

Achieving Reach in a Multi-Media Environment

How a Marketer's First Step Provides the Direction for the Second

JENNI ROMANIUK

Ehrenberg-Bass Institute,
University of South
Australia
Jenni.Romaniuk@
MarketingScience.info

VIRGINIA BEAL

Ehrenberg-Bass Institute,
University of South
Australia
Virginia.Beal@
MarketingScience.info

MARK UNCLES

Australian School of
Business, University of
New South Wales
m.uncles@unsw.edu.au

Do the audiences reached by different media touchpoints match category user profiles? Does a second media touchpoint help reach a new audience? To provide answers, the current study analyzed 16 touchpoints across 23 data sets. Audiences reached by television, gift-packs, in-store displays, and outdoor advertisements closely matched category user profiles. Most other media skewed to heavy category users. Positive word of mouth and social media also skewed to heavy brand users. This knowledge can help advertisers select media to reach certain types of buyers. Analysis of media pairs also revealed that second touchpoints tended to add more duplicate than new audience. Therefore, media should be added only after exhausting the capacity of the first media to achieve cost-efficient reach.

INTRODUCTION

The use of multiple media to reach a target audience is common advertising practice. No longer content to rely solely on conventional high-reach media such as television, advertisers are using a mix of touchpoints, embracing everything from online, to tablets, to social media, to real-time in-store mobile communications (Aitchison, 2011). Such combinations require judicious media planning and integration in line with the principles of integrated marketing communications (IMC; Duncan, 2005; Schultz and Schultz, 2003).

The drivers behind the use of multiple media are not hard to find. Digital technologies have created a huge number of media alternatives. Advertising-industry estimates show U.S. Internet advertising revenues hit \$31 billion in 2011, a 22-percent rise over 2010, with particularly strong growth in mobile, digital video, and search (IAB, 2012). This scale of investment represents about one-fifth of all U.S. advertising revenue. Digital technologies also have expanded offerings through traditional media such as television, radio, and outdoor touchpoints (e.g., digital television with video on demand).

These new avenues offer scope for advertisers to reach different types of customers, engage with individuals at different levels of intensity, and possibly better meet the needs of specific target audiences (Danaher, Lee, and Kerbache, 2010; Danaher, 2007). Offsetting these benefits, however, there is growing concern about media fragmentation and advertising clutter (Calder and Malthouse, 2008). These changes make achieving an efficient media spend more complex and challenging than ever before.

Altogether, these profound changes in the media ecosystem mean renewed emphasis on multi-media campaign efficiency and effectiveness (Assael, 2011). And the results of such examinations can be uneven.

Assuming touchpoints provide synergy ($1 + 1 = 3$), the logic of multi-media campaigns is that it is best to reach a target audience through multiple touchpoints. This logic fails, however, if the touchpoints are poorly chosen, if additional media simply are being incorporated into campaigns for good measure, and if they merely duplicate an audience. Under such circumstances, antergy ($1 + 1 = 1.5$) is a distinct possibility.

A contrasting viewpoint proposes that it is more efficient and effective to reach a target audience

EMPIRICAL GENERALIZATIONS

Positive word of mouth and social media skew to reaching heavy brand buyers, whereas television, gift-packs, in-store, and outdoor media closely match brand and category profiles.

Adding a second media touchpoint to a campaign typically delivers more duplicate than new audience. On average, 60 percent of the audience reached by the second media touchpoint duplicates the audience reached by the first media touchpoint.

through one or very few media, with secondary media to boost reach only as required, which may mean secondary media are not needed at all (Dijkstra, Buijtels, and van Raaij, 2005).

There is no conclusive evidence about these issues, and it would seem the use of multi-media campaigns has expanded at a rate faster than that of our knowledge concerning how fully to leverage such strategies.

The purpose of the current study is to contribute empirical findings concerning the effectiveness of multi-media campaigns by answering two research questions:

RQ1: How do the audiences reached by different media touchpoints compare to category user profiles?

RQ2: To what extent does a second media touchpoint help to reach a new audience?

AUDIENCE PROFILES AND REACH

Reaching consumers in the target audience with a brand message is the key goal of media placement. Given that media budgets are limited, this objective usually is achieved in one of two ways:

- a frequency-of-exposure strategy, in which a small proportion of the target audience is exposed very thoroughly to a brand message; and

- a reach strategy, in which a large proportion of the target audience is sufficiently exposed.

