



Marketing Science

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://pubsonline.informs.org>

Comments

Hugh A. Zielske,

To cite this article:

Hugh A. Zielske, (1986) Comments. Marketing Science 5(2):109-109. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.5.2.109>

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://pubsonline.informs.org/Publications/Librarians-Portal/PubsOnLine-Terms-and-Conditions>

This article may be used only for the purposes of research, teaching, and/or private study. Commercial use or systematic downloading (by robots or other automatic processes) is prohibited without explicit Publisher approval, unless otherwise noted. For more information, contact permissions@informs.org.

The Publisher does not warrant or guarantee the article's accuracy, completeness, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Descriptions of, or references to, products or publications, or inclusion of an advertisement in this article, neither constitutes nor implies a guarantee, endorsement, or support of claims made of that product, publication, or service.

© 1986 INFORMS

Please scroll down for article—it is on subsequent pages



With 12,500 members from nearly 90 countries, INFORMS is the largest international association of operations research (O.R.) and analytics professionals and students. INFORMS provides unique networking and learning opportunities for individual professionals, and organizations of all types and sizes, to better understand and use O.R. and analytics tools and methods to transform strategic visions and achieve better outcomes. For more information on INFORMS, its publications, membership, or meetings visit <http://www.informs.org>

HUGH A. ZIELSKE
Foote, Cone and Belding

I am flattered to see that the data from our 1959 experiment are still being analyzed. And I am impressed with the mathematical elegance of Mahajan and Muller's analysis. It would be presumptuous of me to comment on the technical aspects of the paper. However, some comments on our more recent work in this area may be of interest.

In recent years, we have been using tracking study data to estimate the response curves for various forms of response and various brands. The response forms we have examined include:

- (a) Brand Awareness
- (b) Advertising Awareness
- (c) Brand Image
- (d) Brand Preference

To date, we have developed 125 individual curves for 40 brands.

These studies were not controlled experiments. The observed results are a composite of the influence of advertising and the influence of the other market environment factors that were present for the brand. The tracking study data were used to establish what happened as the campaign ran. By using the standard industry formulas, the frequency distribution of exposures delivered by the campaign could be computed.

These two data sets were used to estimate the probability of response according to the number of exposures an individual received. This was done by using simultaneous equations to relate tracking study results at various points in time to the frequency distribution of exposures the schedule had delivered at corresponding points in time.

Virtually all of the curves we computed for awareness were concave—incremental exposures produced successively smaller increases in response. However, they varied widely from brand to brand in how steeply they went up as exposures increased, the level of response that was achieved, and the point at which they began to level off. Sometimes, the maximum response was reached after very few exposures—sometimes response was still increasing even after many exposures—and sometimes there was no increase at all over the prior level.

We define response as the absolute increase that occurred from the level that existed prior to the campaign. Therefore, as would be expected, the curves generally went up more rapidly for new products than for established products. However, the awareness curves were concave for both types of products.

Our conclusions at this point are:

- (a) Response curves can be useful for planning.
- (b) However, assuming that all brands and all market situations will have the same response curve can be dangerous.

The influence of different forms of scheduling on response is determined by:

- (a) The nature of the response curve for the brand.
- (b) The decay rate for the response form.

In the market place, response curves for awareness are almost always concave, incremental exposures producing successively smaller increases in awareness.

Copyright 1986, by INFORMS, all rights reserved. Copyright of Marketing Science is the property of INFORMS: Institute for Operations Research and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.