College of Business, BUS #347A, P.O. Box 3072, Ruston, LA 71272. (www.business.latech.edu/centers/ams/)

Center for Business Analytics
Villanova University, 800 E. Lancaster Avenue, Villanova, PA 19085. (http://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/centers/businessanalytics.html)

Behavioral Lab
Stanford University, Graduate School of Business, Knight Management Center, 655 Knight Way, Stanford, CA 94305. (www.gsb.stanford.edu/behavioral_lab/)

Behavioral Lab
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill, Kenan-Flagler Business School, 300 Kenan Center Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27599. (www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/faculty/research-centers/behavioral-lab)

Behavioral Research Lab
Columbia University, Graduate School of Business, 3022 Broadway, Uris Hall, New York, NY 10027. (http://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/behaviorlab/)

Center for Behavioral Business Research
Washington State University, College of Business, P.O. Box 644730, Pullman, WA 99164. (www.business.wsu.edu/cbbr/)

Center for Behavioral Decision Research
Carnegie Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. (www.cbrd.cmu.edu)
Center For Consumer Research
Saint Joseph University, Erivan K. Haub School Of Business, 5600 City Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19131. (www.sju.edu/academics/centers/ccr/index.html)

Center for Consumer Research
University of California Davis, Davis, CA 95616. (http://ccr.ucdavis.edu/)

Center for Customer Insight & Marketing Solutions
University of Texas at Austin, McCombs School of Business, 2110 Speedway, B6700, Austin, TX 78712. (www.mccombs.utexas.edu/Centers/CCIMS/)

Center for Customer Insights
Yale University, School of Management, 135 Prospect Street, Box 208200, New Haven, CT 06520. (www.cci.som.yale.edu)

Center for Decision Research
University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, 5807 South Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637. (http://research.chicagobooth.edu/cdr/)

Center for Family and Demographic Research
Bowling Green State University, Five Williams Hall, Bowling Green, OH 43403. (www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr/)

Center for Global Marketing Practice
Northwestern University, Kellogg School of Management, 2001 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208. (www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/research/cfgmp/)

Center for Hispanic Marketing Communications
Florida State University, 3127, Building C, FSU University Center, Tallahassee, FL 32306. (http://hmc.comm.fsu.edu/)

Center for Marketing And Consumer Insights
Villanova University, 800 E. Lancaster Avenue, Villanova, PA 19085. (http://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/centers/marketing_consumerinsights.html)

Center for Marketing and Social Issues
Colorado State University, Department of Marketing, 111 Rockwell Hall, Fort Collins, CO 80523. (http://biz.colostate.edu/marketing/center/Pages/default.aspx)

Center for Marketing and Technology
Bentley University, 175 Forest Street, Waltham, MA 02452. (www.bentley.edu/centers/cmt)
Center for Marketing Research
Cleveland State University, Monte Ahuja Hall, Room 460, 2121 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44115.  (http://csuw3.csuohio.edu/business/academics/mkt/center.html)

Center for Marketing Research
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, 285 Old Westport Road, North Dartmouth, MA 02747.  (www.umassd.edu/cmr)

Center for Mature Consumer Studies
Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, 35 Broad Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30303.  (http://marketing.robinson.gsu.edu/research-centers-roundtables/cmcs/)

Center for Positive Marketing
Fordham University, 113 W. 60th Street, New York, NY 10023.
(www.centerforpositivemarketing.org/)

Center for Professional Selling
Baylor University, Hankamer School of Business, One Bear Place, Waco, TX 76798.
(www.baylor.edu/business/selling/)

Center for Professional Selling
Kennesaw State University, 1000 Chastain Road, BB 255, Kennesaw, GA 30144.
(http://professionalselling.kennesaw.edu/)

Center for Professional Selling
University of Dayton, 300 College Park, Dayton, OH 45469.
(www.udayton.edu/students/sales/index.php#3)

Center for Professional Selling and Marketing
Western Carolina University, 104 Forsyth Building, Cullowhee, NC 28723.
(www.wcu.edu/academics/departments-schools-colleges/COB/college-of-business-centers/center-for-professional-selling-and-marketing/index.asp)

Center for Relationship Marketing
University at Buffalo - The State University of New York, School of Management, 215 Jacobs Management Center, Buffalo, NY 14260.
(http://mgt.buffalo.edu/faculty/academic/marketing/CRM)

Center for Sales & Sales Management
University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Schneider Hall, P.O. Box 4004, Eau Claire, WI 54702.  (www.uwec.edu/cob/salescenter/index.htm)
Center for Sales Leadership  
DePaul University, 1 E. Jackson, Suite 7500, Chicago, IL 60604.  
(www.salesleadershipcenter.com)

Center for Sales Leadership  
University of Alabama - Birmingham, Collat School of Business, 1720 2nd Avenue S,  
Birmingham, AL 35294.  
(www.uab.edu/business/departments-centers/centers-outreach/center-for-sales-leadership)

Center for Services Marketing & Management  
Florida Atlantic University, College of Business, 777 Glades Road, Boca Raton, FL 33431.  
(www.fau.edu/csmm/)

Centre for Integrated Marketing Communications  
San Diego State University, College of Business Administration, 5500 Campanile Drive,  
San Diego, CA 92182.  
(http://cbaweb.sdsu.edu/imc)

Institute For Applied Business Research  
Florida State University, P.O. Box 3061110, Tallahassee, FL 32306.  
(http://tmi.cob.fsu.edu/)

Institute for Consumer Research  
Georgetown University, McDonough School of Business, Rafik B. Hariri Building,  
Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057.  
(http://consumerresearch.georgetown.edu)

Institute for Research In Marketing  
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities Campus, Carlson School of Management,  
321 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455.  
(http://carlsonschool.umn.edu/faculty-research/institute-research-in-marketing)

Institute for the Study of Business Markets  
Pennsylvania State University, 484 Business Building, University Park, PA 16802.  
(http://isbm.smeal.psu.edu/)

Interactive Marketing Institute  
Virginia Commonwealth University, 901 W. Main Street, P.O. Box 84-2034,  
Richmond, VA 23284.  
(www.imi.vcu.edu/)

Interdisciplinary Group in Behavioral Decision Making  
University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), Anderson School of Management, Box 951481, Los Angeles, CA 90095.  
(www.anderson.ucla.edu/x2271.xml)
James M. Kilts Center for Marketing
University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, 5807 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637. (http://research.chicagobooth.edu/kilts/)

Kellstadt Marketing Center
DePaul University, Driehaus College of Business, 1 East Jackson, Chicago, IL 60604. (http://driehaus.depaul.edu/about/centers-and-institutes/kellstadt-marketing-center/about/pages/default.aspx)

Market Research Center
Seton Hall University, Stillman School of Business, 400 S. Orange Avenue, 677 Jubilee Hall, South Orange, NJ 07079. (www.shu.edu/academics/business/market-research/index.cfm)

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago, 1155 E. 60th Street, 3rd Floor, Chicago, IL 60637. (www.norc.org)

National Strategic Selling Institute
Kansas State University, 110 Calvin Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506. (http://cba.k-state.edu/about/departments-initiatives/national-strategic-selling-institute/index.html)

Owen Entrepreneurship Center
Vanderbilt University, Owen Graduate School of Management, 401 21st Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37206. (http://www2.owen.vanderbilt.edu/oec/)

Sales Excellence Institute
University of Houston, C. T. Bauer College of Business, 334 Melcher Hall, Houston, TX 77204. (www.bauer.uh.edu/sei/index.php)

Selig Center for Economic Growth
University of Georgia, 110 East Clayton Street, Suite 608, Athens, GA 30602. (www.terry.uga.edu/selig/)

Sensory & Consumer Research Center
Kansas State Olathe, 22201 W. Innovation Drive, Olathe, KS 66061. (913) 307-7354. (http://olathe.k-state.edu/centers-institutes/ConsumerResearch.html)

Southwest Marketing Advisory Center
Southwest Minnesota State University, Science & Technology 203, 1501 State Street, Marshall, MN 56258. (www.smsu.edu/smac/)

The Wharton Customer Analytics Initiative
University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School, 700 Jon M. Huntsman Hall, 3730 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. (www.wharton.upenn.edu/wcai/)
The following are marketing programs at institutions with AACSB-accredited MBA programs:

**Alfred University**  
School of Business, Olin Building, 1 Saxon Drive, Alfred, NY 14802.  
(http://business.alfred.edu/academics/marketing.cfm)

**American University**  
Kogod School of Business, 4400 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20016.  
(www.american.edu/kogod/graduate/ms-mktg.cfm)

**Appalachian State University**  
John A. Walker College of Business, Department of Marketing, 416 Howard Street, Boone, NC 28608.  
(http://marketing.appstate.edu/)

**Arizona State University**  
W.P. Carey School of Business, Department of Marketing, 450 E. Lemon Street, Tempe, AZ 85287.  
(https://wpcarey.asu.edu/marketing-degrees)

**Auburn University**  
Raymond J. Harbert College of Business, Department of Marketing, 405 W. Magnolia Avenue, Auburn, AL 36849.  
(http://business.auburn.edu/academics/departments/department-of-marketing)

**Auburn University Montgomery**  
School of Business, Marketing Department, Clement Hall Business Building, P.O. Box 244023, Montgomery, AL 36124.  
(www.business.aum.edu/academic-programs/undergraduate-programs/marketing)

**Babson College**  
F.W. Olin Graduate School of Business, Marketing Division, Olin Hall, 231 Forest Street, Babson Park, MA 02457.  
(www.babson.edu/Academics/divisions/marketing/Pages/home.aspx)
Ball State University  
Miller College of Business, 2000 W. University Avenue, Muncie, IN 47306.  
(http://cms.bsu.edu/academics/collegesanddepartments/mcob/majors-and-degrees/depts/marketing)

Baruch College - CUNY  
Zicklin School Of Business, One Bernard Baruch Way (55 Lexington Avenue at East 24th Street), New York, NY 10010.  (http://zicklin.baruch.cuny.edu/)

Baylor University  
Hankamer School of Business, One Bear Place, #98001, Waco, TX 76798.  
(www.baylor.edu/business/marketing/)

Belmont University  
Jack C. Massey Graduate School of Business, 1900 Belmont Boulevard, Nashville, TN 37212.  (www.belmont.edu/business/masseyschool/index.html)

Bentley University  
Center for Marketing and Technology, 175 Forest Street, Waltham, MA 02452.  
(www.bentley.edu/centers/cmt)

Binghamton University - State University of New York  
School of Management, 4400 Vestal Parkway East, Binghamton, NY 13902.  
(www.binghamton.edu/som/undergraduate-programs/bs-management/concentration-marketing.html)

Boise State University  
College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing and Finance, Micron Business and Economics Building, 1910 University Drive, Boise, ID 83725.  
http://cobe.boisestate.edu/marketingandfinance/

Boston College  
Carroll School of Management, Marketing Department, 140 Commonwealth Avenue, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467.  
(www.bc.edu/content/bc/schools/csom/departments/marketing.html)

Boston University  
School of Management, Marketing Department, 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215.  
(http://management.bu.edu/faculty-research/departments/marketing/)

Bradley University  
Foster College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 409 Baker Hall, 1501 W. Bradley Avenue, Peoria, IL 61625.  
(www.bradley.edu/academic/departments/marketing/)
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Brigham Young University
Marriott School of Management, W437 TNRB, Provo, UT 84602.
(http://marriottschool.byu.edu/mba/media-curriculum-majors/14_Marketing.pdf)

Bryant University
Graduate School of Business, Department of Marketing, 1150 Douglas Pike, Smithfield, RI 02917. (http://gsb.bryant.edu/mba/)

Butler University
College of Business, Holcomb Building, 4600 Sunset Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46208.
(www.butler.edu/academics/graduate-cob/)

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Orfalea College of Business, 1 Grand Avenue, San Luis Obispo, CA 93407.
(www.cob.calpoly.edu/academic/marketing/)

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
College of Business Administration, 3801 W. Temple Avenue, Pomona, CA 91768.
(http://cba.csupomona.edu/mba/files/00334-Career_Ephasis_MBA_Curriculum_Sheet_-_Marketing_Management.pdf)

California State University - Bakersfield
School of Business and Public Administration, 9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, CA 93311. (www.csub.edu/bpa/index.html)

California State University - Chico
College of Business, Business Graduate Programs, 400 West 1st Street, Chico, CA 95929. (www.csuchico.edu/cob/)

California State University - East Bay
College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing & Entrepreneurship, 25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard, Hayward, CA 94542.
(http://www20.csueastbay.edu/cbe/departments/marketing/index.html)

California State University - Fresno [Fresno State]
Craig School of Business, Department of Marketing & Logistics, 5245 N. Becker Avenue, Fresno, CA 93740. (www.fresnostate.edu/craig/depts-programs/mktg/)

California State University - Fullerton
Mihaylo College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing, 800 N. State College Boulevard, Fullerton, CA 92834. (http://business.fullerton.edu/marketing/)
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California State University - Long Beach
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840. (www.csulb.edu/colleges/cba/marketing/)

California State University - Los Angeles
College of Business and Economics, 5151 State University Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90032. (www.calstatela.edu/business/mkt)

California State University - Sacramento [Sacramento State]
College of Business Administration, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819. (www.cba.csus.edu/graduate/index.html)

California State University - San Bernardino
College of Business and Public Administration, Department of Marketing, 5500 University Parkway, JB-458, San Bernardino, CA 92407. (http://marketing.csusb.edu/)

California State University - Stanislaus
College of Business Administration, One University Circle, Turlock, CA 95382 (www.csustan.edu/mba/)

Canisius College
Richard J. Wehle School of Business, Bagen Hall, 2001 Main Street, Buffalo, NY 14208. (www.canisius.edu/marketing/)

Carnegie Mellon University
Tepper School of Business, Doctoral Program in Marketing, Posner Hall, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. (http://tepper.cmu.edu/prospective-students/phd/program/marketing)

Case Western Reserve University
Weatherhead School of Management, 10900 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44106. (http://weatherhead.case.edu/degrees/msm-finance-shanghai/marketing-management)

Chapman University
George L. Argyros School of Business and Economics, One University Drive, Beckman Hall 301, Orange, CA 92866. (www.chapman.edu/business/index.aspx)

Claremont Graduate University
Peter F. Drucker and Masatoshi Ito Graduate School of Management, 1021 N. Dartmouth Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711. (www.cgu.edu/pages/274.asp)
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
College of Business Administration, Department of Management & Marketing, 840 Wood Street, Clarion, PA 16214.  

