Reason Why Advertising

By

John E. Kennedy

Table of Contents

Reason Why Advertising

I	You Must Do the Sum to Prove it
II	To Whom are You Advertising
Ш	The Responsive Chord in Advertising
IV	"Let There be Light"
٧	They Who Blindly Follow the Blind
VI	Fortunes Wasted in following "Will-o'-the-Wisps"
VII	Why Some Advertisers grow Wealthy while others Fail
/III	Making Sure of Results from General Advertising
IX	How Mail Order Advertising is Tested
Χ	How to Test Out General Advertising

Chapter I

"You Must Do the Sum to Prove it!"

Advertising should be judged <u>only</u> by the goods it is conclusively <u>known to sell</u> at a given cost. Mere <u>Opinions</u> on Advertising Copy should be excluded from consideration.

<u>Opinions</u> on Advertising are as conflicting as <u>opinions</u> on Religion. Forty per cent of all the people in the world are Buddhists, and are of the <u>Opinion</u> that Buddhism is the only true religion. Twelve per cent of the world's people being Roman Catholics, are firm in the Opinion that the remaining 88 percent are wrong, and sure of damnation accordingly.

Eight percent of the world's people being Protestants believe that both the Buddhists and the Catholics, and all others, are deplorably ignorant of the only true faith, which of course must be their own particular <u>sect</u> of Protestantism. And, neither Buddhist, Catholic, nor Protestant, can convince the 2 per cent of Jews that <u>their</u> opinion is wrong and should be changed.

This is a side-light on the inconsistency of mere Opinion.

Religion must continue in the realm of <u>Opinion</u>, because no one can decide which Creed is right;, and which wrong, till he dies and finds out the facts for himself. And no mere man who died has ever come back to Earth to settle the dispute.

But, it is different with Advertising, as it is with Mechanics or with Medicine, all three of which can be conclusively tested.

Many Advertisers, however, seem satisfied to spend their money on mere <u>Opinions</u> about Advertising when they might have invested it on <u>Evidence</u> about Advertising. These are the Advertisers whose business must die before they can be convinced that "General Publicity" (merely "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People") is wrong and "Salesmanship-on-paper" right.

They blindly <u>gamble</u> in Advertising when they might have safely <u>invested</u> in it. If they were to buy any <u>other</u> kind of Service, except Advertising, they would demand <u>tangible</u> proof of its efficacy before they spent money on it.

If they hired a Salesman, for instance, they would expect him to <u>prove</u> he was earning his salary by making a satisfactory Record on Sales. They would not accept, for long, statements from him that he was "Making a General impression on the Trade" for his salary.

Nor would they be satisfied with the statement that he was "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People" profitably enough to compensate for <u>lack</u> of <u>Sales</u>.

Nor would they enthuse over a report from him that he was "Influencing Sales" for their other salesmen. What the Advertising Employer would demand from his Salesman would be profitable <u>Orders</u>. He would demand <u>Sales</u>, clearly made by the Salesman himself, each sale carrying a given profit over cost for the Employer.

That is just what the Advertising Employer should demand from his Advertising Expenditure, too-<u>Sales</u>-proven Sales, carrying a satisfactory profit. And, if he <u>insists</u> upon it he <u>can</u> get the <u>kind</u> of Advertising which will actually produce <u>Sales</u> instead of a vague "General Influence on Sales."

Because, true Advertising is only "<u>Salesmanship-on-paper</u>"after all. When it is anything <u>less</u> than Salesmanship it is not <u>real</u> Advertising, but only "General Publicity." And, "General Publicity" admittedly claims only to "Keep the Name before the People," – to produce a "General impression on the Trade," and to "Influence Sales" for the salesmen.

It makes the same lame excuses as would be made by a Salesman who failed to earn his salary in actually <u>selling</u> goods. But "General Publicity," or any other Advertising, should be <u>judged</u> by the selfsame <u>standards</u> as the Salesman is judged, viz., by the goods it is clearly proven <u>to sell</u> at a given cost per dollar invested in it.

.

Chapter II

"To Whom are You Advertising?"

MR. ADVERTISER!

