

How Do Radio Results Compare With Those of Other Media?

By MAURICE B. MITCHELL

Director, Broadcast Advertising Bureau

STOP ANY advertising salesman and ask him which medium he thinks will do the best job. He'll pick his own medium and *prove he's right*. And in most cases he'll demonstrate that he's earning a good living—usually based on commissions—*selling his kind of advertising*.

What does this prove? That all media are best? Impossible! Instead, it proves that *salesmanship* is the real key to obtaining a satisfactory share of the total advertising dollar. And the successful advertising salesman is usually the man who is best informed about all the other media to which his clients may be exposed.

The need for this kind of selling is perhaps greatest in radio for two reasons. First, our industry has grown faster than its capacity to produce well-trained selling representatives. Out selling for dozens of stations around the nation are men who, for lack of sound advertising background in general and a working understanding of *other competitive media* in particular, have devoted their efforts to selling business away from other stations. This does nothing to increase the size of radio's share of the total advertising dollar, and leads to the rate-cutting and other unethical selling practices which have become such a nuisance.

Second, radio has always been a football for other media. Newspapers have never recovered from the shock of finding another major medium selling beside them on Main Streets across the country, and many publishers still use the destructive selling tactics they first stooped to when this new bogey-man appeared. Magazines first sniffed cautiously at radio, settled down with an attitude of amused condescension, but finally began to refer to their readers as an "audience." Other media paused to criticize, ended by aping some of radio's most effective selling and research techniques.

All Successfully Selling

All these media are successfully selling their wares in places where effective radio selling can drastically reverse media decisions. And this kind of radio selling can best be done by the radio representative—local or national—who can incorporate these facts into his selling story:

1. *Radio does the best job of describing its audience.* Magazines and newspapers use "net-paid" circulation figures. These are comfortable indices on a space-buyer's desk, handy facts for an advertising manager. But they're really meaningless, as informed buyers of advertising will admit. They don't measure the audience the

advertiser really wants to know about. Advertisers want to buy *impressions*—not just advertising.

Both newspapers and magazines have taken a cautious peek at the real size of the *impressions* they deliver to an advertiser. The facts were shocking—2% actual readership to a 70-line newspaper ad—a 5% average actual readership to a full-page black and white advertisement in LIFE. This was a hard story to tell to advertisers who were sold on printed media's favorite laissez-faire basis, sometimes known as "transportation," most of whom firmly believed they were getting, as readers, the total paid circulation! It was, in fact, too hard a story to tell. Thousands of advertisers, large and small, have yet to hear it. And dozens of others are still accepting advertising agency coverage and cost comparisons which match this meaningless "net paid" data against radio's count of actual exposure to advertising.

Best Argument

Yet, in the hands of every radio station equipped with a BMB measurement, or even with a diary study, telephone coincidental, or other form of audience measurement, is the best argument of all—a count of the audience to the advertiser's message! No radio salesman has adequately represented his medium in a competitive situation until he has invited comparison on this basis.

Radio's research bill in its short 30 years of existence far exceeds the combined research investment of all other media since their inception. First really to care about the audience to its advertisers' messages, first to tailor its listener services to the proven likes and dislikes of its audience, radio has been and will apparently continue to be America's most open-faced advertising medium. There are no skeletons, no "reducible factors" in radio's standard measurement totals.

2. *Radio gets the most attention.* In the average radio family, listening averages 5 hours 53 minutes *daily*. Newspapers' best claim, made by the defunct A.N.A.N., reached 3 hours, 18 minutes per family per day but few papers care to try to document these figures. A recent diary study in a major market showed an average reading time of 58 minutes per day per *adult*—only 7 minutes of newspaper reading per day for those under 18. And magazines just don't belong in this league. A recently *Saturday Evening Post* survey, triumphantly disseminated by that periodical, claimed top readership among magazines with 2 hours 54 minutes of total reading per weekly issue!

Of all these attention measurements, only BMB's radio data seems to have been produced in

the *regular research channels* by a continuing research arm of the industry! When other media get into this kind of self-examination, they do it in the manner of a woman with a "new look" short haircut—can't wait for it to grow long again!