Clark University
Graduate School of Management, 950 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01610.  
(www.clarku.edu/gsom/)

Clarkson University
School of Business, CU Box 5770, 8 Clarkson Avenue, Potsdam, NY 13699.  
(www.clarkson.edu/business/about/index.html)

Clemson University
College of Business and Behavioral Science, Marketing Department, Sirrine Hall, Clemson, SC 29634.  
(www.clemson.edu/cbbs/departments/marketing/)

Cleveland State University
Monte Ahuja College of Business, Department of Marketing, 2121 Euclid Avenue, BU460, Cleveland, OH 44115.  
(www.csuohio.edu/business/academics/mkt/index.html)

College of William and Mary
Raymond A. Mason School of Business, P.O. Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187.  
(http://mason.wm.edu/programs/ftmba/index.php)

Colorado State University
College of Business, Department of Marketing, Rockwell Hall, 1201 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80523.  
(http://biz.colostate.edu/marketing/Pages/default.aspx)

Colorado State University - Pueblo
Malik and Seeme Hasan School of Business, 2200 Bonforte Boulevard, Pueblo, CO 81001.  
(http://hsb.csupueblo.edu/UndergraduatePrograms/Majors/BusinessMajorWithInformationMarketingEmphasis/Pages/default.aspx)

Columbia University
Graduate School of Business, 3022 Broadway, Uris Hall, New York, NY 10027.  
(www8.gsb.columbia.edu/programs-admissions/doctoral-program/academics/marketing)

Cornell University
S.C. Johnson Graduate School of Management, Sage Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853.  
(www.johnson.cornell.edu/Two-Year-MBA/Curriculum/Immersion-Learning/Strategic-Marketing.aspx)
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Creighton University
Heider College of Business, 2500 California Plaza, Omaha, NE 68178.  
(http://business.creighton.edu/undergraduate/undergraduate-majors/marketing)

Dartmouth College
Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth, 100 Tuck Hall, Hanover, NH 03755.  
(www.tuck.dartmouth.edu/admissions/blog/career-treks-marketing)

DePaul University
Driehaus College of Business, Charles H. Kellstadt Graduate School of Business, 
1 E. Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604.  
(http://driehaus.depaul.edu/departments/marketing/Pages/default.aspx)

Drexel University
LeBow College of Business, 3141 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.  
(www.lebow.drexel.edu/academics/disciplines/marketing)

Duke University
Fuqua School of Business, 100 Fuqua Drive, Box 90120, Durham, NC 27708.  
(www.fuqua.duke.edu/student_resources/academics/concentrations/marketing/)

Duquesne University
Palumbo-Donahue School of Business, 600 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15282. 
(www.duq.edu/academics/schools/business/undergraduate/academics/majors/marketing)

East Carolina University
College of Business, Department of Marketing, Bate Building, 3rd Floor, Mail Stop 503, 
Greenville, NC 27858.  
(www.ecu.edu/cs-bus/mscm/index.cfm)

East Tennessee State University
College of Business and Technology, Department of Management and Marketing, 
P.O. Box 70625, Johnson City, TN 37614.  
(http://business.etsu.edu/mgmtmkt/)

Eastern Illinois University
School of Business, 600 Lincoln Avenue, Charleston, IL 61920.  
(www.eiu.edu/business/marketing.php)

Eastern Michigan University
College of Business, Marketing Department, 300 West Michigan Avenue, 473 Gary 
Owen Building, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.  
(www.emich.edu/cob/departments_centers/marketing/index.php)
Eastern Washington University  
College of Business Administration and Public Administration, Department of  
Marketing, 668 N. Riverpoint Boulevard, Spokane, WA 99202.  
(www.ewu.edu/cbpa/programs/marketing.xml)

Emory University  
Goizueta Business School, 1300 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30322.  
(http://goizueta.emory.edu/faculty/academic_areas/marketing/index.html and  
http://goizueta.emory.edu/faculty/marketinganalytics/index.html)

Emporia State University  
School of Business, 1 Kellogg Circle, Emporia, KS 66801.  
(www.emporia.edu/business/programs/marketing/)

Fairfield University  
Charles F. Dolan School of Business, 1073 North Benson Road, Fairfield, CT 06824.  
(www.fairfield.edu/academics/schoolscollegescenters/charlesfdolanschoolofbusiness/undergraduateprograms/marketing/)

Fairleigh Dickinson University  
Silberman College of Business, 1000 River Road, Teaneck, NJ 07666.  
(http://view.fdu.edu/?id=2460 and http://view.fdu.edu/?id=1584)

Florida Atlantic University  
College of Business, 777 Glades Road, Boca Raton, FL 33461.  
(http://business.fau.edu/masters-phd/phd-program/marketing/index.aspx#.UqvXWCfy040)

Florida International University  
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 11200 SW 8th Street,  
RBB 307B, Miami, FL 33199.  (http://business.fiu.edu/marketing/index.cfm)

Florida State University  
College of Business, Department of Marketing, 821 Academic Way, RBA 307, P.O. Box  
3061110, Tallahassee, FL 32306.  (www.cob.fsu.edu/Academic-Programs/Departments/Marketing)

Fordham University  
Gabelli School of Business and Graduate School of Business, 33 W. 60th Street,  
Fourth Floor, New York, NY 10023.  
(www.fordham.edu/info/23370/marketing_intelligence)
Francis Marion University
School of Business, Box 100547, Florence, SC 29501. (www.fmarion.edu/academics/schoolofbusiness)

George Mason University
School of Management, 4400 University Drive, MS 1B1, Enterprise Hall, Fairfax, VA 22030. (http://business.gmu.edu)

George Washington University
School of Business, Department of Marketing, Duquès Hall, 2201 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20052. (http://business.gwu.edu/marketing/)

Georgetown University
McDonough School of Business, 37th and O Streets NW, Washington DC 20057. (http://msb.georgetown.edu)

Georgia College
J. Whitney Bunting College of Business, Department of Marketing, 301 Atkinson Hall, Milledgeville, GA 31061. www.gcsu.edu/business/majors/marketing.htm)

Georgia Institute of Technology
Ernest Scheller Jr. College of Business, 800 West Peachtree Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30332. (http://scheller.gatech.edu/fac_research/acad_areas/marketing.html)

Georgia Regents University
James M. Hull College of Business, 1120 15th Street, Augusta, GA 30912. (www.gru.edu/hull/undergrad/bba_marketing.php)

Georgia Southern University
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, Statesboro, GA 30460. (http://coba.georgiasouthern.edu/ml/undergraduate/marketing/)

Georgia State University
J. Mack Robinson College of Business, Department of Marketing, 35 Broad Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30303. (http://marketing.robinson.gsu.edu/)

Gonzaga University
School of Business Administration, 502 East Boone Avenue, Spokane, WA 99258. (www.gonzaga.edu/Academics/Colleges-and-Schools/School-of-Business-Administration/undergraduate/concentrations/marketing.asp)
Grand Valley State University
Seidman College of Business, Marketing Department, L. William Seidman Center, 50 Front Avenue SW, SCB 3086, Grand Rapids, MI 49504. (www.gvsu.edu/business/marketing/)

Harvard University
Business School, Soldiers Field, Boston, MA 02163 (www.hbs.edu/faculty/units/marketing/Pages/default.aspx)

Hofstra University
Frank G. Zarb School of Business, Department of Marketing & International Business, Hempstead, NY 11549. (www.hofstra.edu/Academics/Colleges/Zarb/MKIB/index.html)

Howard University
School of Business, 2600 6th Street NW, Washington, DC 20059. (www.bschool.howard.edu/mba_marketing.html)

Idaho State University
College of Business, 921 South 8th Avenue, Stop 8020, Pocatello, ID 83209. (www.isu.edu/cob/marketing.shtml)

Illinois Institute of Technology
Stuart Graduate School of Business, 10 West 35th Street, 18th Floor, Chicago, IL 60616. (www.stuart.iit.edu/programs/ms-marketing-analytics-and-communication)

Illinois State University
College of Business, Department of Marketing, Campus Box 5500, Normal, IL 61790. (http://business.illinoisstate.edu/about/departments/marketing/)

Indiana State University
Scott College of Business, Federal Hall, Room 207, 200 North Seventh Street, Terre Haute, IN 47809. (www.indstate.edu/business/marketing/)

Indiana University - Bloomington
Kelley School of Business, 1275 East Tenth Street, Suite 2010, Bloomington, IN 47405. (www.kelley.indiana.edu/MBA/Academics/MajorsMinors/page38913.html)

Indiana University - Kokomo
School of Business, Main Building, Room 185, 2300 S. Washington Street, Kokomo, IN 46904. (www.iuk.edu/business/degrees/majors/business/marketing-concentration.php)
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
Richard T. Doermer School of Business, Department of Management and Marketing, 2101 Coliseum Boulevard East, Fort Wayne IN 46805. (www.ipfw.edu/management-marketing/)

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Kelley School of Business, 801 West Michigan Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202. (http://kelley.iupui.edu/degrees/undergrad/academics/majors/marketing/)

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Eberly College of Business and Information Technology, Marketing Department, Eberly Hall, 664 Pratt Drive, Indiana, PA 15705. (www.iup.edu/marketing/default.aspx)

Iona College
Hagan School of Business, 715 North Avenue, New Rochelle, NY 10801. (www.iona.edu/Academics/Hagan-School-of-Business/Departments/Marketing/Graduate-Programs/MBA-Marketing-Concentration.aspx)

Iowa State University
College of Business, Dr. Charles B. Handy Graduate Program, 1360 Gerdin Business Building, Ames, IA 50011. (www.business.iastate.edu/masters/mba/academics/electives/specializations/marketing/)

Jackson State University
College of Business, Department of Management and Marketing, 1400 Lynch Street, Jackson, MS 39217. (www.jsums.edu/management/)

Jacksonville State University
College of Commerce and Business Administration, Department of Management and Marketing, 700 Pelham Road North, Jacksonville, AL 36265. (www.jsu.edu/ccba/mm/marketing/index.html)

John Carroll University
John M. and Mary Jo Boler School of Business, 1 John Carroll Boulevard, University Heights, OH 44118. (http://sites.jcu.edu/boler/pages/our-future-undergraduates/programs-of-study/marketing/)

Kansas State University
College of Business Administration, Marketing Department, 201 Calvin Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506. (http://cba.k-state.edu/about/departments-initiatives/marketing/index.html)
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Kennesaw State University
Michael J. Coles College of Business, Department of Marketing & Professional Sales, Burruss Building, 1000 Chastain Road, Kennesaw, GA 30144. (http://coles.kennesaw.edu/departments_faculty/marketing.htm)

Kent State University
Graduate School of Management, Department of Marketing and Entrepreneurship, P.O. Box 5190, Kent, OH 44242. (http://www2.kent.edu/catalog/2015/BU/UG/MKTG)

La Salle University
School of Business Administration, Marketing Department, 1900 W. Olney Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19141. (www.lasalle.edu/marketing/)

Lehigh University
College of Business and Economics, Rauch Business Center, Marketing Department, 621 Taylor Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015. (http://cbe.lehigh.edu/marketing)

Long Island University - C.W. Post Campus
College of Management, Department of Marketing and International Business, 720 Northern Boulevard, Brookville, NY 11548. (www.liu.edu/CWPost/Academics/Schools(COM)/Dept/MI)

Louisiana State University
E.J. Ourso College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, Business Education Complex, Room 2100, Baton Rouge, LA 70803. (http://business.lsu.edu/marketing/Pages/About.aspx)

Louisiana Tech University
College of Business, Department of Marketing & Analytics, P.O. Box 10318, Ruston, LA 71272. (www.business.latech.edu/marketing)

Loyola Marymount University
College of Business Administration, 1 LMU Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045. (http://admission.lmu.edu/academics/majors/marketing/)

Loyola University Chicago
Quinlan School of Business, 1 E. Pearson, Suite 204, Chicago, IL 60611. (www.luc.edu/quinlan/undergraduate/majors/minors/marketing/)

Loyola University Maryland
Joseph A. Sellinger School of Business, Marketing Department, 4501 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21210. (www.loyola.edu/sellinger/about/departments/marketing.aspx)
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Loyola University New Orleans  
College of Business, 6363 St. Charles Avenue, Box 15, New Orleans, LA 70118.  
(www.business.loyno.edu/marketing)

Marist College  
School of Management, 3399 North Road, Dyson 127, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601.  
(www.marist.edu/management/)

Marquette University  
Graduate School of Management, Department of Marketing, Straz Hall, 606 13th Street,  
Milwaukee, WI 53233.  (http://business.marquette.edu/departments/marketing)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Sloan School of Management, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02142.  
(http://mitsloan.mit.edu/phd/marketing.php)

McNeese State University  
College of Business, Department of Management, Marketing, and Business Administration, 4205 Ryan Street, Lake Charles, LA 70609.  
(www.mcneese.edu/business/department_of_management%2C_marketing%2C_and_business)