There are variations on these two options—for instance, manipulating the number of campaign cycles across a budget year—but such exceptions are nuances to the basic trade-off between frequency and reach.

Evidence is that most advertising-sales response functions (that relate increased opportunities to see and increased sales) are convex (Taylor, Kennedy, and Sharp, 2009): the first advertising exposure has the most effect, and subsequent exposures have positive, but lower, sales response.

Thus, if the goal of an advertiser is to maximize the return delivered from an advertising campaign, achieving that very first exposure is of considerable importance; the number of people reached at least once is an important campaign success factor (Jones, 1992, 1995; McDonald and Sharp, 2005).

Furthermore, considerable empirical evidence suggests that reaching as many category buyers as possible is the best strategy to grow a brand (Sharp, 2010; Anschuetz, 2002; Dawes, 2011). Typically, this means that when brands grow, they do so by attracting a few very heavy buyers and many light buyers, in line with NBD modeling predictions (Goodhardt, Ehrenberg, and Chatfield, 1984; Ehrenberg 1988; Ehrenberg, Uncles, and Goodhardt, 2004).

Therefore, it is useful to understand whether any particular medium skews to reaching heavy or light buyers, at category and brand levels, as this variance might affect media choices. This understanding is grounded in two objectives:

- to discover whether the audiences reached by different media touchpoints are reflective of the category user profile (where the profiling variables are category usage weight and brand usage weight, and traditionally used demographics of age and gender); and
- to examine whether the addition of specific secondary media touchpoints helps to reach a new audience and, thereby, broaden the reach of a campaign.

DATA DESCRIPTION

The focus of the current study was the exposure of buyers to brand messages in various media. To generalize findings, multiple brands and multiple media touchpoints were examined in different time periods and different countries. This provided the authors with a basis for establishing empirical generalizations. For consistency, only three product categories were considered.

Specifically,

- nineteen data sets were used for RQ1;
- in an effort to boost sample sizes for media pairs, a total of 23 data sets were analyzed for RQ2;
- data were collected as part of brand-health tracking projects for commercial clients over the period November 2009 to February 2012; and
- analysis refers to 13 brands across three alcoholic beverage categories (standard whisky, premium whisky, and rum).

The definition of “media touchpoints” is broad and includes paid-for media, paid-for marketing activities, and volunteered

The focus of the current study was the exposure of buyers to brand messages in various media.

brand-related communication. This is in keeping with IMC principles of reaching the target audience through an array of touchpoints, over which the advertiser has varying levels of control.

Some 16 media touchpoints were considered: television, radio, print, outdoor, online, social media, a brand's proprietary Web site(s), public-relations activities, events, in-store displays/promotions, sampling, on-trade displays, gift-packs, and positive word of mouth (PWOM), e-mail promotion, and competitions. (The latter two were available only for testing RQ2.)

Several additional media touchpoints had to be excluded (e.g., sponsorship, advergames, competitions, mobile, and online video) because of low reach and/or low frequency of occurrence; inclusion of these would call into question the reliability of the results (See Appendix).

Each data set contained questions regarding the exposure of buyers to a set of brand-related activities. Most questions were of a similar format. Respondents were shown de-branded pictures, video, or audio of the activity and asked whether they had seen it in the relevant medium (e.g., "Have you seen the advertisement on television?"). If multiple executions for the same brand were tested within the same medium in the same wave of the survey—in two television advertisements, for instance—the results of each execution were combined to give an overall media reach score for that brand. This is appropriate, as the objective was not to

investigate the reach-efficiency of scheduling within media touchpoints but rather to evaluate the circumstance of combining media touchpoints.

An exception to this questioning style was for PWOM, which was a verbal question: "Which brands, if any, has anyone you know talked positively about or recommended in the past 3 months?" Respondents were then provided with a list of brands in the category and asked to indicate the relevant brands or the "none-of-these" option.

METHODOLOGY

The geographical scope of the data sets was nine countries: Greece, Japan, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Respondents were recruited from online panels in each country and were subject to screening questions to ensure representative quotas of relevant demographics and for category usage. Samples were comparable across countries in that they comprise respondents who met the same criteria of consuming the category at least once in the 4 weeks prior to the survey, which was the basis for inclusion in the survey.

