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A 4-A sponsored survey of the opinions of research directors of the 50 highest billing advertising agencies showed considerable agreement that comprehension tests, behavioral, recall and attitude (toward brand or company) tests are of real or high value, and that recognition tests have minor value in testing single advertisements, whether printed or broadcast.

Ever since the Advertising Research Foundation published its classic book *Copy Testing* in 1939 there has been interest in an industry-wide viewpoint on current methods of copy research. Individuals have taken on the task of evaluation, but not until late 1964 has there been an authentic consensus of the chief users. Such an overview has been made possible through an authorized survey of the opinions of research directors of the 50 top-billing agencies, agencies with an aggregate of some $3,340,500,000 of the total estimated and projected $5,750,000,000 domestic billings in the United States by regular advertising agencies in 1964.

This article summarizes the findings of this survey, presented as objectively as possible by the AAAA Research Subcommittee responsible for the study. The results are, inescapably, partly a function of the questionnaire and partly other procedural elements. The authors are responsible for the selection and arrangement of tabulations, the choice of quotations from verbatim comments, and the article's structure. However, an attempt was made to minimize our subjective interpretations and reactions, in order that the reader might see what follows almost as an independent observer. No other sources are quoted, for the same reason.

The purpose of this study was more to assess the current situation than to improve it. The Subcommittee was aware of problems of research methodology and interpretation, the clash of viewpoints in the advertising industry, and the need for a better understanding before there could be a more common approach. A first step, it was felt, should be an attempt to assess existing industry views; the views of those responsible for copy research in advertising agencies. Official approval was obtained for conducting an opinion survey among AAAA members.

It was decided early that the survey should be made by mail, so that researchers could report their own views frankly without revealing agency identity. It was also decided that a census of major agencies would be more meaningful to the industry than a sample survey of all agencies, or even all AAAA members. This would at least pinpoint the general source of replies, no matter how incomplete the response. Meanwhile the AAAA agreed to have replies channeled through its central office, so that a follow-up system could be maintained and a maximum response could be secured without making agency identity available to the Subcommittee.

Developing a satisfactory questionnaire became a major project. It is difficult to define all the terms used in copy research. There are many variations in application of the same basic technique. There may be adaptations, or even separate techniques, which are confidential. There is a wide range of objectives for which different techniques are applied, and the value of a technique depends to some extent on the importance of the feature to which it is applied. There are many other considerations, but perhaps the most significant is the fact that techniques are not applied in some general way. They are always adopted for, and adapted to, specific problems. Their users seldom have occasion to back off and try to give generalized appraisals of their value.

Other departures from the real environment of copy testing were made solely for the purpose of obtaining
unqualified ratings of the various test methods. Frequently such factors as time limitations, small budgets, or inadequacy of the performance of outside suppliers, have major influence on the choice of method employed. Yet respondents were instructed to assume ideal conditions and make evaluations in the abstract.

Evolution of the questionnaire, which is not shown here, involved many stages. Trial runs were made with cooperative individuals who seemed typical, but who would not be solicited in the final run. Despite the efforts of these early respondents to criticize and help, the Subcommittee found no practical way of ensuring that comments would not be solicited in the final run. Despite the cooperative individuals who seemed typical, but who were involved many stages. Trial runs were made with cooperative individuals who seemed typical, but who would not be solicited in the final run. Despite the efforts of these early respondents to criticize and help, the Subcommittee found no practical way of ensuring either complete clarity or a realistic frame for all questions. The voluntary revisions contributed by final respondents, and their sometimes caustic comments in the margins, left no doubt as to the limitations of the questionnaire design. Nevertheless, 40 of the 50 solicited agencies were represented by useable replies furnished by responsible research executives. This 80 percent response from such a weighty segment of the agency field provides the basis for any evidence or implied conclusions which follow.

TESTING INDIVIDUAL PRINTED ADVERTISMENTS AND TELEVISION COMMERCIALS

The survey questions on the printed questionnaire were preceded by a considerable amount of carefully planned instruction. Three of the paragraphs of general guidance follow:

We take the universe of national advertising of principally consumer goods as the kind of advertising whose testing we are concerned with; in other words, that advertising which accounts for the bulk of media expenditures.