Michigan State University  
Eli Broad College of Business, Marketing Department, North Business College Complex,  
632 Bogue Street N370, East Lansing, MI 48824.  (http://marketing.broad.msu.edu/)

Middle Tennessee State University  
College of Business, 1301 East Main Street, Murfreesboro, TN 37132.  
(www.mtsu.edu/programs/marketing/)

Millsaps College  
Else School of Management, 1701 N. State Street, Jackson, MS 39210.  
(www.millsaps.edu/academics/else_school_of_management.php)

Mississippi State University  
College of Business, Department of Marketing, P.O. Box 9582, Mississippi State, MS 39762.  (http://business.msstate.edu/programs/marketing/)

Missouri State University  
College of Business, Marketing Department, 901 S. National Avenue, Springfield, MO 65897.  (www.missouristate.edu/mkt/)
Monmouth University
Leon Hess Business School, Department of Marketing and International Business, 400 Cedar Avenue, West Long Branch, NJ 07764. (www.monmouth.edu/business-school/marketing-and-international-business.aspx)

Montana State University
Jake Jabs College of Business & Entrepreneurship, P.O. Box 173040, Bozeman, MT 59717. (www.montana.edu/business/marketing/index.html)

Montclair State University
School of Business, Marketing Department, 203 College Hall Normal Avenue, Montclair, NJ 07043. (http://business.montclair.edu/programs/undergraduate-programs/marketing)

Monterey Institute of International Studies at Monterey
Fisher Graduate School of International Business, 460 Pierce Street, Monterey, CA 93940. (www.miis.edu/academics/programs/mba/specializations/marketing)

Murray State University
Arthur J. Bauernfeind College of Business, 102 Curris Center, Murray, KY 42071. (www.murraystate.edu/Academics/CollegesDepartments/CollegeOfBusiness/Programs/ManagementMarketingAndBusinessAdministration/Marketing.aspx)

New Jersey Institute of Technology
School of Management, 3000 CAB, University Heights, Newark, NJ 07102. (http://management.njit.edu/academics/undergraduate/bs-business/specializations.php)

New Mexico State University
College of Business Administration and Economics, Marketing Department, MSC 5280, P.O. Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003. (http://business.nmsu.edu/departments/marketing/)

New York University
Leonard N. Stern School of Business, Marketing Department, 44 W. Fourth Street, Henry Kaufman Management Center, New York, NY 10012. (www.stern.nyu.edu/experience-stern/about/departments-centers-initiatives/academic-departments/marketing)

Niagara University
College of Business, P.O. Box 2037, Niagara University, NY 14109 (www.niagara.edu/marketing)
Nicholls State University  
College of Business Administration, Powell Hall, P.O. Box 2015, 104 White Hall, Thibodaux, LA 70310.  (www.nicholls.edu/marketing)

North Carolina State University  
Poole College of Management, Campus Box 8114, Raleigh, NC 27695.  (http://poole.ncsu.edu/mba/concentrations/marketing-management/)

Northeastern University  
D’Amore-McKim School of Business, 350 Dodge Hall, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115.  (http://damore-mckim.neoriental.edu/faculty/marketing/)

Northern Arizona University  
W.A. Franke College of Business, 20 W. McConnell Drive, P.O. Box 15066, Flagstaff, AZ 86011.  (http://franke.nau.edu/)

Northern Illinois University  
College of Business, Marketing Department, Barsema Hall, 740 Garden Road, DeKalb, IL 60115.  (www.cob.niu.edu/mktg)

Northern Kentucky University  
Haile/US Bank College of Business, Business Academic Center 315, Nunn Drive, Highland Heights, KY 41099.  (http://www.nku.edu/majors/undergrad/marketing.html)

Northwestern University  
Kellogg School of Management, Marketing Department, 2001 Sheridan Road, Leverone Hall, 4th Floor, Evanston, IL 60208.  (www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/departments/marketing.aspx)

Oakland University  
School of Business Administration, 427 Elliott Hall, 2200 N. Squirrel Road, Rochester, MI 48309.  (www.oakland.edu/business/marketing)

Ohio State University  
Max M. Fisher College of Business, Department of Marketing, 2108 Neil Avenue, 100 Gerlach Hall, Columbus, OH 43210.  (http://fisher.osu.edu/departments/marketing-and-logistics)

Ohio University  
College of Business, Marketing Department, 209B Copeland Hall, Athens, OH 45701.  (http://aspnet.cob.ohio.edu/isms/cobContent.aspx?1417)

Oklahoma State University  
Spears School of Business, Department of Marketing, 312A Business Building, Stillwater, OK 74078.  (http://spears.okstate.edu/marketing/)
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Old Dominion University
College of Business and Public Administration, Department of Marketing, 2126 Constant Hall, Norfolk, VA 23529. (www.odu.edu/mktgdept)

Oregon State University
College of Business, 200 Bexell Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331. (http://business.oregonstate.edu/marketing)

Pace University
Lubin School Of Business, Marketing Department, One Pace Plaza, New York, NY 10038. (www.pace.edu/lubin/lubin-academic-programs/undergraduate-programs/bba-programs/marketing-bba)

Pacific Lutheran University
School of Business, Morken Center, Tacoma, WA 98447. (www.plu.edu/busa)

Penn State University - Harrisburg
School of Business Administration, 777 W. Harrisburg Pike, Middletown, PA 17057. (http://harrisburg.psu.edu/programs/bachelor-science-marketing)

Penn State University - University Park
Mary Jean and Frank P. Smeal College of Business, Business Administration Building, University Park, PA 16802. (www.smeal.psu.edu/depts/academic-departments/mktg)

Pepperdine University
Graziadio School of Business and Management, 6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045. (http://bschool.pepperdine.edu/programs/full-time-mba/concentrations/marketing.htm)

Pittsburg State University
Gladys A. Kelce College of Business, Department of Management and Marketing, 1701 S. Broadway, Pittsburg, KS 66762. (www.pittstate.edu/department/marketing/degree-programs/marketing.dot)

Portland State University
School of Business Administration, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207. (www.pdx.edu/sba/undergraduate-major-marketing)

Purdue University
Krannert Graduate School of Management, Marketing Department, 403 W. State Street West Lafayette, IN 47907. (www.krannert.purdue.edu/academics/Marketing/home.asp)

Purdue University - Calumet
School of Management, Department of Marketing, 2200 169 Street, Hammond, IN 46323. (http://webs.purduecal.edu/mhrm/)
Quinnipiac University
Lender School of Business, Department of Marketing & Advertising, 275 Mt. Carmel Avenue, Hamden, CT 06518.
(www.quinnipiac.edu/school-of-business-and-engineering/department-of-marketing-and-advertising/)

Radford University
College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing, P.O. Box 6956, Radford, VA 24142.
(www.radford.edu/content/cobe/home/academic-departments/marketing.html)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Lally School of Management and Technology, 110 Eighth Street, Troy, NY 12180.
(http://lallyschool.rpi.edu/academics/Details/Marketing.pdf)

Rice University
Jesse H. Jones Graduate School of Management, P.O. Box 2932, Houston, TX 77252.
(http://business.rice.edu/Marketing.aspx)

Rider University
College of Business Administration, 2083 Lawrenceville Road, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648.
(www.rider.edu/academics/colleges-schools/college-business-administration/undergraduate-programs/marketing-advertising)

Rochester Institute of Technology
E. Philips Saunders School of Business, 105 Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, NY 14623. (http://saunders.rit.edu/programs/undergraduate/marketing/index.php)

Rowan University
William G. Rohrer College of Business, 201 Mullica Hill Road, Bunce Hall, Glassboro, NJ 08028. (www.rowan.edu/colleges/business/programs/bs_marketing/index.cfm)

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey - New Brunswick
School of Management and Labor Relations, Janice H. Levin Building, 94 Rockafeller Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854. (www.business.rutgers.edu/mba/concentrations/marketing)

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey - Newark
Rutgers Business School, 190 University Avenue, Newark, NJ 07102. (http://business.rutgers.edu/mba/concentrations/marketing)

Saint Louis University
John Cook School of Business, Department of Marketing, Davis-Shaughnessy Hall, 3674 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63108. (http://business.slu.edu/departments/marketing/)
Salisbury University  
Franklin P. Perdue School of Business, Department of Management and Marketing,  
1101 Camden Avenue, Salisbury, MD 21801. (www.salisbury.edu/mgmtmktg/)

Sam Houston State University  
College of Business Administration, Box 2056, Huntsville, TX 77341.  
(www.shsu.edu/catalog/mgt.html#BBAmark)

Samford University  
Brock School of Business, 800 Lakeshore Drive, Birmingham, AL 35229.  
(www.samford.edu/business/marketing-major)

San Diego State University  
College of Business Administration, Marketing Department, 5500 Campanile Drive, San  
Diego, CA 92182. (http://cbaweb.sdsu.edu/marketing)

San Francisco State University  
College of Business, 835 Market Street, Suite 550, San Francisco, CA 94132.  
(http://cob.sfsu.edu/cob/marketing)

San Jose State University  
Lucas College and Graduate School of Business, Marketing and Decision Sciences,  
One Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95192. (www.sjsu.edu/mktds)

Santa Clara University  
Leavy School of Business, Department of Marketing, 500 El Camino Real, 300 Lucas  
Hall, Santa Clara, CA 95053. (www.scu.edu/business/marketing/index.cfm)

Seattle Pacific University  
School of Business and Economics, 3307 Third Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119.  
(www.spu.edu/academics/school-of-business-and-economics)

Seattle University  
Albers School of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing, 901 12th Avenue,  
P.O. Box 222000, Seattle, WA 98122. (www.seattleu.edu/albers/inner.aspx?id=24446)

Seton Hall University  
Stillman School of Business, 400 S. Orange Avenue, Jubilee Hall, South Orange, NJ  
07079. (www.shu.edu/academics/business/bs-marketing/)
Southeast Missouri State University
Harrison College of Business, Department of Management and Marketing, One University Plaza, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701. (www.semo.edu/managementandmarketing/index.htm)

Southeastern Louisiana University
College of Business and Technology, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, Garrett Hall Room 74, P.O. Box 10844, Hammond, LA 70402. (www.southeastern.edu/acad_research/depts/mrkt_scm/index.html)

Southern Illinois University
College of Business and Administration, Department of Marketing, Rehn Hall, Room 229, Carbondale, IL 62901. (www.business.siu.edu/academics/dept/marketing/index.html)

Southern Methodist University
Cox School of Business, Department of Marketing, Fincher Building, P.O. Box 750333, Dallas, TX 75275. (www.marketing.cox.smu.edu/indexf.html)

St. Cloud State University
Herberger Business School, Department of Marketing, 720 Fourth Avenue South, St. Cloud, MN 56301. (www.stcloudstate.edu/mkbl/default.asp)

St. John’s University
Peter J. Tobin College of Business, Department of Marketing, 8000 Utopia Parkway, Queens, NY 11439. (www.stjohns.edu/academics/schools-and-colleges/peter-j-tobin-college-business/programs-and-majors/marketing-bachelor-science)

St. Joseph’s University
Ervan K. Haub School of Business, 5600 City Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19131. (www.sju.edu/majors-programs/undergraduate/majors/marketing-major)

St. Mary’s University
Bill Greehey School of Business, One Camino Santa Maria, San Antonio, TX 78228. (www.stmarytx.edu/academics/business/undergraduate/marketing)

Stanford University
Stanford Graduate School of Business, Knight Management Center, 655 Knight Way, Stanford, CA 94305. (www.gsb.stanford.edu/academicareas/mktg.html)

State University of New York, Buffalo
School of Management, Marketing Department, 215 Jacobs Management Center, Buffalo, NY 14260. (http://mgt.buffalo.edu/faculty/academic/marketing)
**State University of New York, Oswego**  
School of Business, 7060 Route 104, Rich Hall, Oswego, NY 13126.  
(www.oswego.edu/academics/colleges_and_departments/business/programs/marketing.html)

**Stephen F. Austin State University**  
Nelson Rusche College of Business, Management, Marketing, and International Business Department, McGee Business Building, Suite 403, P.O. Box 13070, SFA Station, Nacogdoches, TX 75962.  (www.sfasu.edu/cob/mmib.asp)

**Stetson University**  
School of Business Administration, 421 N. Woodland Boulevard, DeLand, FL 32720.  (www.stetson.edu/other/academics/programs/marketing.php)

**Suffolk University**  
Sawyer Business School, Marketing Department, Eight Ashburton Place, Boston, MA 02108.  (www.suffolk.edu/business/departments/9819.php)

**Syracuse University**  
Martin J. Whitman School of Management, 721 University Avenue Syracuse, NY 13244.  (http://whitman.syr.edu/programs-and-academics/academics/marketing/index.aspx)

**Temple University**  
Fox School of Business and Management, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 1801 Liacouras Walk, Alter Hall, Philadelphia, PA 19122.  
(www.fox.temple.edu/cms_academics/dept/marketing_and_supply_chain_management)

**Tennessee Technological University**  
College of Business Administration, Johnson Hall, 1 William L Jones Drive, Cookeville, TN 38505.  (www.tntech.edu/cob/academic-units)

**Texas A&M International University**  
A.R. Sanchez, Jr. School of Business, 5201 University Boulevard, Laredo, TX 78041.  
(www.tamiu.edu/catalog/current/bba-mkt.shtml)

**Texas A&M University - College Station**  
Mays Business School, 4117 TAMU, 390 Wehner Building, College Station, TX 77843.  
(http://mays.tamu.edu/full-time-mba/about-us-mba/program-overview-mba/)

**Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi**  
College of Business Administration, 6300 Ocean Drive, Corpus Christi, TX 78412.  
(http://catalog.tamucc.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=7&poid=579)
Texas A&M University - Commerce
College of Business and Entrepreneurship, P.O. Box 3011, Commerce, TX 75429.
(www.tamuc.edu/academics/colleges/business/departments/businessAdministration/programs/default.aspx)

Texas Christian University
M.J. Neely School of Business, P.O. Box 298540, Fort Worth, TX 76129.
(http://neeley.tcu.edu/Academic_Departments/Marketing/Marketing.aspx)

Texas Southern University
Jesse H. Jones School of Business, 3100 Cleburne Avenue, Houston, TX 77004.
(www.tsu.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/jesse-h-jones-school-of-business/#)

Texas State University
Emmett & Miriam McCoy College of Business Administration, 424 McCoy Hall, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, TX 78666. (http://marketing.mccoy.txstate.edu/)

Texas Tech University
Jerry S. Rawls College of Business Administration, P.O. Box 42101, Lubbock, TX 79409. (http://marketing.ba.ttu.edu/)

The Citadel
Citadel Graduate College, 171 Moultrie Street, Charleston, SC 29409.
(www.citadel.edu/root/csb_)

Thunderbird School of Global Management
Garvin School of International Management, 15249 N. 59th Avenue, Glendale, AZ 85306. (www.thunderbird.edu/graduate-degrees/programs/ms-global-marketing)

Truman State University
School of Business, 100 E. Normal Street, Kirksville, MO 63501.
(http://business.truman.edu/programs/marketing.asp)

Tulane University
A. B. Freeman School of Business, Goldring/Woldenberg Hall, 7 McAlister Drive, New Orleans, LA 70118. (http://freeman.tulane.edu and www.freeman.tulane.edu/students/bsm/pdf/MKTG%20Checksheet.pdf)

University at Albany, State University of New York
School of Business, Marketing Department, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222. (www.albany.edu/business/school-of-business-departments-marketing.php)
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University of Akron
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 259 S. Broadway, Akron, OH 44325. (www.uakron.edu/cba/departments/marketing)

University of Alabama
Culverhouse College of Commerce, Marketing Department, Alston Hall, 361 Stadium Drive, Box 870225, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487.
(http://cba.ua.edu/academics/departments/marketing)

University of Alabama - Birmingham
Collat School of Business, BEC 216, 1720 2nd Avenue S., Birmingham, AL 35294.
(www.uab.edu/business/departments-centers/academic-departments/marketing-economics-industrialdistribution-law)

University of Alabama - Huntsville
College of Business Administration, 301 Sparkman Drive, Huntsville, AL 35899.
(www.uah.edu/cba)

University of Alaska - Anchorage
College of Business and Public Policy, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508.
(www.uaa.alaska.edu/cbpp/academics/marketing/index.cfm)

University of Alaska - Fairbanks
School of Management, 201 Bunnell Building, P.O. Box 756080, Fairbanks, AK 99775.
(www.uaf.edu/som)

University of Arizona
Eller Graduate School of Management, McClelland Hall, Room 320, P.O. Box 210108, Tucson, AZ 85721. (http://marketing.eller.arizona.edu/)

University of Arkansas
Sam M. Walton College of Business, Department of Marketing, Business Building 302, Fayetteville, AR 72701. (http://waltoncollege.uark.edu/mktg/)

University of Baltimore
Merrick School of Business, 1420 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21201.
(www.ubalt.edu/merrick/undergraduate-programs/business-administration/specializations-bsba/marketing-specialization-bsba.cfm)

University of California - Berkeley
Haas School of Business, 2000 Center Street, Berkeley, CA 94704.
(http://mba.haas.berkeley.edu/academics/marketing.html)
University of California - Davis  
Graduate School of Management, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616.  
(www.gsm.ucdavis.edu)

University of California - Irvine  
The Paul Merage School of Business, Irvine, CA 92697.  
(http://merage.uci.edu/Faculty/AcademicAreas/Marketing.aspx)

University of California - Los Angeles  
UCLA Anderson School of Management, 110 Westwood Plaza, Box 951481, Los Angeles, CA 90095. (www.anderson.ucla.edu/faculty/marketing/marketing-curriculum)

University of California - Riverside  
A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management, 900 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92521. (http://soba.ucr.edu/schools_areas/marketing.html)

University of Central Arkansas  
Marketing and Management Department, 201 Donaghey Avenue, COB 312, Conway, AR 72035. (http://uca.edu/marketingmanagement/marketing/)

University of Central Florida  
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 4000 Central Florida Boulevard, P.O. Box 161991, Orlando, FL 32816. (www.bus.ucf.edu/marketing)

University of Central Missouri  
Harmon College of Business and Professional Studies, Department of Marketing, Dockery 3001, Warrensburg, MO 64093. (www.ucmo.edu/efm/index.cfm)

University of Chicago  
Booth School of Business, James M. Kilts Center for Marketing, 5807 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637. (http://research.chicagobooth.edu/kilts/)

University of Cincinnati  
Carl H. Lindner College of Business, 2925 Campus Green Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45221. (http://business.uc.edu/departments/marketing/faculty.html#sthash.hr9vDk7T.dpuf)

University of Colorado - Boulder  
Leeds School of Business, 995 Regent Drive, 419 UCB, Boulder, CO 80309. (http://leeds.colorado.edu/marketing#overview)

University of Colorado - Colorado Springs  
Graduate School of Business Administration, 1420 Austin Bluffs Parkway, Colorado Springs, CO 80918. (www.uccs.edu/business/academics/bachelors-degrees/areas-of-emphasis/marketing.html)
University of Colorado - Denver
Business School, 1475 Lawrence Street, Denver, CO 80202. (www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/business/degrees/ms/marketing/Pages/Marketing.aspx)

University of Connecticut
School of Business, Marketing Department, 2100 Hillside Road, Unit 1041, Storrs, CT 06269. (www.business.uconn.edu/cms/p215)

University of Dayton
School of Business Administration, Department of Management and Marketing, 300 College Park Avenue, Dayton, OH 45469. (www.udayton.edu/business/management_and_marketing/index.php)

University of Delaware
Alfred Lerner College of Business and Economics, 110 Alfred Lerner Hall, Newark, DE 19716. (www.lerner.udel.edu/departments/business-administration/marketing)

University of Denver
Daniels College of Business, Department of Marketing, 2101 S. University Boulevard, Denver, CO 80208. (http://daniels.du.edu/faculty-research/marketing/)

University of Detroit Mercy
College of Business Administration, 4001 W. McNichols Road, Detroit, MI 48221. (http://business.udmercy.edu/programs/undergraduate/business-admin/index.htm)

University of Florida
Warrington College of Business Administration, Heavener School of Business, Department of Marketing, 133 Bryan Hall, P.O. Box 117150, Gainesville, FL 32611. (http://warrington.ufl.edu/departments/mkt/)

University of Georgia
Terry College of Business, Brooks Hall, 310 Herty Drive, Athens, GA 30602. (www.terry.uga.edu/undergraduate/majors/marketing)

University of Hartford
Barney School of Business, 200 Bloomfield Avenue, West Hartford, CT 06117. (www.hartford.edu/barney/undergraduate/majors/marketing.aspx)

University of Hawaii - Manoa
Shidler College of Business, Marketing Department, 2404 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822. (http://shidler.hawaii.edu/majors/marketing and http://shidler.hawaii.edu/mkt)
University of Houston
C.T. Bauer College of Business, Department of Marketing & Entrepreneurship,
334 Melcher Hall, Houston, TX 77204. (www.bauer.uh.edu/departments/marketing/)

University of Houston - Clear Lake
School of Business, 2700 Bay Area Boulevard, Houston, TX 77058.
(http://prtl.uhcl.edu/portal/page/portal/BUS/School-of-Business/Programs/Marketing)

University of Illinois at Chicago
Liautaud Graduate School of Business, 815 W. Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60607.
(http://business.uic.edu/home-uic-business/prospective-students/undergraduate-programs/bs-marketing)

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Business Administration, 350 Wohlers Hall, 1206 South Sixth Street,
Champaign, IL 61820. (https://business.illinois.edu/ba/areas/marketing/)

University of Iowa
Henry B. Tippie College of Business, 108 John Pappajohn Business Building, Iowa City,
IA 52242. (http://tippie.uiowa.edu/marketing/)

University of Kansas
School of Business, 1300 Sunnyside Avenue, Lawrence, KS 66045.
(www.business.ku.edu/degrees/marketing/bsb)

University of Kentucky
Gatton College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing & Supply Chain,
550 S. Limestone, Lexington, KY 40506.
(http://gatton.uky.edu/Content.asp?PageName=AUMarketing)

University of Louisiana - Lafayette
B.I. Moody III College of Business, Box 44610, Lafayette, LA 70504.
(http://marketing.louisiana.edu/)

University of Louisville
College of Business, 2301 South 3rd Street, Louisville, KY 40292.
(http://business.louisville.edu/marketing/)

University of Maine
The Maine Business School, 5723 D. P. Corbett Business Building, Orono, ME 04469.
(http://umaine.edu/business/undergraduate-programs/marketing/)
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University of Maryland - College Park
Robert H. Smith School of Business, 2308 Van Munching Hall, College Park, MD 20742.
(www.rhsmith.umd.edu/programs/undergraduate-programs/academics/academic-majors/marketing)

University of Massachusetts - Amherst
Isenberg School of Management, 121 Presidents Drive, Amherst, MA 01003.
(www.isenberg.umass.edu/marketing/)

University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth
Charlton College of Business, 285 Old Westport Road, North Dartmouth, MA 02747.
(www.umassd.edu/charlton/programs/marketing/)

University of Massachusetts - Lowell
The Robert J. Manning School of Business, One University Avenue, Lowell, MA 01854.
(www.uml.edu/MSB/Departments/management/Marketing.aspx)

University of Memphis
Fogelman College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing, Memphis, TN 38152. (www.memphis.edu/marketing/)

University of Miami
School of Business Administration, Marketing Department, P.O. Box 248027, Coral Gables, FL 33124. (www.bus.miami.edu/faculty-and-research/academic-departments/marketing/)

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor
Ross School of Business, 710 East University Street E 2540, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.
(www.bus.umich.edu/academics/departments/Marketing/mktg-index.html)

University of Michigan - Dearborn
College of Business, 19000 Hubbard Drive, Fairlane Center South, Dearborn, MI 48126.
(http://cob.umd.umich.edu/bba-marketing/)

University of Michigan - Flint
School of Management, 303 E. Kearsley Street, Flint, MI 48502.
(http://catalog.umflint.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=11&poid=3080)

University of Minnesota - Duluth
Labovitz School of Business and Economics, 1318 Kirby Drive, Duluth, MN 55812.
(https://lsbe.d.umn.edu/marketing/marketing.php)

University of Minnesota - Twin Cities Campus
Carlson School of Management, 321 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
(www.carlsonschool.umn.edu/marketing)
University of Mississippi
School of Business Administration, 253 Holman Hall, University, MS 38677.
(www.olemissbusiness.com/marketing)

University of Missouri - Columbia
Robert J. Trulaske Sr. College of Business, Department of Marketing, 213 Cornell Hall, Columbia, MO 65211.
(http://business.missouri.edu/programs-and-admissions/undergraduate/degree-programs/marketing)

University of Missouri - Kansas City
Henry W. Bloch School of Business, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, MO 64110.
(http://bloch.umkc.edu/about-us/academic-departments/mktg-supply-chain-management/)

University of Missouri - St. Louis
College of Business Administration, Marketing Department, One University Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63121. (www.umsl.edu/divisions/business/marketing/index.html)

University of Montana - Missoula
School of Business Administration, Department of Management and Marketing, Gallagher Business Building, Missoula, MT 59812.
(www.business.umt.edu/degreesprograms/ManagementandMarketing.aspx)

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, P.O. Box 880405, Lincoln, NE 68588. (http://cba.unl.edu/departments/marketing/default.aspx)

University of Nebraska - Omaha
College of Business Administration, 6001 Dodge Street, Omaha, NE 68182. (http://cba.unomaha.edu/M_M/)

University of Nevada - Las Vegas
Lee Business School, Department of Marketing and International Business, 4505 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89154. (http://business.unlv.edu/mlb/)

University of New Hampshire
Peter T. Paul College of Business and Economics, Marketing Department, Durham, NH 03824. (https://paulcollege.unh.edu/departments/marketing)

University of New Mexico
Robert O. Anderson Graduate School of Management, Department of Marketing Management, MSC 053090, 1 New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131. (http://bba.mgt.unm.edu/concentrations/marketing.asp)
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
Kenan-Flagler Business School, 300 Kenan Center Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27599. (www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/programs/mba/curriculum/concentrations/marketing)

University of North Carolina - Charlotte
Belk College of Business Administration, 9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223. (http://belkcollege.uncc.edu/about-college/departments/marketing)

University of North Carolina - Greensboro
Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, Bryan Building, Room 220, P.O. Box 26156, Greensboro, NC 27402. (http://admissions.uncg.edu.major-marketing.php)

University of North Carolina - Wilmington
Cameron School of Business, Marketing Department, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, NC 28403. (www.csb.uncw.edu/mkt/index.htm)

University of North Florida
Coggin College of Business, 4567 St. John’s Bluff Road S., Jacksonville, FL 32224. (www.unf.edu/coggin/marketing)

University of North Texas
College of Business Administration, P.O. Box 311160, Denton, TX 76203. (www.cob.unt.edu/mktg)

University of Northern Iowa
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, Curris Business Building, Cedar Falls, IA 50614. (http://business.uni.edu/web/pages/departments/marketing.cfm)

University of Notre Dame
Marketing Department, 102 Mendoza College of Business, Notre Dame, IN 46556. (http://business.nd.edu/marketing/)