Professional online-panel companies, employing requisite respondent ID and survey quality checks, managed each of the data collection processes. All surveys were conducted in the dominant language of each focal country. A native speaker translated the questions and responses, and a local expert with knowledge of the category then checked the translation to ensure it accurately described each medium and the possible responses. The same translations were used for multiple waves within the same country.

To address RQ1—regarding the profile of recipients of brand messages in different media touchpoints—six profiling variables were identified:

- four usage measures (two category usage frequency variables to capture in-home and out-of-home consumption, recency of brand usage, and favorite brand status); and
- two demographic measures (age and gender, although gender was not available in some data sets because the profile was exclusively male).

For each profiling variable, the distribution of responses across all category users was calculated. For example, the total sample for a Spanish data set was 80 percent male and 20 percent female, reflecting the gender skew in category consumption.

The same calculation was performed for those reached by each of the media options. For example, those reached by television advertising for Brand X in Spain may have been 60 percent male and 40 percent female. This Brand X media touchpoint reach profile then was compared to the overall category user profile to determine the percentage point difference. In this example, it would be 60 percent minus 80 percent or -20 percentage points male. This approach allowed for comparisons across data sets in different categories and countries, where the category profiles may have differed.

The analysis was repeated for every variable for each media touchpoint for each brand within each data set. Not all data sets contained all media touchpoint options, so there were different numbers of studies for each option (See Tables 1 and 2).

To summarize the effect, the median across all instances was used to ensure that one-off large deviations did not affect the averages, as the purpose was to uncover empirical generalizations. Continuing in the tradition of work in the profiling area to assess whether there are consistent deviations, many-sets-of-data were used rather than relying on significance testing with

a single set of data (Hammond, Ehrenberg, and Goodhardt, 1996; Kennedy and Ehrenberg, 2001a, 2001b; Uncles, Kennedy, Nenycz-Thiel, Singh, and Kwok, 2012). In line with other profiling work, average skews larger than ± 5 percentage points were considered of managerial significance and are the focus of discussion in the results section (Kennedy, Ehrenberg, and Long, 2000; Hammond et al., 1996).

As RQ2 was concerned with which media touchpoints combine to create a greater level of campaign reach, the analysis concentrated on the degree to which adding a second media touchpoint contributed to building audience reach versus duplicating those already reached.

Four steps were undertaken:

- Step 1: Identification of all possible permutations of pairs of media touchpoints within each data set. The possible combinations depended on the specific medium touchpoints included in each data set for each brand.
- Step 2: For each medium/touchpoint combination, the one with the highest reach was treated as the base media (i.e., the first used) and the other as the second option. This ensured valid comparisons were made across media touchpoint pairs.
- Step 3: The percentage of the second media touchpoint's audience that the first media also reached (Duplication) was calculated and the percentage not exposed to the first media (New Audience).

Duplication % + New Audience % = 100%. This normalization of the audience distribution at 100 percent enabled comparison of the new audience delivered from media combinations, irrespective of the level of spend (which is unavailable for these analyses).

- Step 4: Across all 23 data sets, similar media touchpoint pairs were identified. These were combined to identify empirical generalizations across all media touchpoint pairs and for specific types of pairs.

In total, 486 media touchpoint pairs were included in the analysis. In principle, this analysis could be extended to assess a third media touchpoint and higher-order combinations, but even with three media touchpoints, the number of media-triplets was small, and concerns around sampling error make it hard to perform valid analyses.

For Step 2, the choice of the highest reach medium as the first media for this calculation is a mathematical one and should not be taken as an indicator of scheduling order. Without this decision, there would have been exponentially more possible media combinations, which would have obscured the results and limited our capacity to find generalizations.

As the focus of the current study is on reach, the media option of the pair that scored highest on this metric alone was the most logical starting point. By contrast, starting with a small-reach medium would increase the chance that additional media will add reach points and, thereby, artificially inflate the percentage of new audience.

RESULTS

Results for the two RQs are presented, followed by discussion of the implications of both analyses.

RQ1: How do the audiences reached by different media touchpoints compare to category user profiles?

Results are shown in two sections. The first section reports on the behavioral measures of category and brand usage weight along

with favorite brand status. The second section reports on the demographic profiling results.