N.O.R.C. Studies

"The People Look At Radio," "Radio Listening in America" (both of them N. O. R. C. studies available through NAB's Research Department), and the March 1949 *Fortune* study of radio listening, are good reading for the salesman who wants full details on the extent of the attention paid radio by American listeners.

3. *Radio's penetration is deepest.* Radio offers figures, again produced by an established, continuing industry source, to document this fact. BMB data—produced by the joint efforts of broadcasters, agencies and advertisers alike—show 88,000,000 radios in 39,280,000 American homes—or 94.2% of all American homes. Newspapers, with a 1% circulation increase in 1949 over 1948, show a total aggregate daily net paid circulation of over 52,000,000. That this penetration is much shallower than radio's is borne out by examination of the facts in individual cities, as well as by the obvious 30,000,000 differential between sets and newspapers. In one major Eastern city, 25% of the total population, when asked by *the newspapers*, reported that they saw no newspapers at all!

Magazine Circulation

Magazines can be dismissed as having only splinter circulation. As even the Bureau of Advertising of A.N.P.A. has pointed out, the eight great circulation leaders among American magazines can deliver a combined audience of only 24,000,000 homes. And even if an advertiser bought all 45 of the top magazines, he'd be missing 17.5% of the homes—homes that get *no magazines at all!*

This comparison of the penetration of major media will prove out in practically any market you select. Note the way NBC nails the point home in its promotion for two areas in which it operates stations:

NEW YORK AREA—	
Radio—total WNBC Audience—Daytime (BMB—1946)	3,077,190
Magazines—total Circulation in area (nation's largest magazine)	1,801,673
Newspapers—total Circulation in area (New York's largest newspaper)	2,320,466
WASHINGTON, D. C. AREA—	
Radio—total WRC Audience—Daytime (BMB—1946)	316,580
Magazines—total Circulation in area (nation's largest magazine)	156,421
Newspapers—total Circulation in area (Washington's largest newspaper)	245,246

This difference in radio's penetration as compared with other major media becomes even more

pronounced in less urban areas, where newspaper circulation thins out quickly outside of the city zone, and where individual magazine circulations are negligible factors in covering the whole market.

Circulation measurements are more than a definition of the size of an advertising medium. A manufacturer, for example, should look at circulation figures to prove to himself that he is spending advertising dollars for impressions made *where his products are sold*—not just in the areas where the newspaper or magazine is sold. Will his advertising work for all his dealers, for all his company salesmen? Radio will pass this and other tests with a far higher score than printed media.

Retailers Disturbed

Retailers, too, are becoming increasingly disturbed by the failure of *local* newspapers to follow the spreading outlines of their trading areas. Newspaper space costs zoom astonishingly when it becomes necessary to buttress the local paper's coverage by buying a flock of community papers in outlying areas. The swift appearance of these community sheets is documentary evidence of the newspaper's failure to offer a service in these new-born communities, and the new publishers well know that with only the slimmest news and feature service, liberally sprinkled with "local personals," they can soon build a better coverage and acceptance story than the adjoining city newspaper. Big city retailers in particular are turning to radio in increasing numbers to solve this problem.

The very "bigness" of the radio coverage picture—and it keeps growing all the time!—makes some advertisers feel that radio must be an expensive medium. Yet, despite its high impact and deep penetration, radio is the least expensive of all major media.

4. *Radio costs less.* It costs less no matter how you figure it, but if you toss aside the concept of cost that printed media have been peddling for these many years, and measure the *actual cost of the goods delivered to the buyer*, then the cost picture in favor of radio is astounding. When the advertiser begins to measure what he is really buying—*impressions*—then radio's genuine economy becomes dramatically apparent. And radio salesmen can prove this point by asking advertisers to do this simple bit of arithmetic:

To compute radio's cost-per-thousand: Find the audience (number of people) to a specific radio program. Divide this figure into the time cost. *Result:* The actual cost of making a thousand advertising impressions on listeners to

(Continued on page 20)