University of Oklahoma
Michael F. Price College of Business, Division of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 307 W. Brooks, Room 1F, Norman, OK 73019. (www.ou.edu/price/marketing_supplychainmanagement/marketing_marketing.html)

University of Oregon
Charles H. Lundquist College of Business, Department of Marketing, Lillis Business Complex, Eugene, OR 97403. (https://business.uoregon.edu/departments/marketing)
University of Pennsylvania
Wharton School, Marketing Department, 700 Jon M. Huntsman Hall, 3730 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. (https://marketing.wharton.upenn.edu/)

University of Pittsburgh
Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business, Mervis Hall, Pittsburgh, PA 15260. (www.business.pitt.edu/katz/faculty/marketing)

University of Portland

University of Rhode Island
College of Business Administration, Ballentine Hall, Seven Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881. (http://web.uri.edu/business/marketing/)

University of Richmond
Robins School of Business, Marketing Department, 1 Gateway Road, University of Richmond, VA 23173. (http://robins.richmond.edu/undergraduate/academics/marketing/index.html)

University of Rochester
William E. Simon Graduate School of Business Administration, Carol G. Simon Hall, Box 270100, Rochester, NY 14627. (www.simon.rochester.edu/programs/phd/academic-overview/marketing/index.aspx)

University of San Diego
School of Business Administration, Olin Hall, 5998 Alcala Park, San Diego, CA 92110. (www.sandiego.edu/business/programs/undergraduate/majors/marketing/index.php)

University of San Francisco
Masagung Graduate School of Management, Malloy Hall, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. (www.usfca.edu/management/departments/Department_of_Marketing/)

University of Scranton
Kania School of Management, Department of Management & Marketing, Brennan Hall, Suite 343, Scranton, PA 18510. (www.scranton.edu/academics/ksom/mgt-marketing/)

University of South Alabama
Mitchell College of Business, 307 University Boulevard, Mobile, AL 36688. (http://southalabama.edu/mcob/mkt.html)
University of South Carolina  
The Darla Moore School of Business, Marketing Department, 1705 College Street, Columbia, SC 29208.  
(http://moore.sc.edu/academicprograms/undergraduate/majorsoffered/marketing.aspx)

University of South Florida  
College of Business Administration, Marketing Department, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, Tampa, FL 33620.  
(www.usf.edu/business/departments/marketing/index.aspx)

University of Southern California  
Marshall School of Business, Department of Marketing, 3660 Trousdale Parkway, ACC 306E, Los Angeles, CA 90089.  
(www.marshall.usc.edu/faculty/marketing)

University of Southern Maine  
School of Business, P.O. Box 9300, 96 Falmouth Street, Portland, ME 04104.  
(http://usm.maine.edu/sb/bs-business-administration-marketing-major)

University of Southern Mississippi  
College of Business, Department of Marketing and Merchandising, Joseph Greene Hall, 118 College Drive, Hattiesburg, MS 39406.  
(www.usm.edu/business/marketing-fashion_merchandising)

University of Tampa  
John H. Sykes College of Business, 401 W. Kennedy Boulevard, Tampa, FL 33606.  
(www.ut.edu/marketing/?terms=department%20of%20marketing)

University of Tennessee - Chattanooga  
College of Business Administration, Department 6056, Fletcher Hall, 615 McCallie Avenue, Chattanooga, TN 37403.  
(www.utc.edu/college-business/about/departments/marketing-and-entrepreneurship.php)

University of Tennessee - Knoxville  
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 310 Stokely Management Center, Knoxville, TN 37996.  
(http://mscm.bus.utk.edu/)

University of Tennessee - Martin  
College of Business and Global Affairs, 113 Business Administration Building, Martin, TN 38238.  
(www.utm.edu/departments/mmci/)

University of Texas - Arlington  
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, UTA Box 19376, Arlington, TX 76019.  
(http://wwweb.uta.edu/marketing/)
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University of Texas - Austin
McCombs School of Business, Department of Marketing, 1 University Station, B6000, Austin, TX 78712. (www.mccombs.utexas.edu/departments/marketing/)

University of Texas - Dallas
Naveen Jindal School of Management, 800 West Campbell Road, Richardson, TX 75083. (http://jindal.utdallas.edu/academic-areas/marketing/)

University of Texas - Pan American
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 1201 W. University Drive, Edinburgh, TX 78539. (http://portal.utpa.edu/utpa_main/daa_home/coba_new_home/coba_departments/departments_mark)

University of Texas - San Antonio
College of Business, Department of Marketing, One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, TX 78249. (http://business.utsa.edu/marketing/index.aspx)

University of the Pacific
Eberhardt School of Business, 3601 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, CA 95211. (www.pacific.edu/Academics/Schools-and-Colleges/Eberhardt-School-of-Business.html)

University of Toledo
College of Business and Innovation, Department of Marketing and International Business, 2801 W. Bancroft, Toledo, OH 43606. (www.utoledo.edu/business/MIB/index.html)

University of Tulsa
Collins College of Business, Department of Management and Marketing, 800 South Tucker Drive, Tulsa, OK 74104. (www.utulsa.edu/academics/colleges/collins-college-of-business/bus-dept-schools/Department-of-Management-and-Marketing.aspx)

University of Utah
David Eccles School of Business, Marketing Department, Spencer Fox Eccles Business Building 7132, 1655 E. Campus Center Drive, Salt Lake City, UT 84112. (www.business.utah.edu/page/marketing-department)

University of Vermont
School of Business Administration, 55 Colchester Avenue, 101 Kalkin Hall, Burlington, VT 05405. (www.uvm.edu/business/?Page=marketing.html&SM=academic_submenu.html)

University of Virginia
Darden Graduate School of Business Administration, 100 Darden Boulevard, P.O. Box 6550, Charlottesville, VA 22906. (www.darden.virginia.edu/web/mba/academics/curriculum-electives/areas/marketing/)
University of Washington
Michael G. Foster School of Business, Department of Marketing and International Business, 474 Paccar Hall, Box 353226, Seattle, WA 98195. (www.foster.washington.edu/academic/departments/mib/Pages/marketing-internationalbusiness.aspx)

University of West Florida
College of Business, Department of Marketing & Economics, 11000 University Parkway, Pensacola, FL 32514. (http://uwf.edu/market/)

University of West Georgia
Richards College of Business, 1601 Maple Street, Carrollton, GA 30118. (www.westga.edu/business/index.php)

University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
College of Business, Department of Management and Marketing, P.O. Box 4004, Eau Claire, WI 54702. (www.uwec.edu/COB/departments/managementmarketing/index.htm)

University of Wisconsin - La Crosse
College of Business Administration, Marketing Department, 1725 State Street, La Crosse, WI 54601. (www.uwlax.edu/ba/mkt/)

University of Wisconsin - Madison
Wisconsin School of Business, Department of Marketing, 975 University Avenue, 4166 Grainger Hall, Madison, WI 53706. (http://bus.wisc.edu/knowledge-expertise/academic-departments/marketing)

University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business, P.O. Box 742, 3202 N. Maryland Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53201. (http://www4.uwm.edu/business/programs/busmasters/ms/msmktg.cfm)

University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh
College of Business Administration, 800 Algoma Boulevard, Oshkosh, WI 54901. (www.uwosh.edu/cob/future-students/undergraduate/academics/majors/marketing)

University of Wisconsin - Parkside
School of Business and Technology, 900 Wood Road, Box 2000, Kenosha, WI 53141. (www.uwp.edu/departments/business/marketing)

University of Wisconsin - Whitewater
College of Business and Economics, Hyland Hall, 809 W. Starin Road, Whitewater, WI 53190. (www.uww.edu/cobe/marketing)
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University of Wyoming
Management & Marketing, 1000 E. University Avenue, Dept. 3275, Laramie, WY 82071. (www.uwyo.edu/mgtmkt)

Valdosta State University
Langdale College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing and Economics, 1500 N. Patterson Street, Valdosta, GA 31698. (http://valdosta.edu/colleges/business/marketing-and-economics/welcome.php)

Valparaiso University
Graduate School of Business, 1909 Chapel Drive, 104 Urschel Hall, Valparaiso, IN 46383. (www.valpo.edu/cba/undergrad/marketing.php)

Vanderbilt University
Owen Graduate School of Management, 401 21st Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37203. (www.owen.vanderbilt.edu/programs/mba/curriculum/choose-your-academic-focus/concentrations/marketing.cfm)

Villanova University
School of Business, Department of Marketing and Business Law, 800 Lancaster Avenue, Bartley Hall, Villanova, PA 19085. (http://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/departments/marketing_buslaw.html)

Virginia Commonwealth University
School of Business, Department of Marketing, 301 West Main Street, P.O. Box 844000, Richmond, VA 23284. (http://business.vcu.edu/marketing.html)

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Wake Forest University
Babcock Graduate School of Management, P.O. Box 7659, Winston-Salem, NC 27106 (http://business.wfu.edu/default.aspx?id=1808)

Washington State University
College of Business, Department of Marketing and International Business, Todd Addition 367, P.O. Box 644730, Pullman, WA 99164. (www.business.wsu.edu/academics/Marketing/Pages/index.aspx)

Washington University in St. Louis
John M. Olin School of Business, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1133, St. Louis, MO 63130. (www.olin.wustl.edu/EN-US/academic-programs/full-time-MBA/platforms-and-concentrations/Pages/Marketing.aspx)
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Wayne State University
School of Business Administration, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 5201 Cass Avenue, 300 Prentis Building, Detroit, MI 48202. (http://business.wayne.edu/supplychain/department.php)

Weber State University
John B. Goddard School of Business, Department of Business Administration, 3802 University Circle, Ogden, UT 84408. (www.weber.edu/majors/marketing.html)

West Virginia University
College of Business and Economics, 1601 University Avenue, P.O. Box 6025, Morgantown, WV 26506. (Www.wvu.edu/academics)

Western Carolina University
College of Business, 104 B Forsyth Building, Cullowhee, NC 28723 (www.wcu.edu/academics/departments-schools-colleges/COB/college-of-business-departments/esmht/index.asp)

Western Michigan University
Haworth College of Business, 2130 Arnold Schneider Hall, Kalamazoo, MI 49008. (www.wmich.edu/marketing)

Western Washington University
College of Business and Economics, Department of Finance & Marketing, 516 High Street, Bellingham, WA 98225. (http://cbe.wwu.edu/fmkt/index.shtml)

Wichita State University
W. Frank Barton School of Business, Department of Marketing, 1845 Fairmount, Box 84, Wichita, KS 67260. (www.wichita.edu/thisis/home/?u=marketing)

Widener University
School of Business Administration, One University Place, Chester, PA 19013. (www.widener.edu/academics/schools/business)

Wright State University
Raj Soin College of Business, Department of Marketing, 266 Rike Hall, Dayton, OH 45435. (https://business.wright.edu/academics/undergraduate/marketing/program-overview)

Xavier University
Williams College of Business, 3800 Victory Parkway, Cincinnati, OH 45207. (www.xavier.edu/williams/undergraduate/marketing)
Yale University
Yale School of Management, 135 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06520.
(http://som.yale.edu/)

Youngstown State University
Warren P. Williamson Jr. College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing,
One University Plaza, Youngstown, OH 44555.
(http://web.ysu.edu/gen/wcba/Department_of_Marketing_m15.html)
APPENDIX C

ACADEMIC - PH.D./DBA MARKETING PROGRAMS

Arizona State University
W.P. Carey School of Business, Department of Marketing, P.O. Box 874906, Tempe, AZ 85287. (https://wpcarey.asu.edu/marketing-degrees/doctoral)

Bentley University
The Elkin B. McCallum Graduate School of Business, 175 Forest Street, Waltham, MA 02452. (http://phd.bentley.edu/phd-programs/business/phd-program-business)

Boston University
School of Management, Marketing Department, 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215. (http://management.bu.edu/graduate/graduate-programs/phd/management/)

Carnegie Mellon University
Tepper School of Business, Doctoral Program in Marketing, Posner Hall, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. (http://tepper.cmu.edu/prospective-students/phd/program/marketing)

City University of New York
Baruch College, Zicklin School Of Business, One Bernard Baruch Way (55 Lexington Avenue at East 24th Street), New York, NY 10010. (http://zicklin.baruch.cuny.edu/programs/doctoral/areas-of-study/areas-of-study/marketing)

Cleveland State University
Monte Ahuja College of Business, 2121 Euclid Avenue, BU420, Cleveland, OH 44115. (www.csuohio.edu/business/academics/mkt/dba_marketing.html)

Columbia University
Graduate School of Business, 3022 Broadway, Uris Hall, New York, NY 10027. (http://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/programs-admissions/doctoral-program/academics/marketing)

Cornell University
S.C. Johnson Graduate School of Management, Sage Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853. (www.johnson.cornell.edu/PHD-Program/Areas-of-Study/Marketing.aspx)
Drexel University
LeBow College of Business, 207 Matheson Hall, 3141 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. (www.lebow.drexel.edu/academics/programs/doctorate/phd-business/plan-of-study/specializations/marketing)

Duke University
Fuqua School of Business, 100 Fuqua Drive, Box 90120, Durham, NC 27708. (www.fuqua.duke.edu/marketing/phd/)

Emory University
Goizueta Business School, 1300 Clifton Road, NE, Atlanta, GA 30322. (http://goizueta.emory.edu/degree/phd/marketing/index.html)

Florida Atlantic University
College of Business, 777 Glades Road, Boca Raton, FL 33461. (http://business.fau.edu/masters-phd/phd-program/marketing/index.aspx#.VZGvOhtViko)

Florida International University
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 11200 SW 8th Street, Miami, FL 33199. (http://business.fiu.edu/chapman/phd/index.cfm)