You spend your money to <u>tell</u> People what you've got to <u>sell</u>. Now, what <u>kind</u> of People can afford to buy <u>your</u> particular Goods?

What income must they possess to be probable Consumers of <u>your</u> Advertised Product? How many <u>possibilities</u> of Sale has your product per thousand average Readers?

These are all vital factors in the <u>framing up</u> of your campaign, and in the prospects of Success from it. Here are some Census figures upon which <u>we</u> base <u>our</u> Campaigns and Calculations.

In the year 1900 there were 15,964,000 Families in the United States. These Families averaged about five persons each, or a total population of 75,994,575. Fifty-one per cent of that population

lived in the country – 10 2/3 per cent was Semi-urban, and 38 1/3 per cent lived in Cities and Towns.

The Newspapers and Periodicals these Families read had a total circulation of 8,168,148,749 copies per year. That means 512 copies per year per Family, or nearly two copies per day for each Family.

A great deal of Reading, isn't it?

Now comes the astonishing part of the Census figures. Nearly <u>33 per cent</u> of all these Families had an average Income of <u>less</u> than \$400 per year, or about \$80 per capita.

Only 21 per cent of these Families had an annual Income of \$400 to \$600.

Only 15 per cent of these Families had an annual Income of \$600 to \$900.

Only 10 ½ per cent of them had an annual Income of \$900 to \$1,200.

Only 7 ½ per cent of them had an annual Income of \$1,800 to \$3,000.

And, of the Automobile Class only 5 per cent had an Income of over \$3,000 per Family, or \$600 per capita.

Now, wouldn't that set you thinking?

Suppose you have <u>Pianos</u> to sell through advertising, how <u>many</u> Families of the total that read Newspapers and Magazines could <u>afford</u> to buy one? Then, how <u>many</u> of these are already supplied?

That estimate shows your <u>Possible Market</u> through Advertising, and indicates the way that Market must be approached.

It also shows about how many Readers you must pay to reach who <u>cannot</u> buy your Piano, no matter how much your advertising makes them <u>want</u> it. And it also shows the futility of writing "Catchy" copy to <u>attract</u> the <u>greatest number</u> of Readers for your advertisement, What you need is not <u>numbers</u> of <u>Readers</u>, but Class of Readers. That very <u>limited</u> class you must <u>convince</u>, when you once get its attention, or you lose all profit from your Piano advertising.

You must make up in <u>Conviction</u> and <u>Selling-force</u> for what you lose in possible number of purchasers with such a proposition.

But, when your product is something which can be used <u>by the Masses</u>, it is then a better subject for Advertising. Because, you then have about 85 per cent more <u>possibilities</u> of Sale, among Average Readers, than you would have had with a Piano or Automobile. The current mistake in Advertising to this great 85 per cent of Average Families is that of <u>talking</u> <u>over their heads</u>, in terms and thought-forms which are unfamiliar or unintelligible to them.

Observe that not one of this great 85 per cent of families has an Income of more than \$1,800 a year, or \$360 per person. Observe also that the <u>Average</u> Income of this great 85 per cent is less than \$500 per year, per family, or \$100 per head. We must not expect the Average of <u>such</u> people to have <u>classical</u> educations, nor an excessive appreciation of Art and Inference.

Neither are they as Children in Intellect, nor thick-headed Fools. They are just Average Americans of good average intelligence, considerable shrewdness, and large bumps of Incredulity. Most of them might have come "from Missouri" because they all have "show me!" ever ready in their minds, when any plausible Advertising Claim is made to them.

But, they are <u>willing</u> to be "Shown" when the arguments are <u>sensible enough</u>, as well as <u>simple enough</u>, to appeal readily to their mental make-up. They are not suffocating for want of pretty pictures and pleasing phrases in Advertising.

What they are <u>most interested in</u> is, "Show me how to get more for my money of what I <u>need</u> for Existence and Comfort rather than for Luxury." This "great <u>85 per cent"</u> of Readers has a peculiar Habit-of-Thought or <u>Mental Calibre</u> of Its own which <u>responds</u> most freely to a certain well-defined form of approach and reasoning.