In evaluating the copy research measurements covered in the questionnaire, please think of them as measurements of advertising effects rather than solely in the narrower frame of reference of testing specific aspects of copy.

In evaluating the various copy research measurements, do so in terms of theoretical considerations only. We make the assumption that each measure is used in studies executed in a competent, professional manner.

Problems of terminology were anticipated, and suitable guidance was given. For example, rather than attempting to distinguish between laboratory and real-life situations, and between pretest and post-test situations, respondents were asked to put the emphasis on forced vs. natural exposure, as seen through the consumer's eyes. Thus, an on-the-air test of a finished TV commercial without pre-enlistment of viewers might seem like the final stage of a pretest to an agency man, but to the respondent the conditions are presumed to seem natural.

The test methods selected for evaluation as measures of individual advertisements are listed below with some explanation, where it seemed most necessary, as given in the questionnaire:

Recognition measurements
Recall measurements
Attitude and opinion measurements (e.g., ratings of brands, users, companies—but not ads themselves—on image items such as "not too sweet," "comes in right package sizes," "modern," etc.)
Comprehension measures (understanding and/or meaning)
Believability measures (ad theme, proposition, facts)
Persuasion measures (respondent opinion of degree of persuasiveness)
Buying predisposition measures (indirect measurement via brand purchase preference, closeness to purchase)
Ad rating measures (direct reporting of opinion toward ad, i.e., liking, esthetic value, etc.)
Behavioral measures (product choice, coupon use, simulated purchase)

There are certain obvious omissions of techniques. Psychological evaluations, obtained through depth interviewing and projective techniques, were not included because their application is chiefly in the early stages of formulating advertising strategy. A number of mechanical devices, including the tachistoscope, eye camera and psychogalvanometer, were not included on the assumption that they are not used extensively.

Finally, in order to structure the evaluations of test techniques, a four-point rating scale was devised. The agency research director was asked to rate each measuring method as being of the "highest value in copy tests," of "real value," of "some value," or of "rather minor value." Stress was put on the desirability of reporting the views of the research directors, themselves, rather than official views of their agencies. In many instances, it is assumed, there is no official view.

Table 1 summarizes the findings on individual adver-
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In the context of advertising measuring techniques, as reported by 40 respondents from 40 leading agencies, the two highest and two lowest value ratings for each measuring method have been combined for ready comparison.

If degree of agreement is to be the criterion for assessment of the survey findings, initial mention should be made of three methods for which 34 of the 40 agency respondents gave relatively little value. These three are the recognition method and the two procedures in which consumers are asked to judge the effects of advertising; namely, how persuasive to themselves and how effective in total. The recognition method was criticized because of the influence of noncontrollable factors such as previous advertising seen for the product, experience with the product or a competitive brand, etc. Some also noted that recognition does not assess the impact of advertising impressions. Numerous reasons were given for the conviction that asking consumers for their own opinions of the effects of advertising, whether to rate advertisements as to total effect or as to persuasiveness, is of little value. The consumer is not considered to be a good judge of the possible effects of advertisements, either on himself or on others.

Four of the nine surveyed copy research methods obtained net ratings of high or real value; one with a vote of four to one, and the other three with approximately two-thirds majorities. If a two-thirds majority constitutes industry-wide acceptance, then at least four of the designated methods can be said to enjoy general reliance. Comprehension measures especially, with a vote of 32 to 8, rated high both in the voting and in the number of favorable comments. They are esteemed because they are regarded as basic if advertisements are to communicate what is intended. They also were designated as a valuable diagnostic tool.

Behavioral, recall, and attitude measures all ranked high on the positive side and with identical tabulations. Comments on the behavioral measures emphasized the fact that they indicate the ability of an advertisement to influence a respondent’s preferences or purchases. They also stressed the adaptability of behavioral measures for application under realistic and natural circumstances.

Recall measures are credited with measuring communication; that is, what the reader or viewer gets out of an advertisement. Respondents also stressed the value of the differential scores obtained by different copy points as measured by recall. It may also be significant that research directors favored unaided recall in response to a question comparing aided and unaided recall.