Florida State University
College of Business, Marketing Department, P.O. Box 3061110, Tallahassee, FL 32306. (http://business.fsu.edu/academics/graduate-programs/phd-program#mar)

George Washington University
School of Business, Department of Marketing, Duques Hall, 2201 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20052. (http://business.gwu.edu/programs/doctoral-programs/fields-of-study/marketing-phd/)

Georgia Institute of Technology
Ernest Scheller Jr. College of Business, 800 West Peachtree Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30332. (http://scheller.gatech.edu/degree-programs/phd/phd-concentrations/phd-marketing.html)

Georgia State University
J. Mack Robinson College of Business, Department of Marketing, 35 Broad Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30303. (http://marketing.robinson.gsu.edu/academic-programs/phd/)

Harvard University
Business School, Soldiers Field, Boston, MA 02163. (www.hbs.edu/doctoral/areas-of-study/marketing/Pages/default.aspx)
Indiana University
Kelley School of Business, 1275 E. 10th Street, Room 2010, Bloomington, IN 47405. (www.bus.indiana.edu/Marketing/Doctoral/page10515.html)

Iowa State University
College of Business, 1360 Gerdin Business Building, Ames, IA 50011. (www.business.iastate.edu/phd/curriculum/areas-of-specialization/marketing/)

Kennesaw University
Michael J. Coles College of Business, Department of Marketing & Professional Sales, Burruss Building, 1000 Chastain Road, Kennesaw, GA 30144. (http://coles.kennesaw.edu/graduate/dba/)

Kent State University
Graduate School of Management, Department of Marketing and Entrepreneurship, P.O. Box 5190, Kent, OH 44242. (http://www2.kent.edu/catalog/2014/bu/minors/dmkt)

Louisiana State University
E.J. Ourso College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, Business Education Complex, Room 2100, Baton Rouge, LA 70803. (http://business.lsu.edu/marketing/Pages/PhD-Marketing.aspx)

Louisiana Tech University
College of Business, Department of Marketing & Analytics, P.O. Box 10318, Ruston, LA 71272. (www.business.latech.edu/graduate/dba.htm)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Sloan School of Management, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02142. (http://mitsloan.mit.edu/phd/marketing.php)

Michigan State University
Eli Broad College of Business, Marketing Department, North Business College Complex 632 Bogue Street N370, East Lansing, MI 48824. (www.bus.msu.edu/marketing/phd/)

Mississippi State University
College of Business, Department of Marketing, P.O. Box 9582, Mississippi State, MS 39762. (http://business.msstate.edu/marketing-phd/)

Morgan State University
Earl G. Graves School of Business and Management, McMechen Building, 1700 East Cold Spring Lane, Baltimore, MD 21251. (www.morgan.edu/departments/business_administration/degreesprograms/phd_business_administration.html)
New Mexico State University
College of Business Administration and Economics, Marketing Department, Marketing Department, College of Business, MSC 5280, P.O. Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003. (http://business.nmsu.edu/academics/graduate-programs/mktg-phd/)

New York University
Leonard N. Stern School of Business, Marketing Department, 44 W. Fourth Street, Henry Kaufman Management Center, New York, NY 10012. (www.stern.nyu.edu/experience-stern/about/departments-centers-initiatives/academic-departments/marketing/academic-programs/phd-programs/index.htm)

Northwestern University
Kellogg School of Management, Marketing Department, 2001 Sheridan Road, Leverone Hall, 4th Floor, Evanston, IL 60208. (www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/departments/marketing/programs/phd_program.aspx)

Ohio State University
Max M. Fisher College of Business, Department of Marketing, 2108 Neil Avenue, 100 Gerlach Hall, Columbus, OH 43210. (http://fisher.osu.edu/prospective/graduate/phd/)

Oklahoma State University
Watson Graduate School of Management, Department of Marketing, 312A Business Building, Stillwater, OK 74078. (http://watson.okstate.edu/mktgphd/)

Old Dominion University
College of Business and Public Administration, Department of Marketing, 2126 Constant Hall, Norfolk, VA 23529. (http://bpa.odu.edu/bpa/academics/baphd.shtml)

Pennsylvania State University
Mary Jean and Frank P. Smeal College of Business, Business Administration Building, University Park, PA 16802. (www.smeal.psu.edu/phd/mktg)

Purdue University
Krannert Graduate School of Management, Marketing Department, 403 W. State Street West Lafayette, IN 47907. (www.krannert.purdue.edu/programs/phd/program-details/marketing.asp)

Rutgers University
School of Management and Labor Relations, Janice H. Levin Building, 94 Rockafeller Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854. (www.business.rutgers.edu/phd/programs/marketing-science)
Saint Louis University
John Cook School of Business, Department of Marketing, Davis-Shaughnessy Hall, 3674 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63108. (www.slu.edu/x16695.xml)

Southern Illinois University
College of Business and Administration, Department of Marketing, Rehn Hall, Room 229, Carbondale, IL 62901. (www.business.siu.edu/academics/phd/mktg-phd.html)

Stanford University
Stanford Graduate School of Business, Knight Management Center, 655 Knight Way, Stanford, CA 94305. (www.gsb.stanford.edu/phd/fields/marketing)

State University of New York, Binghamton
School of Management, 4400 Vestal Parkway East, P.O. Box 6000, Binghamton, NY 13902. (www.binghamton.edu/som/graduate/doctoral-programs/marketing-concentration.html)

Syracuse University
Martin J. Whitman School of Management, 721 University Avenue Syracuse, NY 13244. (http://whitman.syr.edu/programs-and-academics/programs/whitman-phd-experience/major-fields/marketing.aspx)

Temple University
Fox School of Business and Management, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 1515 Market Street, Speckman Hall Suite 400, Philadelphia, PA 19102. (www.fox.temple.edu/cms_academics/phd/marketing/)

Texas A&M University
Mays Business School, 4117 TAMU, 390 Wehner Building, College Station, TX 77843. (http://mays.tamu.edu/degrees-and-majors/phd/mktg-phd/?)

Texas Tech University
Jerry S. Rawls College of Business Administration, P.O. Box 42101, Lubbock, TX 79409. (www.depts.ttu.edu/rawlsbusiness/graduate/phd/marketing/index.php)

University of Alabama
Culverhouse College of Commerce, Marketing Department, Alston Hall, 361 Stadium Drive, Box 870225, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487. (www.cba.ua.edu/mkt/phd/)

University of Arizona
Eller Graduate School of Management, McClelland Hall, Room 320, P.O. Box 210108, Tucson, AZ 85721. (http://marketing.eller.arizona.edu/doctroral/)
University of Arkansas
Sam M. Walton College of Business, Department of Marketing, Business Building 302, Fayetteville, AR 72701.  (http://gsb.uark.edu/marketingphd.asp)

University at Buffalo
The State University of New York, School of Management, 215 Jacobs Management Center, Buffalo, NY 14260.  (www.mgt.buffalo.edu/phd/)

University of California - Berkeley
Haas School of Business, 2000 Center Street, Berkeley, CA 94704.  (www.haas.berkeley.edu/Phd/academics/marketing/index.html)

University of California - Irvine
The Paul Merage School of Business, Irvine, CA 92697  
(http://merage.uci.edu/Classic/DoctoralProgram/AcademicAreas/PHDMarketing.aspx)  
and  (http://merage.uci.edu/Faculty/AcademicAreas/Marketing.aspx)

University of California - Los Angeles
UCLA Anderson School of Management, 110 Westwood Plaza, Box 951481, Los Angeles, CA 90095.  (www.anderson.ucla.edu/x24271.xml)

University of Central Florida
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 4000 Central Florida Boulevard, P.O. Box 161991, Orlando, FL 32816.  
(wwwgraduatecatalog.ucf.edu/programs/program.aspx?id=1078&tid=210&track=Marketing)

University of Chicago
Booth School of Business, James M. Kilts Center for Marketing, 5807 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637.  
(www.chicagobooth.edu/programs/phd/academics/dissertation/marketing)

University of Cincinnati
Carl H. Lindner College of Business, 2925 Campus Green Drive, Cincinnati OH 45221.  
(http://business.uc.edu/graduate/phd/curriculum.html#Mktg)

University of Colorado - Boulder
Leeds School of Business, 995 Regent Drive, 419 UCB, Boulder, CO 80309.  
(http://leeds.colorado.edu/phd)

University of Connecticut
School of Business, Marketing Department, 2100 Hillside Road, Unit 1041, Storrs, CT 06269.  (http://phd.business.uconn.edu/)
University of Florida
Warrington College of Business Administration, Heavener School of Business, Department of Marketing, 133 Bryan Hall, P.O. Box 117160, Gainesville, FL 32611. (www.cba.ufl.edu/mkt/programs/phd/)

University of Georgia
Terry College of Business, Brooks Hall, 310 Herty Drive, Athens, GA 30602. (www.terry.uga.edu/marketing/phd/)

University of Hawaii - Manoa
Shidler College of Business, Marketing Department, 2404 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822. (http://shidler.hawaii.edu/phd)

University of Houston
C.T. Bauer College of Business, Department of Marketing & Entrepreneurship, 334 Melcher Hall, Houston, TX 77204. (www.bauer.uh.edu/doctoral/marketing/)

University of Illinois at Chicago
Liautaud Graduate School of Business, 815 W. Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60607. (http://business.uic.edu/home-uic-business/liautaud-programs/doctoral-programs/phd-in-business-administration/marketing)

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
Department of Business Administration, 350 Wohlers Hall, 1206 South Sixth Street, Champaign, IL 61820. (https://business.illinois.edu/ba/doctoral/areas/marketing/)

University of Iowa
Henry B. Tippie College of Business, 108 John Pappajohn Business Building, Iowa City, IA 52242. (http://tippie.uiowa.edu/marketing/phd/)

University of Kansas
School of Business, 1300 Sunnyside Avenue, Lawrence, KS 66045. (https://business.ku.edu/degrees/business/phd/marketing)

University of Kentucky
Gatton College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing & Supply Chain, Lexington, KY 40506. (http://gatton.uky.edu/Content.asp?PageName=PHDMsgIndex)

University of Maryland
Robert H. Smith School of Business, 2308 Van Munching Hall, College Park, MD 20742. (www.rhsmith.umd.edu/programs/phd-program/academics/fields-study/marketing)
University of Massachusetts
Isenberg School of Management, 121 Presidents Drive, Amherst, MA 01003. (www.isenberg.umass.edu/programs/doctoral/concentrations/marketing)

University of Memphis
Fogelman College of Business and Economics, Department of Marketing, Memphis, TN 38152. (www.memphis.edu/fcbephd/index.php)

University of Miami
School of Business Administration, Marketing Department, P.O. Box 248027, Coral Gables, FL 33124. (www.bus.miami.edu/phd-programs/)

University of Michigan
Ross School of Business, 710 East University Street E 2540, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. (www.bus.umich.edu/Academics/Phd/AreasOfStudy/Marketing/)

University of Minnesota
Carlson School of Management, 321 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455. (http://carlsonschool.umn.edu/degrees/phd/areas-concentration/marketing)

University of Mississippi
School of Business Administration, 253 Holman Hall, University, MS 38677. (http://www.olemissbusiness.com/programs/phd/)

University of Missouri
Robert J. Trulaske Sr. College of Business, Department of Marketing, 213 Cornell Hall, Columbia, MO 65211. (http://business.missouri.edu/1622/Default.aspx)

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, P.O. Box 880405, Lincoln, NE 68588. (http://cba.unl.edu/academic-programs/departments/marketing/phd/)

University of North Carolina
Kenan-Flagler Business School, 300 Kenan Center Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27599. (www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/Programs/PhD/marketing.cfm)

University of North Texas
College of Business Administration, P.O. Box 311160, Denton, TX 76203. (www.coba.unt.edu/programs/phd/phd_mktg.php)
University of Oklahoma
Michael F. Price College of Business, Division of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 307 W. Brooks, Room 1F, Norman, OK 73019.  (www.ou.edu/content/price/marketing_supplychainmanagement/mkt_supplychain_PhD.html)

University of Oregon
Charles H. Lundquist College of Business, Department of Marketing, Lillis Business Complex, Eugene, OR 97403.  (http://lcb.uoregon.edu/App_Aspx/Mktg.aspx?mktg.9.txt)

University of Pennsylvania
Wharton School, Marketing Department, 700 Jon M. Huntsman Hall, 3730 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.  (https://marketing.wharton.upenn.edu/programs/phd/)

University of Pittsburgh
Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business, Mervis Hall, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.  (www.business.pitt.edu/katz/phd/academics/marketing.php)

University of Rhode Island
College of Business Administration, Ballentine Hall, Seven Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881.  (http://web.uri.edu/business/phd-program/)

University of Rochester
William E. Simon Graduate School of Business Administration, Carol G. Simon Hall, Box 270100, Rochester, NY 14627.  (www.simon.rochester.edu/academic-groups/marketing/marketing-phd-program/index.aspx)

University of South Carolina
The Darla Moore School of Business, Marketing Department, 1705 College Street, Columbia, SC 29208.  (http://moore.sc.edu/academicprograms/doctoral.aspx)

University of South Florida
Muma College of Business, Marketing Department, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, Tampa, FL 33620.  (www.usf.edu/business/graduate/doctoral/marketing/index.aspx)

University of Southern California
Marshall School of Business, Department of Marketing, 3660 Trousdale Parkway, ACC 306E, Los Angeles, CA 90089.  (www.marshall.usc.edu/phd/fields/mkt)

University of Tennessee
Haslam College of Business, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 310 Stokely Management Center, Knoxville, TN 37996.  (http://haslam.utk.edu/DoctoralPrograms.asp)
University of Texas - Arlington
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, UTA Box 19376, Arlington, TX 76019. (http://wweb.uta.edu/business/gradbiz/newgradbiz/PhD/program/marketing/marketing.html)