To strike the Responsive Chord with the class of Readers aimed at is to multiply the Selling-power of every Reason-Why given and every line of space used. So a few Pointers upon this will be in order for our next chapter.

Chapter III

"The Responsive Chord in Advertising"

ADVERTISING is just Salesmanship-on-paper.

It is a means of multiplying the work of the Salesman, who writes it, several thousand-fold.

With the salary paid to a single Salesman it is possible, through advertising, to reach a thousand customers for every <u>one</u> he could have reached orally.

It is also a means of discovering, and developing, <u>new</u> customers where they were not previously <u>known</u> to exist. These facts are mentioned here because few Business Men have a correct idea of what <u>true</u> Advertising should consist of.

To start with the <u>wrong</u> point-of-view, on an advertising campaign, is to grope, experiment, and <u>speculate</u>, with an appropriation which should have been <u>invested</u> as intelligently as in merchandise.

True Advertising is just <u>Salesmanship</u> multiplied. When we multiply <u>nothing</u> by ten thousand we still have <u>nothing</u> as a result. When we multiply a pretty picture, or a catchphrase, or the mere name of a firm, or article, a thousand times we have comparatively <u>nothing</u> as a result.

But when we multiply one thousand times a good, strong, clearly expressed <u>Reason-why</u>, a person should buy the article we want to sell, we <u>then</u> have impressed, through advertising, one thousand more people with <u>that</u> reason than if it had been told verbally to <u>one</u> person by the same salesman.

Of course, cold type usually lacks the <u>personal influence</u> of the Salesman and, because of this, even Salesmanship-on-Paper needs to be stronger – more <u>convincing</u> and conclusive than Salesmanship need be by word of mouth.

Besides, when we multiply anything a thousand fold, at a large expense for the <u>mechanical process</u> of doing so, it is wisdom to see that the thing to be multiplied is as nearly perfect as we can get it.

Nothing multiplied by one thousand <u>costs</u> just the same for the mechanical expense of multiplying it, but the net result is <u>nothing</u> – less that expense. This is why so many Advertising Campaigns fail. Because, the Good Folks who spend their money for Space have no definite idea of what should occupy it.

When we clearly understand that <u>Salesmanship</u> alone should fill it, we all know, in a general way, what <u>that</u> means, though each of us might go about it in a different way, Salesmanship-on-Paper means <u>convincing</u> readers that they should <u>buy</u> the article <u>we</u> want to <u>sell</u>.

Many good Salesmen find it impossible to do this convincing <u>on Paper</u> because the customer does not stand before them, with his facial expression as an index to the line of talk the Salesman should use in that particular case.

This is where the <u>creative</u> power of the Salesman-on-Paper becomes vitally necessary. He must, first of all, analyse the proposition thoroughly – master the full details of the thing to be sold, then lay out a strong logical line of argument upon it, "lime-lighting" the good points, and subtly masking the bad ones out of the reader's mental vision.

All this, however, is just what any good Salesman-on-the-Road, or Salesman-in-the-Warehouse, could, should, and probably does, do. But, a glance at the Advertising pages of current publications will show how comparatively few <u>Advertisers</u> adopt these first principles of <u>Salesmanship</u> in their copy. However, it is <u>after</u> this that the true genius and power of able Salesman-on-Paper must be exerted. That consists in the <u>staging</u> of the arguments, to fit the audience

A given argument, presented in a certain form of thought and expression, will strike <u>responsively</u> in the minds of a given number, among the <u>class</u> of people aimed at, in each thousand.

If that per cent be <u>high</u>, it means large profit to the Advertiser – large returns. If that per cent be <u>low</u>, it means that the advertisement <u>has not convinced</u>, has not struck <u>responsively</u> upon the particular <u>class</u> for whom the article advertised is best adapted, notwithstanding the sound argument used This peculiarly "Responsive" quality in an advertisement may be called its <u>Personality</u>.

Observe that it need not be the Personality of the Writer at all, but the Personality which he <u>estimates</u> will best <u>fit</u> the particular class of people who compose the <u>largest</u> field of sale for the article advertised.