Attitude and opinion measures — when applied to products, brands and companies but not to advertisements themselves — were liked especially for three reasons: they measure what an advertisement is supposed to do — to modify and improve attitudes toward a product; they are precursors of behavior and, therefore, are predictive of buying; and, they are as useful in diagnosis as they are in prediction.

Measures of buying predisposition emerged with a small favorable majority based on 21 supporters as against 18 moderate or indifferent voters. The chief support is associated with the fact that buying predisposition is, logically, closely related to the ultimate purpose of most advertising. This general line of reasoning was opposed by such arguments as: lack of demonstrated connection with actual purchase; difficulty of isolating and identifying the amount of resulting increase in purchase intention; and, current lack of adequate methodology.

Believability measures, while they acquired only 15 strongly favorable votes, were not without strong supporters. Nearly one-half of the researchers in favor point out that disbelief or intrigue may sometimes be highly valuable reactions to advertisements. Those opposed argue that there is no clear relationship between belief and advertising effect, and that no acceptable method has yet been developed for measuring believability. In all, 24 research directors, or 60 percent of the respondents, rated believability measures as not having more than moderate value for copy research.

Values as Related to Test Conditions and Applications

Despite the generalized ratings of leading copy research methods, there are some necessary considerations of conditions of testing to be taken into account. Four such conditions are: how natural or forced the exposure may be; whether absolute or incremental measurement is being applied; the degree of finish of the copy being tested; and, how soon after exposure the measurement is made. These are the only conditions which were separately analyzed, although others may be important. One additional consideration which was believed to deserve separate treatment was the distinction between measures applied to print copy and those applied to broadcast copy. Although some respondents felt strongly about one or more points, only some of the highlights of these analyses are discussed.

More than twice as many research directors (21) favor natural conditions of exposure of test copy as favor forced exposure (10), while nine made no distinction. Those in favor of natural exposure believe it produces more objective and meaningful information. As one researcher noted, the respondent is not sensitized to the test activity when exposure is natural, and this makes measurement more realistic. Equally vigorous proponents of forced exposure point to advantages in ability to control variables other than the test copy, ability to generate more data and suitability of smaller samples, all at a lower cost.

The vote favoring incremental over nonincremental measurements was again more than two to one (21 to 9), with ten making no distinction. Those in favor emphasized the parallel between incremental measures and the advertising objective to change attitudes and behavior. They also emphasized the advantages of
incremental measures as the only practical way of dealing with differences in sample studies, and the increased opportunity they afford for rigorous experimental control. However, the opponents took a view reflected in the following quotation:

Incremental measurements are based on the assumption that a single exposure, or even several exposures, will produce a perceptible change in the audience's attitudes. This seems an unwarranted assumption. If a viewer's attitude really changed as much as the usual incremental measurement indicates, he would be a mental basket case after watching an evening's worth of TV commercials."

There was little agreement on two other test conditions; namely, the degree of finish of the copy and how soon after exposure the measurement was made. Definite votes were obtained from 33 research directors on the influence of degree of finish, but only 17 had a preference and the other 16 said it did not matter. Ten of the 17 favored finished form and seven favored tests of something less than finished form. Near-finished form was defined in the questionnaire as comps (comprehensive layouts) for print advertisements and rough cuts for television commercials. Those favoring near-finished emphasized opportunity afforded for creative people to make indicated changes on comps and rough cuts following tests. Arguments were supplied by those who favored finished copy, but the noncommittal statement of one respondent may well represent a consensus:

Our experience indicates that in some instances rough form results in the same decisions as finished form. In other instances, the full flavor of the advertising cannot be captured in rough form.

The question as to how soon after exposure to apply measurement of recall found 13 favoring a delay of 12 to 24 hours, designated as delayed exposure testing in the survey. There were 11 in favor of more immediate testing after exposure, while another 11 felt there was no important difference. As stated by one of those favoring delay, "You get a better idea of how the main idea 'sticks,' and less important ideas fall out." But those opposing delay stressed the opportunity provided for contamination as well as forgetting. Immediate recall was especially recommended for diagnostic tests, since more details are recalled and there is less opportunity for loss of feelings and meanings which have been generated. Again, one of the noncommittal responses may represent a kind of consensus:

... which measures best depends on the test objectives. Immediate measurements will indicate maximum effects of the advertising and result in exaggerated but perhaps more sensitive results. Delayed measurements indicate the more lasting effects of the advertising which may or may not simulate better how advertising works... more experimental work is required in this area.