University of Texas - Austin
McCombs School of Business, Department of Marketing, 1 University Station, B6000, Austin, TX 78712. (www.mccombs.utexas.edu/ Departments/Marketing/Marketing-PhD)

University of Texas - Dallas
Naveen Jindal School of Management, 800 West Campbell Road, Richardson, TX 75083. (http://jindal.utdallas.edu/academic-programs/phd-programs/management-science-concentrations/marketing-concentration/)

University of Texas - Pan American
College of Business Administration, Department of Marketing, 1201 W. University Drive, Edinburgh, TX 78539. (http://portal.utpa.edu/utpa_main/daa_home/coba_new_home/coba_degrees/coba_graduate/coba_phd)

University of Texas at San Antonio
College of Business, Department of Marketing, One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, TX 78249. (www.business.utsa.edu/marketing/mkt_phd.aspx)

University of Utah
David Eccles School of Business, Marketing Department, Spencer Fox Eccles Business Building 7132, 1655 E. Campus Center Drive, Salt Lake City, UT 84112. (http://phd.business.utah.edu/page/marketing)

University of Virginia
Darden Graduate School of Business Administration, 100 Darden Boulevard, P.O. Box 6550, Charlottesville, VA 22906. (www.darden.virginia.edu/phd/about/)

University of Washington
Michael G. Foster School of Business, Department of Marketing and International Business, 474 Paciar Hall, Box 353226, Seattle, WA 98195. (www.foster.washington.edu/academic/PhD/Pages/Marketing.aspx)

University of Wisconsin - Madison
Wisconsin School of Business, Department of Marketing, 975 University Avenue, 4166 Grainger Hall, Madison, WI 53706. (http://bus.wisc.edu/phd/program-overview/areas-requirements/marketing)
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University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business, P.O. Box 742, 3202 N. Maryland Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53201. (http://uwm.edu/business/academics/doctoral/areas-of-study/)

University of Wyoming
Management & Marketing, 1000 E. University Avenue, Dept. 3275, Laramie, WY 82071. (www.uwyo.edu/mgtmkt/)

Vanderbilt University
Owen Graduate School of Management, 401 21st Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37203. (www.owen.vanderbilt.edu/programs/phd/)

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Pamplin College of Business, Department of Marketing, 1044 Pamplin Hall, Blacksburg, VA 24061. (https://secure.hosting.vt.edu/www.marketing.pamplin.vt.edu/general.php?page=phd)

Washington State University
Carson College of Business, Department of Marketing and International Business, Todd Addition 367, P.O. Box 644730, Pullman, WA 99164. (http://business.wsu.edu/graduate-programs/phd-business/marketing/)

Washington University in St. Louis
John M. Olin School of Business, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1133, St. Louis, MO 63130. (www.olin.wustl.edu/academicprograms/Doctorate/Marketing/Pages/default.aspx)

Wayne State University
School of Business Administration, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, 5201 Cass Avenue, 300 Prentis Building, Detroit, MI 48202. (http://business.wayne.edu/phd/marketing.php)

West Virginia University
College of Business and Economics, 1601 University Avenue, P.O. Box 6025, Morgantown, WV 26506. (www.be.wvu.edu/phd_marketing/index.htm)

Yale University
Yale School of Management, 135 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06520. (http://phd.som.yale.edu/program/marketing)
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Accenture, 1345 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10105. (917) 452-4400. (www.accenture.com)


American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), 625 Avis Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48108. (734) 913-0788. (www.theacsi.org)

Ascend2, 36 Links Lane, Marstons Mills, MA 02648. (800) 762-1595. (www.ascend2.com)


BIA/Kelsey, 15120 Enterprise Court, Chantilly, VA 20151. (703) 818-2425. (www.biakelsey.com)


Boston Consulting Group, Exchange Place, 31st Floor, Boston, MA 02109. (617) 973-1200. (www.bcg.com)

Brand Keys, 115 E. 57th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10022. (212) 532-6028. (www.brandkeys.com)

Chadwick Martin Bailey, 179 South Street, 3rd Floor, Boston, MA 02111. (617) 350-8922. (www.cmbinfo.com)

Concentric Marketing, 101 Worthington Avenue, Suite 190, Charlotte, NC 28203. (704) 731-5100. (www.getconcentric.com)

Datamonitor, 245 Fifth Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10016. (212) 686-7400. (www.datamonitor.com)
Economic Analysis Associates, 5 Glen Court, Greenwich, CT 06830. (203) 869-9667. (www.eaaresearch.com)

Econsultancy, 350 7th Avenue, Suite 307, New York, NY 10001. (212) 971-0630. (www.econsultancy.com)

eMarketer, 11 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. (800) 405-0844. (www.emarketer.com)


First Research, 5800 Airport Boulevard, Austin, TX 78752. (866) 788-9389. (www.firstresearch.com).

ForeSee, 2500 Green Road, Suite 400, Ann Arbor, MI 48105. (800) 621-2850. (www.foresee.com)

Forrester Research, 60 Acorn Park Drive, Cambridge, MA 02140. (617) 613-5730. (www.forrester.com)

Frost & Sullivan, 331 E. Evelyn Avenue, Mountain View, CA 97845. (877) 463-7678. (www.frost.com)

Gartner, 56 Top Gallant Road, Stamford, CT 06902. (203) 964-0096. (www.gartner.com)

GfK, 200 Liberty Street, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10281. (212) 240-5300. (www.gfk.com)

Harris Interactive, a Nielsen Company, 60 Corporate Woods, Rochester, NY 14623. (585) 272-8400. (www.harrisinteractive.com)

IEG, 350 North Orleans Street, Suite 1200, Chicago, IL 60654. (800) 834-4850. (www.sponsorship.com)

International Data Corporation, 5 Speen Street, Framingham, MA 01701. (508) 872-8200. (www.idc.com)

International Demographics, 10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 200, Houston, TX 77042. (713) 626-0333. (www.themediaaudit.com)

Ipsos Marketing, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 500, Westbury, NY 11590. (516) 507-3515. (www.ipsos.com/marketing)
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Riedel Marketing Group, 5327 East Pinchot Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85018. (602) 840-4948. (www.4rmg.com)

Service Management Group, 1737 McGee Street, Kansas City, MO 64108. (800) 764-0439. (www.smg.com)

Temkin Group, 48 White Oak Road, Waban, MA 02468. (617) 916-2075. (www.temkingroup.com)

The Conference Board, 845 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022. (212) 759-0900. (www.conference-board.org)

The Futures Company, 1300 Environ Way, Chapel Hill, NC 27517. (919) 932-8858. (www.thefuturescompany.com)


The NPD Group, 900 West Shore Road, Port Washington, NY 11050. (516) 625-0700. (www.npd.com)

Unity Marketing, 206 E. Church Street, Stevens, PA 17578. (717) 336-1600. (www.unitymarketingonline.com)

Urban Land Institute, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Suite 500 West, Washington, DC 20007. (202) 624-7000. (www.uli.org)

uSamp, 16501 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 250, Encino, CA 91436. (877) 217-9800. (www.usamp.com)

Winterberry Group, 60 Broad Street, Suite 3810, New York, NY 10004. (212) 842-6000. (www.winterberrygroup.com)

WSL Strategic Retail, 307 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1707, New York, NY 10001. (212) 924-7780. (www.wslstrategicretail.com)
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ASSOCIATIONS

ABM, The Association of Business Information and Media Companies, 675 Third Avenue, Suite 2200, New York, NY 10017. (212) 661-6360. (www.abmassociation.com)

Academy of Marketing Science, c/o College of Business, Louisiana Tech University P.O. Box 3072, Ruston, LA 71272. (www.ams-web.org)

American Association of Advertising Agencies, 1065 Avenue of the Americas, 16th Floor, New York, NY 10018. (212) 682-2500. (www.aaaa.org)

American Marketing Association, 311 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5800, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 542-9000. (www.marketingpower.com)

Association of National Advertisers, 708 Third Avenue, 33rd Floor, New York, NY 10017. (212) 697-5950. (www.ana.net)

Association of Strategic Marketing, 2510 Alpine Road, Eau Claire, WI 54703. (866) 226-0828. (www.associationofmarketing.org)

Business Marketing Association, 708 Third Avenue, 33rd Floor, New York, NY 10017. (212) 697-5950. (www.marketing.org)

Canadian Marketing Association, 1 Concorde Gate, Suite 607, Don Mills, ON M3C 3N6 Canada. (416) 391-2362. (www.the-cma.org)

Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) Council, 1494 Hamilton Avenue, San Jose, CA 95125. (408) 677-5300 x5333. (www.cmocouncil.org)

Corporate Executive Board, 1919 North Lynn Street, Arlington, VA 22209. (571) 303-3000. (www.executiveboard.com)

Direct Marketing Association, 1120 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036. (212) 768-7277. (www.the-dma.org)
Exhibit & Event Marketers Association, 2214 NW 5th Street, Bend, OR 97701.  
(541) 317-8768.  (www.e2ma.org)

International Association of Exhibitions and Events (IAEE), 12700 Park Central Drive, Suite 308, Dallas, TX 75251.  (972) 458-8002.  (www.iaee.com)

Internet Marketing Association, 10 Mar Del Rey, San Clemente, CA 92673.  
(949) 443-9300.  (www.imanetwork.org)

ITSMA, 91 Hartwell Avenue, Lexington, MA 02421.  (781) 862-8500.  (www.itsma.com)


Online Marketing Institute, 2088 Union Street, #3, San Francisco, CA 94123.  
(415) 450-9524.  (www.onlinemarketinginstitute.org)

Web Marketing Association.  (www.webmarketingassociation.org)
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MARKETING BLOGS

- Adages: The Blog (http://adage.com/blog)
- adfreak (www.adweek.com/afreak)
- AdPulp (www.adpulp.com)
- Adrants (www.adrants.com)
- Ads of the World (www.adsoftheworld.com)
- Advertising Lab (http://adverlab.blogspot.com)
- Affiliate Marketing Blog by Shawn Collins (http://blog.affiliatetip.com/)
- Agency Spy (www.mediabistro.com/agencyspy)
- aimClear Blog (www.aimclearblog.com)
- Awaken Your Superhero (www.christopherspenn.com)
- BBH Labs (http://bbhlabs.com)
- Blogging Tips (www.bloggingtips.com)
- BrandFlakesForBreakfast (www.brandflakesforbreakfast.com)
- Branding Strategy Insider (www.brandingstrategyinsider.com)
- Brian Solis (www.briansolis.com)
- Bruce Clay Blog (www.bruceclay.com/blog/)
- Business 2 Community (www.business2community.com)
- CenterNetworks (www.centernetworks.com)
- ChrisBrogan.com (www.chrisbrogan.com)
- Church of the Customer (www.churchofthecustomer.com)
- ClickZ (www.clickz.com/type/news)
- Community Spark (www.communityspark.com)
- Compete Pulse (http://blog.compete.com)
- comScore blog (http://blog.comscore.com)
- Conversation Agent (www.conversationagent.com)
- ConverStations (www.converstations.com)
- Convince & Convert (www.convinceandconvert.com)
- Copyblogger (www.copyblogger.com)
- Creative Zone by MediaMind (http://creativezone.mediamind.com)
- crowdSPRING Blog (http://blog.crowdspring.com)
- Customer Experience Matters (http://experiencematters.wordpress.com)
- Daily Blog Tips (www.dailyblogtips.com)
- Damn, I Wish I’d Thought of That! (www.damniwish.com)
- Dan Zarrella (http://danzarrella.com)
- DigitalNext (http://adage.com/blog/digitalnext/603)
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• Drew’s Marketing Minute (www.drewsmarketingminute.com)
• Duct Tape Marketing (www.ducttapemarketing.com)
• Everybody Loves Free Stuff (http://blog.epromos.com)
• Everything Technology Marketing (http://everythingtechnologymarketing.blogspot.com/)
• Famous Bloggers (www.famousbloggers.net)
• First Call - Celebrity Acquisition + Engagement (http://octagonfirstcall.com/tag/first-call/)
• Forrester’s Marketing Blog (http://blogs.forrester.com)
• Future of Real Estate Marketing (www.futureofrealestatemarketing.com)
• Geoff Livingston’s Blog (http://geofflivingston.com)
• Global Neighbourhoods (http://globalneighbourhoods.net)
• grow (www.thegrowblog.com)
• GrowMap (www.growmap.com)
• Guerrilla Marketing defined (http://blog.guerrillacomm.com)
• HubSpot Internet Marketing Blog (http://blog.hubspot.com)
• If It’s Hip, It’s Here (http://ifitshipitshere.blogspot.com)
• Ignite Social Media (www.ignitesocialmedia.com)
• iMedia Connection Blog (http://blogs.imediaconnection.com)
• Influential Marketing Blog (http://rohitbhargava.typepad.com)
• Internet Marketing Strategies (http://internetmarketingstrategiesblog.org)
• jaffe juice (www.jaffejuice.com)
• Joe Pulizzi: Content Marketing Institute (http://blog.junta42.com)
• JoelComm.com (www.joelcomm.com)
• Jonathan Volk Affiliate Marketing Blog (www.jonathanvolk.com)
• Katya’s Nonprofit Marketing Blog (http://nonprofitmarketingblog.com)
• KDPaine’s Measurement Blog (http://kdpaine.blogs.com)
• Kyle Lacy (http://kylelacy.com)
• LevelTen Interactive (www.leveltendesign.com/blog)
• Logic+Emotion (http://darmano.typepad.com)
• Marketing Over Coffee (www.marketingovercoffee.com)
• Marketing Pilgrim (www.marketingpilgrim.com)
• Marketing Profs Daily Fix (www.mpdailyfix.com)
• Mobile Marketing Watch (www.mobilemarketingwatch.com)
• Neuromarketing (www.neurosciencemarketing.com/blog/)
• Occam’s Razor by Avinash Kaushik (www.kaushik.net)
• Online Marketing Blog (www.toprankblog.com)
• Online PR Thoughts (http://online-pr.blogspot.com)
• Outspoken Media Blog (http://outspokenmedia.com/blog/)
• Personal Branding Blog (www.personalbrandingblog.com)
• Potomac Flacks (www.potomacflacks.com)
• PPC Hero (www.ppchero.com)
• PR Couture (www.prcouture.com)
• PR Fuel (www.ereleases.com/prfuel)
• PR Squared (www.pr-squared.com)
• PR. Differently (http://prdifferently.typepad.com)
• PRNewser (www.mediabistro.com/prnewser)
• Pronet Advertising (www.pronetadvertising.com)
• PSFK (www.psfk.com)
• Publishing 2.0 (www.publishing2.com)
• ReelSEO Video Marketing (www.reelseo.com)
• ReveNews (www.revenews.com)
• Richard Edelman - 6 a.m. (http://edelman.com/speak_up/blog/)
• Search Engine Guide (www.searchengineguide.com)
• Search Engine Journal (www.searchenginejournal.com)
• Search Engine Land (http://searchengineland.com)
• Search Engine Optimization Journal (www.searchengineoptimizationjournal.com)
• Search Engine Roundtable (www.seroundtable.com)
• Search Engine Watch (http://searchenginewatch.com)
• Search Marketing Standard (www.searchmarketingstandard.com/blogging-for-masses)
• SearchRank Blog (www.searchrank.com/blog)
• SEO by the Sea (www.seobythesea.com)
• SEOBook (www.seobook.com)
• SEOMoz Blog (www.seomoz.org/blog)
• Seth’s Blog (www.sethgodin.typepad.com)
• ShoeMoney (www.shoemoney.com)
• Small Business Branding (www.smallbusinessbranding.com)
• Small Business SEM (www.smallbusinesssem.com)
• SmartBlog on Social Media (http://smartblogs.com/socialmedia/)
• So Good (www.sogoodblog.com)
• Social @ Blogging Tracker (www.facebook.com/SocialBloggingTracker)
• Social Business (www.zdnet.com/blog/feeds)
• Social Media Examiner (www.socialmediaexaminer.com)
• Social Media Explorer (www.socialmediaexplorer.com)
• Spin Sucks (www.spinsucks.com)
• SpinWatch (www.spinwatch.org/blogs-mainmenu-29)
• Sugarrae SEO Blog (www.sugarrae.com)
• Super Affiliate Zac Johnson (http://zacjohnson.com/)
• Techipedia: Tamar Weinberg (www.techipedia.com)
• The Ad Contrarian (http://adcontrarian.blogspot.com)
• The BrandBuilder Blog (http://thebrandbuilder.wordpress.com)
• The Denver Egotist (www.thedenveregotist.com)
• The Future Buzz (http://thefuturebuzz.com)
• The Marketing Technology Blog (www.marketingtechblog.com)
• The Relationship Economy (www.relationship-economy.com)
• The Social Media Marketing Blog (www.scottmonty.com)
• This blog sits at the Intersection of Anthropology and Economics (http://cultureby.com)
• Threeminds (http://threeminds.organic.com)
• tompeters! (www.tompeters.com)
• Traffick (www.traffick.com)
• Vladimir Prelovac (www.prelovac.com/vladimir/)
• WATBlog (www.watblog.com)
• Web Ink Now (www.webinknow.com)
• Web Strategy by Jeremiah Owyang (www.web-strategist.com/blog/)
• What Consumes Me (http://whatconsumesme.com)
• What’s Next Blog (www.whatsnextblog.com)
• WhichTestWon? (http://whichtestwon.com)
• Windmill Networking - Social Media Strategy (http://windmillnetworking.com/blog/)
• Ypulse (www.ypulse.com)
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ONLINE RESOURCES