This intangible <u>Personality</u> feature may be likened to the keynote of a church, or of a music hall.

It is well known that every such building will respond most <u>fully</u> (in sound) to some one particular musical note of the scale, in proportion to the interior size and shape of the structure. This, a note which sounds full, clear, and vibrant in <u>one</u> such edifice, will sound thin, flat, and harsh in another. Because, it is <u>not</u> the Responsive chord of the second building, as it is of the first.

The Musician who could look at the inside of a church, then declare its <u>Responsive Chord</u>, from an estimate, would be in kindred position to the Advertising Writer who could most profitably fit the <u>Personality</u> of his Reason-Why <u>Salesmanship</u> to the class he aims at.

To strike the Responsive Chord full and true, with that class, would mean 100 per cent in possible <u>results</u>, from the arguments deduced. To strike a chord which sounded harsh, uncongenial, or unfamiliar, to <u>that</u> class, would be to arouse latent antagonism or distrust. Either of these would discount the effect of <u>the same logic</u>, from 25 to 50 per cent.

That is why the successful Salesman-on-Paper must possess <u>Imagination</u>, as well as logic. He must be able to form a clear <u>conception</u> of the class he aims to <u>convince</u>. He must

estimate how the average mind of that <u>class</u> is likely to <u>work</u>, under a certain argument, and under a certain mode of expressing it.

Then, he must be able to create the Personality, in his mode of expression, which will strike the most Responsive Chord with the <u>greatest</u> possible number.

Some few Advertisers possess this power of creating a personality which fits <u>responsively</u> the mass of humanity – the great 85 per cent. And this ability to <u>estimate</u> the average mentality, the Habit-of-Thought, of the <u>Class</u> aimed at, with the power to create a personality in the copy which will <u>fit</u> it most agreeably and familiarly, is what the Reason-Why Salesman-on-Paper must have, in addition to the <u>logical</u> arguments of the Salesman in any other field.

The difference in <u>Results</u> between copy written by two equally bright men may be, and often is, 80 per cent, though the same space be used in each case, to sell the selfsame article. That difference consists, first of all, in the quality of argument, the "Reason-Why" that each of the two lines of copy contains, and next in the <u>Personality</u> with which these arguments have been invested, in either copy, so as to strike the <u>most Responsive</u> Chord with the <u>class</u> of readers aimed at.

The faculty of taking the Mental Measure of a given class, and gauging their Habit-of-Thought is a sort of <u>Instinct</u>, such as guides the Timber-Explorer, who travels a hundred square miles of forest and estimates closely just how many thousand feet of timber are on it, though he never counts a tree.

That sales of timber lands running into millions of dollars have been regularly made on this <u>instinctive</u> knowledge of a single man, is <u>evidence</u> of the general <u>accuracy</u>, and reliability, of such trained, and instinctive estimates. This same <u>faculty</u> has more to so with successful <u>Salesmanship-on-Paper</u> than is generally recognized. And, it is <u>rare</u> enough to be interesting.

Chapter IV

"Let There be Light"

NOW, let us be frank!

Let us look at this subject of Advertising squarely, and dissect it. Let us discard all prejudice or predilection, and accept only <u>Evidence</u>, in our final investigation.

Let us cut out sentiment, precedent, and "Popular Opinion," and treat the subject as though we had never heard of it before and "came from Missouri." If, for instance, we had a load of Hay to sell how would we attempt to sell it?

Would we show our customers the Daisies that grew in it, ask them to note the Style of the loading, the fine pair of horses that draw it, and the Vandyke or Otherwise beard of the Driver?

Would we tell him <u>this</u> is the same kind of Hay as was raked by "Maud Muller on a Summer's day" in Whittier's poem?

Guess not! - eh?

We'd tell him of the <u>nutritious</u> qualities that particular load of Hay possessed, for the feeding of horses, and then we'd name the price delivered, show why the hay was worth it, and let it go at that.

Now, if our customer lived at a distance, and we must sell him the Hay <u>by letter</u>, how would we proceed?

Quote "Maud Muller" to him – then refer to the Daisies, the Horses, the Beard? No, sir – not for a moment! We would confine ourselves carefully to the <u>feeding qualities</u> of our Hay, and to the advantages of <u>buying</u> while the price was right.