Differences in the values assigned to the same test methods as applied to printed and broadcast advertisements were explored, and the survey showed that practically no differences exist. Eight of the nine methods were considered of equal value for copy in both types of media by approximately 30 of the 35 having an opinion. The exception was the recognition method, already mentioned as rating low in value by a sizable majority of research directors. Table 2 summarizes the findings.

When this same evaluation was extended to cover various conditions of testing, some significant minority votes stood out, despite a general opinion indicating no difference. Finished commercials were rated as more desirable for television testing than for printed copy by 11 research directors, whereas only one expressed an opposite view. Confirming this view, 16 felt that near-finished copy had a higher value for printed copy testing than for television testing, whereas three voted oppositely. A slight favoring of forced exposure for printed copy tests, and natural exposure for television tests was also expressed. There was a clear consensus that the type of medium was not a consideration in judging the value of how soon to measure after exposure, or judging the choice between incremental and nonincremental measurement.

**EVALUATION OF ADVERTISING CAMPAIGNS**

The survey investigated the question of evaluating campaigns on the basis of the sales influence of advertising, but not until inquiry had first been made about the values of testing intermediate stages. Campaign evaluations on the basis of awareness, recognition, recall, attitude change and buying predisposition were rated by the 40 respondents. A summary is shown in Table 3.

As with individual copy tests, the greatest degree of agreement was on the relatively low utility of recogni-
tion ratings. Of the 40 research directors, only six considered recognition ratings as having real value, while 33 assigned them lower values. Attitude measurements, on the other hand, not only gained the highest positive rating but exceeded their rating as applied to individual advertisements. They were favored for campaign evaluation by 30 out of 40, a gain of five votes over their rating as tests of single advertisements.

Both awareness tests and buying predisposition tests held nearly a two-to-one favorable majority for evaluating campaign effects. Comments indicated that these two measurements are considered as gauges of both minimum and maximum campaign influence. Awareness is described as evidence of an essential, though minimum, accomplishment if advertising is to succeed. Buying predisposition, on the other hand, is the ultimate stage preceding expected sales.

The strongest reversal of rating of the same test method for campaigns as compared to individual advertisements occurs in the case of recall measurements. Whereas, 25 rated recall high vs. 13 low on individual advertisement tests, only 16 held such a favorable view, while 22 rated recall low for campaigns. One respondent reflected a common reaction: “By the time you get campaign results on recall, it’s too late, whereas in testing individual ads, you can use the results.”

Should and Can Sales be the Criterion of Campaign Effectiveness?

Research directors were confronted directly with questions as to whether sales should be the criterion of success for a campaign, and whether meaningful sales data are obtainable for that purpose. Since the former question is only academic if sales results are unobtainable, the findings on the second question are reported first.

The answers to whether sales effects of campaigns are obtainable were emphatic, in that 27 of the 37 committed responses indicated they are obtainable. Statements by the majority point out that sales effects have been measured, that case histories are available, that controlled experiments have continually proven their potential, and that it is merely a question of enough time and money to do accountability studies properly. In other words, it appears that suitable sales data may not be generally available, but that such data can presently be obtained.

The original question, regarding whether or not sales should be used as the chief campaign criterion, now assumes practical meaning. In their answers, however, the directors divided equally, with 20 in favor of the sales criterion and 20 in opposition. Definite commitment on the part of those in favor is reflected in the following comments:

Communications criteria beg the basic issue—if you’re trying to sell a product through advertising, that’s the way we ought to evaluate our effort.

Table 3
RATED VALUES OF FIVE CAMPAIGN EVALUATING METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring method</th>
<th>Highest value or real value</th>
<th>Some value or minor value</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying predisposition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvements in brand or company image and public acceptance or recognition of advertising campaigns are simply interim steps which should in the long run produce sales.

The ultimate criterion of advertising effectiveness in any profit-oriented undertaking is the additional sales generated by the increment in marketing and selling costs traceable to advertising. This is only the well-known marginal analysis of economic theory . . . .