AMA E-Newsletters
(www.ama.org/publications/eNewsletters/Pages/default.aspx)

Bloomberg.com (www.bloomberg.com)
• The site of Bloomberg L.P., which includes Bloomberg Television, delivers business and financial news and draws on the resources of more than 2,300 journalists in 75 countries.

Business.com (www.business.com)
• More than 20 million small- and medium-sized businesses (SMBs) use Business.com to purchase products and services. The site attracts more than 10,000 advertisers.

BusinessInsider (www.businessinsider.com)
• BusinessInsider aggregates, reports, and analyses top business news stories on the Web across vertical industries including technology, finance, entertainment, and retail.

Ecommerce Times (www.ecommercetimes.com)
• Ecommerce Times is published by ECT News Network, one of the largest e-business and technology news publishers in the United States. Membership is free.

MarketingProfs (www.marketingprofs.com)
• Marketing Profs provides business advice through newsletters, conferences, seminars, podcast, articles, and webcasts. The site serves a community of more than 621,000 entrepreneurs, small-business owners, and corporate marketers. Membership is free.

The CMO Survey (www.cmosurvey.org)
• Conducted by Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business (www.fuqua.duke.edu) and sponsored by the American Marketing Association (www.marketingpower.com), the CMO Survey is a semi-annual poll of chief marketing officers.
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PERIODICALS

Advertising Age, 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. (212) 210-0100. (www.adage.com)

Adweek, 770 Broadway, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10003. (877) 496-5246. (www.adweek.com)

Direct Marketing News, c/o Haymarket Media, 114 W. 26th Street, New York, NY 10001. (646) 638-6000. (www.dmnews.com)

eMarketer, 11 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. (800) 405-0844. (www.emarketer.com)

Financial Times, Number One Southwark Bridge, London SE1 9HL, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0) 207 775 6248. (www.ft.com)


International Journal of Market Research, 15 Northburgh Street, London EC1V 0JR, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0) 207 490 4911. (www.mrs.org.uk/ijmr)

Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, c/o Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0) 127 477 7700. (www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/products/journals/journals.htm?id=JBIM)


Journal of International Marketing, c/o American Marketing Association, 311 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5800, Chicago, IL 60606.
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SERVICES FOR RESEARCH & STRATEGY

The following companies provide services for advertising testing, brand identity, customer satisfaction measurement, executive interviewing, focus groups, international services, market research, and test marketing (source: Direct Marketing News):

AceMetrix, 2115 Landings Drive, Mountain View, CA 94043. (800) 279-7984. (www.acemetrix.com)

Adams & Knight, Inc., 80 Avon Meadow Lane, Avon, CT 06001. (860) 676-2300. (www.adamsknight.com)

Added Value, 3400 Cahuenga Boulevard West, Los Angeles, CA 90068. (323) 254-4326. (www.added-value.com)

Alloy Marketing & Promotion, 77 North Washington Street, 8th Floor, Boston, MA 02114. (617) 723-8929. (www.ampagency.com)

Ameritest, 4841 Tramway Ridge Northeast, Albuquerque, NM 87111. (505) 856-0763. (www.ameritest.net)


Brand Keys, 45 E. 57th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10022. (212) 532-6028. (www.brandkeys.com)

Buzzback Market Research, 989 Sixth Avenue, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10018. (646) 519-8010. (www.buzzback.com)

Compete, 501 Boylston Street, Suite 6101, Boston, MA 02116. (617) 933 5600. (www.compete.com)

CRC Marketing Solutions, 6321 Bury Drive, Suite 10, Eden Prairie, MN 55346. (952) 937-6000. (www.crc-inc.com)
Hartman Group, 3150 Richards Road, Suite 200, Bellevue, WA 98005.  
(425) 452-0818.  (www.hartman-group.com)

(908) 788-9393.  (www.hcdi.net)

HDS Marketing, 633 Napor Boulevard, Pittsburgh, PA 15205.  
(412) 279-1600.  (www.hdsmarketing.com)

Higher Power Marketing, 2949 East Shady Spring Trail, Phoenix, AZ 85024.  
(888) 501-5544.  (www.hpowermarketing.com)

Horowitz Research, 270 North Avenue, Suite 805, New Rochelle, NY 10801.  
(914) 834-5999.  (www.horowitzresearch.com)

HRMC, 4012 Gunn Highway, Suite 120, Tampa, FL 33618.  (813) 879-4200.  
(www.hrmc.com)

Hudson Media Services, 305 Madison Avenue, Suite 2316, New York, NY 10065.  
(973) 951-9930.  (www.hudson-media.com)

ImServices Group, 75 Market Street, Suite 20, Elgin, IL 60123.  (847) 695-9575.  
(www.imservicesgroup.com)

IMV, 1400 East Touhy Avenue, Suite 250, Des Plaines, IL 60018.  (847) 297-1404.  
(www.imvinfo.com)

Innerscope Research, 98 North Washington Street, 2nd Floor, Boston, MA 02114.  
(617) 904-0555.  (www.innerscoperesearch.com)

Ipsos, 1700 Broadway, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10019.  (212) 265-3200.  
(www.ipsos.com)

Keller Fay Group, 65 Church Street, 3rd Floor, New Brunswick, NJ 08901.  
(732) 846-6800.  (www.kellerfay.com)

Koski Research, 7 Joost Avenue, Suite 301, San Francisco, CA 94121.  
(415) 334-3400.  (www.koskiresearch.com)

Lightspeed Research, 11 Madison Avenue, 12th Floor, New York, NY 10010.  
(908) 630-0542.  (www.lightspeedresearch.com)

Luth Research, 1365 4th Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101.  (619) 234-5884.  
(www.luthresearch.com)
Managed Direct Response, 22845 Savi Ranch Parkway, Yorba Linda, CA 92887. (800) 915-3634. (www.managedmktg.com)


Marketing Evolution, 4364 Town Center Boulevard, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762. (916) 933-7536. (www.marketingevolution.com)


Marketing Systems Group, 755 Business Center Drive, Horsham, PA 19044. (877) 336-7674. (www.m-s-g.com)

MarketingSherpa, 499 Main Street, Warren, RI 02885. (401) 247-7655. (www.marketingsherpa.com)


Marshall Marketing & Communication, 2600 Boyce Plaza Road, Suite 210, Pittsburgh, PA 15241. (412) 914-0970. (www.mm-c.com)

Medbase200, 736 N. Western Avenue, Suite 125, Lake Forest, IL 60045. (800) 451-5478. (www.medbase200.com)

MillwardBrown Digital, 1 Madison Avenue, 12th Floor, New York, NY 10010. (212) 548-7200. (www.millwardbrowndigital.com)


MSW Research, 1111 Marcus Avenue, Suite MZ 200, Lake Success, NY 11042. (516) 394-6000. (www.mswresearch.com)

NetBase Solutions, 2087 Landings Drive, Mountain View, CA 94043. (650) 810-2100. (www.netbase.com)

Netpop Research, 322 Cortland Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94110. (415) 647-1007. (www.netpopresearch.com)

Ninah Consulting, 375 Hudson, 8th Floor, New York, NY 10014. (212) 820-3300. (www.ninah.com)
Norman Hecht Research, 33 Queens Street, 3rd Floor, Syosset, NY 11791. (516) 496-8866. (www.normanhechtresearch.com)

Oden Marketing & Design, 119 South Main Street, Suite 300, Memphis, TN 38103. (901) 578-8055. (www.oden.com)

Peanut Labs, 180 Montgomery Street, Suite 1700, San Francisco, CA 94104. (415) 659-8266. (www.peanutlabs.com)

Preference Research, 7 Franklin Terrace, South Orange, NJ 07079. (973) 763-1817. (www.preferenceresearch.net)


Research Now, 5800 Tennyson Parkway, Suite 600, Plano, TX 75024. (214) 365-5000. (www.researchnow.com)

Sachs Insights, 200 Varick Street, New York, NY 10014. (212) 924-1600. (www.sachsinsights.com)

Safecount, 11 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10010. (212) 844-3700. (www.safecount.net)

SeeMore Interactive, Inc., 3000 E. Main Street, Suite B101, Columbus, OH 43209. (614) 543-0452. (www.seemoreinteractive.com)

Sequent Partners, 304 Park Avenue South, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10010. (212) 590-2432. (www.sequentpartners.com)

SME, 298 5th Avenue, New York, NY 10001. (212) 924-5700. (www.smebranding.com)


Survey Sampling International, 6 Research Drive, Shelton, CT 06484. (203) 567-7200. (www.surveysampling.com)

Surveys & Forecasts, 2323 North Street, Fairfield, CT 06824. (203) 255-0505. (www.safllc.com)

T3, 1801 North Lamar, Austin, TX 78701. (512) 499-8811. (www.t-3.com)

Taylor Nelson Sofres, 11 Madison Avenue, 12th Floor, New York, NY 10010. (212) 991-6000. (www.tnsglobal.com)
The Factory Advertising, 5534 Tannery Road, Schnecksville, PA 18078.  
(610) 360-7058.  (http://thefactoryadvertising.com)

The Growth Engine Company, One Selleck Street, Norwalk, CT 06855.  
(203) 857-4494.  (www.growth-engine.com)

The Insight Research Corporation, P.O. Box 2472, Durango, CO 81302.  
(973) 541-9600.  (www.insight-corp.com)

Trajectory, 20 Community Place, Morristown, NJ 07960.  (973) 292-1400.  
(www.trajectory4brands.com)

Vision Critical, 436 Lafayette Street, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10003.  (212) 402-8222.  
(www.visioncritical.com)

Wayfinder, 950 Battery Street, Suite 401, San Francisco, CA 94111.  (415) 277-6960.  
(www.wayfindersf.com)

WJ Schroer Co., 2 Michigan Avenue West, Battle Creek, MI 49017.  (269) 963-4874.  
(www.socialmarketing.org)
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