But, suppose we had five hundred loads of this Hay to sell, instead of one load, and did not know just where to write to in order to sell it.

That's when we'd <u>Advertise!</u> But does the fact of our going into <u>Print</u> mean that we <u>must</u> go into Literature, Art, or Clever conceits in space-filling too, in order to sell our <u>Hay</u> through Advertising?

Are we not still trying to sell just <u>Horsefeed</u>? How can we expect the picture of "Maud Muller on a Summer's Day" to help us close a deal with an unpoetical party who has Horses to Feed, and who must do it economically?

The Horse owner knows good Hay when he sees it, and he will know it from description almost as well as from sight.

When he needs good Hay then the most <u>interesting</u> thing we can tell <u>him</u> is a description of the Hay is a description of the Hay <u>we</u> have to sell, and <u>why</u> it is good, and <u>why</u> it is worth the price. No amount of Maud Muller picture, or "Association of Ideas" will sell him Hay so <u>surely</u> and quickly as plain Hay-talk and Horse-sense.

But the Advertiser will be told that "in order for an Advertisement to <u>sell</u> goods it must first be <u>seen</u> and <u>read!</u>" He will also be told that "in the mass of reading matter surrounding your Advertisement your Space must be made more '<u>attractive</u>' than the rest, in order to be seen and read by the <u>largest possible number</u>."

Now, at first sight this line of talk <u>looks</u> logical enough, but <u>how</u> does it dissect? Suppose you have a pretty Maud Muller advertisement about your Hay, with a fancy border or Daisies all around it, and a delicate vignette of "the Judge looked back as he climbed the hill!"

You would certainly <u>attract the attention</u> of many <u>more</u> Readers with that advt. than with the bald caption of "Hay delivered, at \$8.00 a ton" But, the man who <u>wants Hay</u> is the only party you can get back the cost of your advertising from, and you can interest <u>him</u> more intensely with the Hay caption than with all the "Maud Muller" kind of advts. in the publication field.

And, you can afford to <u>lose</u> the "attention" of 400,000 Readers who <u>have no use for Hay</u>. If you can clinch sales for your fine hundred loads with the <u>few</u> people who <u>do</u> need it. Observe that it is not necessary to "attract the attention" of <u>every</u> Reader in a 430,000 circulation, in order to sell 500 loads of Hay.

But it <u>is</u> vitally necessary that you <u>convince</u> at least five hundred probable Purchasers that you have the kind of Hay they need, at the price they can afford to pay for it.

If an advertisement, in a circulation of 430,000 costs \$60 and we have a profit of \$1.00 per load on Hay, we need only <u>sell</u> one load each to <u>sixty</u> people in order to pay expenses.

But, if we "attract the attention" of 80,000 people by our advertisement, and <u>sell</u> only <u>thirty</u> loads of Hay to them, we would then be <u>out</u> \$30, and must credit the balance of our Advertising investment to "General Publicity" – to "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People" - etc., in the vague hope that <u>some other day</u> these people may <u>perhaps</u> buy Hay from us, <u>if</u> we then have it to sell.

That mistaken idea of "Attracting the Attention of the greatest number, for a given price," is what costs fortunes to Advertisers annually.

The striving to "Attract Attention" instead of striving to positively <u>Sell Goods</u> is the basis of all Advertising misunderstanding.

So long as "Attracting Attention" remains the <u>aim</u> of Advertisers, so long will the <u>process</u> of attracting it remain in the hands of Advertising Men who affect the Literary and Artistic attitude, rather than the plain, <u>logical</u>, <u>convincing</u> attitude of the Reason-Why Salesman-on-Paper. And, great are the Advertising Writers' temptations to use "Attractive" copy at the expense of <u>Convincing</u> copy. Because, great is the temptation to be considered "smart," "bright," "catchy," "Literary," "artistic," "dignified," "High-grade," etc.