As might be expected, many of those opposed to the sales criterion argued that the specific sales influence of advertising cannot be isolated from other variables. But, among those who felt that sales should not be the criterion of advertising, half had this view despite their belief that adequate sales data can be obtained. Among those who said that sales results are unobtainable, there were those who felt that there should be continued effort to gain such evidence “because that’s the name of the game.” Some also felt that success is not far off, as reflected in the following:

Isolating sales effects of advertising requires more money rather than improved techniques. Given adequate research funds most (not all) campaigns could be assigned a sales result.

COMMENTS ON CRITERIA, OBJECTIVES, AND METHODOLOGY

While the above reveals a great deal more agreement than conflict among agency research directors on copy research, there is still significant confusion and controversy. Respondents were asked: “What would you say is the major controversial issue confronting copy research today?” This question assumes the existence of controversy, but the replies were often wholly constructive. Regarding criteria, one said:

What is needed is agreement on criteria for measuring ad effectiveness.

While advertising objectives logically determine both the objectives and criteria of measurement, one respondent felt that current copy research needs to
eliminate the redundancy in copy measures and clarify measurement objectives.

Still another respondent felt it necessary to put the emphasis on methodology:

The major issue confronting copy today is the need to identify, define, and invent or adapt methods for measuring the critical response dimensions of advertising messages.

A complete presentation of this part of the survey would require extended quotations and analysis. It is clear that many research directors feel the need for more precise and more frequent definition of advertising objectives. They believe this would provide the needed basis for a clearer definition of research objectives and criteria for copy evaluation. Current methodology would then become much more productive; yet, research directors are aware of the need for new methods of copy research and for experimental evaluation of all methods.

This survey reported some of the conflicts of opinion, especially about copy measuring methods, yet the questionnaire probably tended to obscure some of the conflict in the mind of the individual researcher. This is because respondents were asked to give opinions on measures in general and in the abstract, and without regard to costs, time, manpower or other sources of practical pressure. To that extent, it cannot be assumed that the results are fully realistic.

**SUMMARY**

This survey of the 50 largest advertising agencies gives some quantitative dimensions to areas of acknowledged conflict. The outstanding finding, however, is the evidence that agreement among leaders considerably exceeds the controversy. This suggests the conclusion that copy research has passed the stage of initial exploration with its periodic arousal to the claimed measuring potential of newly introduced, revolutionary techniques. Only a limited number of measuring methods have gained extensive use in the industry, and these were assessed in this survey. The results show, with regard to tests of single advertisements, there is a consensus that:

Recognition ratings and those methods requiring consumers to judge the effectiveness of copy have only minor value.

Comprehension tests, though infrequently used, have high value.

Behavioral, recall, and attitude tests are also generally considered to have "high" value, or at least "real" value for copy research.

Measures of buying predisposition do not have universal support, but appear to be highly valued by a slight majority.

Believability tests have support in only a minority of agency research departments, but some of the advocates are enthusiastic.

Conditions which apply to a test situation may determine the value of the results.

The value of most testing methods is about the same when applied to broadcast commercials as when applied to printed copy.

When advertising campaigns are to be evaluated, the values attached to four methods of individual advertisement testing remain much the same. However, these differences are noted:

- Attitude measures become the highest rated criterion for campaign effectiveness.
- Recall measures receive less than majority support as a highly valuable method.
- Measures of awareness, which were not evaluated for individual advertisement testing, received a favorable vote of nearly two-to-one for campaign evaluation. Measurement of the sales influence of advertising campaigns, while conceded to be possible by a large majority, reached a deadlock as to desirability for use as a final criterion.

**DISCUSSION**

Some of the conclusions and implications which can be drawn from the findings in this study are fairly obvious and are not controversial. Others are more speculative and may be subject to quite a bit of controversy. Some individual advertisement measures are felt to have so little value that the industry should discard them. Consumer evaluations of advertisements are almost completely rejected. Recognition measures are considered to be invalid for reasons centering on problems of control in the interview.

Recently comprehension as a measure seems to have been discarded in favor of other measures. It would appear worthwhile to reinstate a comprehension measure as a basic ingredient in copy measures. In many instances, comprehension may have been taken for granted or have been disregarded on the basis that it is classified under other measures. Or, it may have been considered unimportant because the effect (what the advertisement does to a person) has been thought to be a more pertinent research objective.