The least-to-most-skewed media touchpoint was the basis for ordering the results. In the interest of clarity, the discussion focuses on the positive skews, as these carry the highest managerial interest.

Category-Usage Weight

Given that consumption of alcoholic beverages can occur in-home or out-of-home, the current study used two separate variables to capture category usage weight. For both variables, three categories were created for profiling:

- heavy (at least once a week);
- medium (less than once a week to once every three months); and
- light (less than once every three months).

The profile of consumers recognizing brand-advertising activity varied widely by media touchpoint (See Table 1). Activity in television, gift-packs, in-store displays/promotions, and outdoor advertisements revealed usage profiles that most closely reflected the category.

By contrast, PWOM, public relations, Web sites, sampling, and social-media activity most strongly skewed to reaching heavy category users. The results were consistent for in-home and out-of-home consumption.

Brand-Usage Weight

The brand-usage weight variable is a combination of usage and favorite brand status. Reporting in the current study focused on the percentage of people who said the brand was "their favorite brand" and those who had drunk the brand in the past four weeks.

Heavy brand user skews were less common than heavy category user skews (See Table 1).

TABLE 1
Category and Brand Usage Variables by Media

Media (ordered by least to most skewed)	# of studies (n)	Usage: Frequency of Drinking Category						Usage: Brand Commitment	
		Inside home			Outside home			Drunk in past 4 wks	Favorite brand
		Heavy	Med.	Light	Heavy	Med.	Light		
Television advertisements	15	2	-1	-2	0	0	0	2	1
Gift-packs	7	4	-2	-4	3	1	-2	2	1
In-store displays	11	3	2	-3	3	0	-3	4	0
Outdoor advertisements	12	4	-1	-1	4	-1	-3	2	1
Print advertisements	14	6	-2	-5	5	-2	-3	3	3
Radio advertisements	6	6	-6	-1	5	-5	-1	4	2
Online advertisements	10	8	-5	-2	6	-3	-3	3	3
Events	11	7	-5	-2	6	-3	-4	4	7
On-trade activity	9	5	-3	-3	7	-2	-3	4	4
PWOM	18	5	-3	-2	12	-9	-4	22	15
Public relations	7	10	-4	-7	12	-5	-8	2	3
Web sites	9	6	-3	-4	14	-10	-2	8	3
Sampling	8	20	-16	-6	20	-9	-14	13	1
Social media	8	12	-9	-4	22	-18	-4	9	8

Deviations of over ± 5 percentage points are shown in bold.

Activity in the form of events, PWOM, and social media, however, was recognized much more by those who were predisposed positively toward the brand. In the case of PWOM and social media, moreover, they also were more recent drinkers of the brand.

Sampling activity and visiting the Web site of a brand also skewed toward those who had drunk the brand most recently. In the case of sampling, it is relevant to note that the respondent just had to notice the

sampling activity; participation was not required.

Demographics

The demographic variables collected were gender and age (18–24 years; 25–34 years; 35–44 years; 45–54 years).

The results revealed no gender skews in the profile of those reached by media touchpoint (see Table 2).

For age, however, the activity in several media touchpoint types skewed toward

recognition by younger age brackets. The skew was seen for activity in sampling, social media, Web sites, public relations, PWOM, events, and online advertisements.

No media touchpoint option skewed in favor of those older than 35 years.

RQ2: To what extent does a second media touchpoint help to reach a new audience?

Results were expressed in terms of the percentage of new audience (PNA) reached by the second medium (following the four-step procedure described earlier).

Linear regression revealed a negative relationship between the reach of the first medium (this is always the highest reach of the pair) and PNA ($PNA = -0.70 \times \text{Reach of first media} + 63\%$; $\text{Adj } R^2 = 39\%$; $p < 0.01$, CI for $\beta = -0.63$ to -0.78 ; CI for $c = 0.60$ – 0.66).

This means that the reach of the first medium in the pair explained some (but not all) of the PNA. For example, one would expect that using a very-high-reaching first medium would limit the reach that could be added by the second medium. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) showed the degree to which the second medium touchpoint varied in the reach of the first medium to which it was added.

This analysis revealed only one case of significant variance: gift-packs, on average, were added to a larger-reaching first medium than other second media (54% compared to 33% overall; statistically significant for 7 of the 16 media tested, based on *post hoc* Bonferroni tests).

Significant differences in PNA across media, therefore, were not simply an artifact of variance in the reach of the first media.

An example is for the PNA added by other media touchpoints where online advertising is the first touchpoint ($n = 35$;

TABLE 2
Demographics by Media

Media (ordered by least to most skewed)	# of studies (n)	Gender		Age			
		Male	Female	18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54
Television advertisements	15	2	-2	0	-1	1	0
Gift-packs	7	0	0	3	-2	1	-1
In-store displays	11	0	0	8	-2	-3	1
Outdoor advertisements	12	0	0	5	0	0	-4
Print advertisements	14	-2	2	7	-2	-1	-4
Radio advertisements	6	-1	1	6	0	-3	-3
Online advertisements	10	2	-2	0	5	-3	-5
Events	11	0	0	5	2	-5	-2
On-trade activity	9	1	-1	1	-1	1	-4
PWOM	18	3	-3	7	1	-5	-5
Public relations	7	0	0	6	5	-7	-2
Web sites	9	-3	3	3	13	-7	-10
Sampling	8	2	-2	18	-3	-9	-8
Social media	8	-1	1	9	14	-5	-13

Deviations of ±5 percentage points are shown in bold.

See Table 3). ANOVA results using Bonferroni *post hoc* tests revealed that the differences in PNA between adding television versus in-store activities and gift-packs were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level.

The media touchpoints in the list represent the second medium touchpoints in the instances of pairs where online advertisements achieved the most reach. The list is not all-inclusive but represents naturally occurring variations.

A limitation of these data, however, is that the sample size for specific pairs rarely reached double figures. As a result, the focus of the current study predominantly

was on overall results, with only brief discussion of findings for specific pairs. In an analysis of the results for all media tested across the total of $n = 486$ studies, the overall mean PNA was 40 percent (CI 38%–42%), with the variance normally distributed around this mean (See Table 4).

ANOVAs, also using Bonferroni *post hoc* tests, showed that the only medium with a statistically significant PNA value was PWOM at 54 percent (CI 50%–58%).

Given that the results from RQ1 showed a systematic skew of PWOM reaching heavy brand users, this systematically higher proportion of new audience created by adding PWOM was unexpected.

TABLE 3
For Online Advertisements as the First Medium Touchpoint, Percentage of New Audience (PNA) Reached by the Second Medium

Second media added	# of studies (n)	PNA (%)
In-store displays	2	62*
Gift-packs	2	60*
Public relations	2	50
Print advertisements	8	41
Events	3	40
Radio advertisements	3	39
Outdoor advertisements	7	30
On-trade activity	2	23
Television advertisements	6	19*
Weighted/Un-weighted Average		36/40

$n = 35$; second medium ordered by PNA.
*Significantly different from in-store displays $p = 0.02$; gift-packs $p = 0.04$; television advertisements $p = 0.02$.

Further analysis revealed that, with the exception of television, the PNA for PWOM had a stronger negative relationship with the reach of the first medium touchpoint in the pair than other media touchpoints added (PNA = $-0.008 \times \text{Reach of first medium} + 36\%$; Adj $R^2 = 66\%$; $p < 0.001$, CI for $\beta = -0.004$ to -0.01 ; CI for $c = 0.26$ – 0.46).

An explanation for this finding is that PWOM was given by other consumers, rather than paid for and scheduled by advertisers, and the amount given systematically was linked to market share (Uncles, East, and Lomax, 2010). This means the higher the reach that the advertiser was able to achieve with the first medium, the more likely this audience overlapped with

TABLE 4

For First Medium Touchpoints Overall, Percentage of New Audience (PNA) Reached by the Second Medium

Second media added	# of studies (n)	Reach of first media (%)	PNA (%)	95% Confidence Interval for PNA Mean	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PWOM	90	30	54 ¹	50	58
Events	41	27	43	38	48
Web sites	38	28	43	35	51
In-store displays	36	39	42	35	48
Public relations	32	31	39	31	46
Radio	23	41	37	32	43
Television advertisements	10	32	37	27	47
Online advertisements	35	37	36	30	42
Social media	28	27	36	29	43
Competition	29	34	34	26	43
On-trade activity	44	39	34	29	39
Email promo	14	24	33	18	49
Outdoor	10	38	33	22	44
Gift-packs	11	54	31	21	42
Print advertisements	32	40	29	23	36
Sampling	12	29	22	6	37
Total mean	486	33	40	38	42

n = 486; second medium ordered by PNA.