These conclusions are based on a consensus, but consensus is not in itself a guarantee of the validity of any measure. However, lack of consensus among colleagues working with the same tools on the same problems does indicate a need for some further examination.

Methodological studies are needed, but the subject matter diversity makes analysis of the values of various measuring methods difficult. Circumstances are not replicable from product to product or brand to brand. Hence, for a consensus to be achieved among the re-

---

1 The Subcommittee has prepared comments on the survey which are reproduced here. The discussion reflects some of the more subtle responses, as well as interpretations by those in charge.
research fraternity it is necessary that it be built on repeated measurements for a wide variety of products under a variety of conditions. This further means that the results of methodological studies, whether they agree with accepted beliefs or disagree with them, must be given wide dissemination and be exposed to scrutiny by all concerned.

There appears to be a dilemma on some measures between the *better* measure and the more *practical* measure. In actuality, this conflict is probably stronger than the survey results indicate because respondents were asked to give their opinions on measures in the abstract, without regard to costs, time or considerations of pressures, manpower, *etc.* Despite this, the element of the practicality of one condition of testing over another was reflected in the comments of many respondents. It is apparent that, for *practical* reasons, investigators are willing to accept some measures or to test under conditions which are not whole-heartedly considered to be *best* in a specific situation.

The question also arises as to whether some measurement *methods* or *techniques*, developed and promoted by some advertising agencies and research firms, are much more a compromise rather than superior. If this is so, copy researchers should recognize the situation rather than defending the *method* against all criticism.

Another implication arises from the belief that sales should be the ultimate criterion of advertising. Half of the respondents believed sales should be the criterion. But measurement of the effect of single exposure to individual advertisements is not necessarily the same as measurement of multiple exposure to the same advertisements. It is logical to ask, for what do we measure an individual advertisement? If the ultimate measurement of the effectiveness of a campaign is its contribution to sales, should not an individual advertisement be measured on the same basis? Regardless of the answer, the strategy may be to select interim measurement methods for application to individual advertisements, and particularly those methods believed to be most closely related to the end result of sales.

In view of the reasons given for the high value given the various individual advertisement measures in common use, the conclusion drawn is that *behavioral* and *attitude and opinion* measures, as predictors of future sales behavior, are the *best* measures of the *sales effectiveness* of an individual advertisement. Whether they are actually predictors of sales is a moot point.

It was made clear by respondents that individual advertisement testing is done for a different purpose than campaign effectiveness measurements—that is, as a *diagnostic* procedure. If this is the major purpose of such copy testing, then the implication is strong that the researcher has a specific concept of how advertising works. Only within such a conceptual framework can the criteria be established against which the diagnosis is to be performed. Nevertheless, among leading agency research directors there appears to be no universally accepted theory of how advertising works.

Research directors who say that sales is not the ultimate criterion of advertising effectiveness may have evaluated copy tests within a framework of their communications and attitudinal components, rather than on the basis of their possible use in predicting behavior. Since some measures—for example, attitude and behavioral measures—rate a strong favorable consensus among research directors, it is apparent that the assignment of high value to a measure may conceal very different theoretical frameworks of evaluation. There no doubt exists a consistency between beliefs in the ultimate criterion of campaign effectiveness and the framework for evaluating individual advertisement measures. Nevertheless, among the more highly valued measurements the conclusion seems inescapable that one cannot be said to be more correct than another.

In each specific situation, the judgment and integrity of the research director must be relied on. A management frame of reference which asks for certainty and the development of *the technique* appears to be premature. Perhaps the best solution is one of sophisticated eclecticism.

An analysis of comments on major issues facing copy research indicates that, despite advances in the use of elaborate research designs and sophisticated statistical analytic techniques, the question of measurement is still very much of a problem. Some part of this no doubt is the scholar’s desire for better and better measurements.

The Subcommittee feels that perhaps the right things are not being measured. The comments generally indicated a need for agreement on objectives for measurement. And, in turn, the objectives for measurement appear related to the evaluation of the various measures. This completes a cycle. The inevitable conclusion is that *measures* do not stand as entities. Their values must be related in some logical fashion to the specific purposes of the advertising within a conceptual framework of how the advertising is supposed to work.
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