¹*p* < 0.05 significantly different from other media.

the PWOM audience, resulting in a lower PNA.

Examining Category, Country, and Brand Differences

To test the robustness of this mean PNA, potential confounding factors were examined such as product category, country, and brand.

In the context of establishing empirical generalizations, this is about checking for potential boundary conditions. Testing

for category differences revealed that premium whisky achieved slightly lower PNA than standard whisky and rum (35% compared to 42% for standard whisky, *p* = 0.01, and 40% for rum, *p* = 0.11). The only exception by country was for the United States, which underperformed in the PNA expected given the reach of its first medium for both standard and premium whisky categories (without United States, the $R^2 = 80\%$, *p* < 0.01; with United States, the $R^2 = 63\%$, *p* < 0.01). The reason

for this is unknown at this time. There were no meaningful differences by brand.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to add empirical findings concerning the effectiveness of multi-media campaigns by answering two research questions:

RQ1: How do the audiences reached by different media touchpoints compare to category user profiles?

The evidence is that those reached by television advertising, gift-packs, in-store displays/promotions, and outdoor advertisements were most reflective of the category user profile. This tendency for television to reach all category users may at least partially explain the effectiveness of this medium as part of the media mix (as described in Binet and Field, 2009; Rubinson, 2009).

Perhaps surprisingly, the next least-skewed media touchpoint was the gift-pack. This could be because gift-packs tend to be larger and "flashier" than normal packaging, making them prominent enough to be noticed by everyone. Alternatively, this lack of skew could be due to the audience being people buying for others, rather than for themselves.

PWOM and social media tended to reach heavy category users, heavy brand users, and younger consumers. Sampling and Web sites also skewed to reaching heavy category users, recent drinkers, and younger consumers. These media did not skew to heavy brand users, however, perhaps showing that consumers noticed sampling and used brand Web sites as ways of discovering and learning about less familiar brands.

Public relations skewed to heavy category users and to younger consumers, whereas no substantial brand usage skews were evident.

RQ2: To what extent does a second media touchpoint help to reach a new audience?

The findings show an average of 40 percent of the audience reached by the second media touchpoint was new; 60 percent were duplicates—audiences that already had been reached by the first media touchpoint. This means that, on average, a second medium added more duplicate audience than new audience.

This finding held across three categories, 13 brands, and 10 countries, including markets as diverse as Russia, South Korea, and Japan. The United States was the only country with somewhat exceptional results.

LIMITATIONS AND CAVEATS

A direct measure of the creative quality of each activity was not available to the authors. Confining the analysis to three similar categories, however, meant there was less variance in creative style than if there were diverse product categories. In future research across a wider range of categories, an attempt should be made to incorporate creative quality.

This study also did not take into account the effects of campaign scheduling or the neuro-richness that might have been achieved through a multi-platform approach (Romaniuk, Beal, and Jeans, 2012).

Reach resulting from at least one exposure was the focus in this article. This emphasis is of practical importance: without an initial exposure, there can be no possibility of advertising producing a sales response. Nevertheless, a more complete picture would be obtained by factoring into the analysis more detailed exposure data within and across touchpoints. With the available data this was not possible in this study.

There also are limitations of scope, and the authors encourage replications in

other categories, in other countries, and over different time conditions to test the generalizations presented here.

IMPLICATIONS

The current study is believed to be the first to look for generalized skews in media audiences based on category and brand-usage behavior. This research highlights the importance of going beyond demographics to describe a media touchpoint audience. The results have implications for advertisers and media planners, depending on desired reach strategies:

- To reach an audience that is broadly representative of category users, emphasis should be given to media that are not skewed, notably television, gift-packs, in-store displays, and outdoor advertising (See Table 1). These media touchpoints provide the best opportunity to reach an audience that is broadly representative of users of the category.
- To reach heavy category users, consideration should be given to media such as public relations, Web sites, sampling and, to a lesser extent, print, radio, online, events, and on-trade activities (See Table 1). Heavy category users are of relevance to marketers because of their volume of purchase and their tendency to have larger repertoire sizes (Ehrenberg, 1988), which might make it easier to nudge them to try or re-try a brand.

When a brand grows, however, growth tends to come more from increases in its penetration than increasing loyalty of its buyers (Sharp, 2010; Ehrenberg et al., 2004; McDonald and Ehrenberg, 2003). This finding suggests that marketers should not rely on media skewed to heavy brand buyers—these consumers are already aware of the advertised brand and its advantages.

To this end, the results of the current study would suggest advising against an undue focus on social media or word of mouth if the goal is brand growth as opposed to continued category usage. These findings complement and extend the work that reported that the audience of a brand’s Facebook page tends to skew to heavy brand users and to the broader category of social media (Nelson-Field, Riebe, and Sharp, 2012).

- Adding a second media touchpoint increases creative costs and requires more management attention. The results of the current study demonstrate there is considerable benefit in ensuring that the first media touchpoint is scheduled as efficiently as possible. Moreover, the move to a second media touchpoint should occur only when that option has been exhausted (Dijkstra et al., 2005). The basis for this inference is that second media touchpoints tend to deliver more duplicate than new audience. **JAR**

.....
JENNI ROMANIUK is international director of the Ehrenberg-Bass Institute for Marketing Science, and associate professor at the University of South Australia. Her research spans brand equity, advertising effectiveness, word of mouth, and consumer behavior. In addition to papers in the *Journal of Advertising Research*, her work has appeared in the *Journal of Business Research*, *Journal of Marketing Management*, *Marketing Theory*, and *European Journal of Marketing*.

VIRGINIA BEAL is senior research associate at the Ehrenberg-Bass Institute for Marketing Science, University of South Australia. Her research includes television viewing behavior and advertising effects, with papers published in the *Journal of Advertising Research* and the *Journal of Business Research*. Her industry experience includes senior research roles at BBC, Time Inc., Network TEN, and News International.

MARK UNCLES is deputy dean (faculty) and professor of marketing at the Australian School of Business. Research interests include consumer behavior and brand management, with papers published in journals such as *Marketing Science*, *Journal of Retailing*, *Sloan Management Review*, *European Journal of Marketing*, and *Journal of Advertising Research*.

REFERENCES

- AITCHISON, J. "Cannes Creative Effectiveness Lions 2011: An Analysis of the Published Entries." *Warc*, September 2011.
- ANSCHUETZ, N. "Why a Brand's Most Valuable Customer Is the Next One It Adds." *Journal of Advertising Research* 42, 1 (2002): 15-21.
- ASSAEL, H. "From Silos to Synergy: A Fifty-Year Review of Cross-Media Research Shows Synergy Has Yet to Achieve its Full Potential." *Journal of Advertising Research* 51, 1 (2011): 23.
- BINET, L., and P. FIELD. "Empirical Generalisations about Advertising Campaign Success." *Journal of Advertising Research* 49, 2 (2009): 130-133.
- CALDER, B. J., and E. C. MALTHOUSE. "Media Engagement and Advertising Effectiveness." In *Kellogg on Advertising and Media*, B. J. Calder and P. Kotler, eds. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2008.
- DANAHER, P. J. "Modeling Page Views across Multiple Websites with an Application to Internet Reach and Frequency Prediction." *Marketing Science* 26, 3 (2007): 422-437.
- DANAHER, P. J., J. LEE, and L. KERBACHE. "Optimal Internet Media Selection." *Marketing Science* 29, 2 (2010): 336-347.
- DAWES, J. "Predictable Patterns in Buyer Behaviour and Brand Metrics: Implications for Brand Managers." In *Perspectives on Brand Management*, M. Uncles, ed. Copenhagen, Denmark: Tilde University Press, 2011.
- DIJKSTRA, M., H. E. BUIJTELS, and W. F. VAN RAAI. "Separate and Joint Effects of Medium Type on Consumer Responses: A Comparison of Television, Print, and the Internet." *Journal of Business Research* 58, 3 (2005): 377-386.
- DUNCAN, T. *Principles of Advertising and IMC*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2005.
- EHRENBERG, A. S. C. *Repeat-buying: Facts, Theory and Applications*. London: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- EHRENBERG, A. S. C., M. UNCLES, and G. J. GOODHARDT. "Understanding Brand Performance Measures: Using Dirichlet Benchmarks." *Journal of Business Research* 57, 12 (2004): 1307-1325.
- GOODHARDT, G. J., A. S. C. EHRENBERG, and C. CHATFIELD. "The Dirichlet: A Comprehensive Model of Buying Behaviour." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 147, 5 (1984): 621-655.
- HAMMOND, K., A. S. C. EHRENBERG, and G. J. GOODHARDT. "Market Segmentation for Competitive Brands." *European Journal of Marketing* 30, 12 (1996): 39-49.
- INTERACTIVE ADVERTISING BUREAU. *IAB Internet Advertising Revenue Report: 2011 Full Year Results*. New York: Interactive Advertising Bureau and PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2012.
- JONES, J. P. *How Much Is Enough? Getting the Most from Your Advertising Dollar*. New York, NY: Lexington Books, 1992.
- JONES, J. P. *When Advertisements Work—New Proof That Advertising Triggers Sales*. New York, NY: Lexington Books, 1995.
- KENNEDY, R., and A. S. C. EHRENBERG. "Competing Retailers Generally Have the Same Sorts of Shoppers." *Journal of Marketing Communications* 7, 1 (2001a): 19-26.
- KENNEDY, R., and A. S. C. EHRENBERG. "There Is No Brand Segmentation." *Marketing Insights, Marketing Research* 13, 1 (2001b): 4-7.
- KENNEDY, R., A. S. C. EHRENBERG, and S. LONG. "Competitive Brands' User-Profiles Hardly Differ." Brighton, UK: Market Research Society Conference, March 15-17, 2000.
- MCDONALD, C., and A. S. C. EHRENBERG. *What Happens When Brands Gain or Lose Share? Customer Acquisition or Increased Loyalty? Report 31 for Corporate Members*. Adelaide: Ehrenberg-Bass Institute for Marketing Science, 2003.
- MCDONALD, C., and B. SHARP. *Individual-level Advertising Effects. Report 36 for Corporate Members*. Adelaide: Ehrenberg-Bass Institute for Marketing Science, 2005.
- NELSON-FIELD, K., E. RIEBE, and B. SHARP. "What's Not to 'Like?': Can a Facebook Fan Base Give a Brand the Advertising Reach It Needs?" *Journal of Advertising Research* June (2012): 1-8.
- ROMANIUK, J., V. BEAL, and M. JEANS. *Planning For Synergy: Harnessing the Power of Multi-Platform Media*. London: Ehrenberg-Bass Institute and CNBC, 2012.
- RUBINSON, J. "Empirical Evidence of Television Advertising Effectiveness." *Journal of Advertising Research* 49, 2 (2009): 220-226.
- SCHULTZ, D., and H. SCHULTZ. *IMC: The Next Generation*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- SHARP, B. *How Brands Grow*, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2010.

TAYLOR, J., R. KENNEDY, and B. SHARP. "Making Generalizations About Advertising's Convex Sales Response Function: Is Once Really Enough?" *Journal of Advertising Research* 49, 2 (2009): 198–200.

UNCLES, M., R. EAST, and W. LOMAX. "Market Share is Correlated with Word-of-Mouth Volume." *Australasian Marketing Journal* 18, 3 (2010): 145–150.

UNCLES, M., R. KENNEDY, M. NENY CZ-THIEL, J. SINGH, and S. KWOK. "In 25 Years, across 50 Categories, User Profiles for Directly Competing Brands Seldom Differ: Affirming Andrew Ehrenberg's Principles." *Journal of Advertising Research* 52, 2 (2012): 252–261.

APPENDIX 1

Details of the Scope of Data

Country	Number of data sets	Date(s)	Total sample size in each wave
Greece	1	2009	300
Japan	2	2010, 2011	300
Russia	3	2011 × 2, 2012	300
South Africa	1	2010	403
South Korea	1	2011	300
Spain	6	2009, 2010, 2011 × 4	400–500
Taiwan	3	2009 × 2, 2011	200
UK	3	2010 × 2, 2011	200–425
USA	3	2010, 2011, 2012	200–500

Copyright of Journal of Advertising Research is the property of Warc LTD 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.