There is popular applause for the Writer of <u>catchy</u> "General Publicity," which "attracts attention" even though it <u>does not sell goods</u>. But, there is no applause for the Writer of prosaic Salesmanship-on-Paper which is forceful enough, and convincing enough to

actually <u>sell</u> goods in volume. This is <u>one</u> reason-why "Catchy" Advertising is so current, and true Reason-Why Salesmanship-in-Type so rare.

Another reason is the far greater <u>cost</u> to produce studied Reason-Why Salesmanship-in-Type than to produce four times as much catchy "General Publicity."

A still further reason is that the Makers of "General Publicity" know they can never be <u>held</u> to account for definite results from the latter kind of Copy, because nothing definite is promised through it.

- To "Keep-the-Name-before-the-People."
- To "Make a General Impression on the Trade."
- To "Influence Sales."
- To "Protect the Market."

These are the vague nothings <u>promised</u> to the Advertiser by the Makers of "General Publicity." These are the <u>fractional parts</u> of Advertising he gets in return for an outlay which <u>could have</u> broken to him back 150 per cent instead of 30 to 90 per cent of his outlay for Space

Remember that Reason-Why Salesmanship-on-Paper will do <u>all</u> that "General Publicity" can do

Toward "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People," "Creating a General Impression on the Trade," etc.

And, in <u>addition</u> to this, it can actually, positively, and conclusively <u>Sell Goods</u>, through Retailers (or by Mail), in sufficient volume to pay 50 to 300 per cent profit on the investment in Space it occupies.

Chapter V

They Who Blindly Follow the Blind

CARLYLE compared Mankind to a flock of Sheep.

He said, "Stretch a rope across a country path, about a foot and a half from the ground. Then drive a flock of Sheep over it! When the Bell-wether (or leader) has jumped that elevated rope lower it to the ground and note what happens."

Every sheep in the flock that follows will jump a foot and a half in the air over that same rope, though it <u>now lies slack on the earth</u>. They follow the Bell-wether blindly, - <u>unreasoningly</u>, - without regard to changed conditions.

They don't jump for the same reason that the Bell-wether jumped, but because they say another Sheep jumped a given height, at a given spot.

Carlyle's comparison fits the Advertising situation like a blister. There be flocks of Sheep innumerable in the Advertising field, Neighbour! When Sapolio used the "Spotless Town" jingles (merely to revive mental impressions created by previous logical advertising, the flock of Sheep ran

amuck on jingles, regardless of the application to other purposes.

When "Uneeda Biscuit" appeared on the market to fill a colossal waiting demand for a finecent package, it was backed by an appropriation the mere volume of which must create a sensation with Retailers (whether it actually sold goods to Consumers or not).

This, in turn, was followed by a brood of inane trade-marks launched on the Advertising field <u>after</u> it and <u>because</u> of it. When "Ivory Soap" Publicity appeared on the scene, with its full pages of pretty pictures, and its <u>Five per cent of Selling Effect</u>, the Sheep concluded <u>that</u>, too, must be "the best ever" in Advertising, so they promptly got in line and leaped the imaginary rope.

Then we had an epidemic of empty catch-phrases, following hard upon "Good Morning! Have you used Pears' Soap?" This, regardless of the fact that Pears' much parodied phrase had a foundation of a hundred years in <u>accumulated advertising</u> to tide it over its period of mental aberration.

Where are these false Gods of Advertising today?

"Spotless Town" is off the map, and Hand Sapolio is now being advertised on the good old Reason-Why basis that built House Sapolio. The old-time brood of "Try-a-bita," "U-want-a" and such other Uneeda chickens has gone home to roost long before the tolling of Curfew bell.

"Uneeda Biscuit" itself, with the millions of trust money behind it, can keep up the Publicity bluff better than it can afford to admit the mistake of starting it.

But there are unwilling admissions of a Change of Heart, in such of their advertisements as "The Food Value of a Soda Cracker," and other recent "type" copy. Where is that meteor of

General Publicity, "the Cremo Cigar," which one-time flashed across the horizon of Adversing, with its million-dollar outlay for <u>Bill-Board</u> display in Newspaper space?

It, too, has gone into eclipse.

Study the Ivory soap advertising of the present and watch it for the future. You will find in it, month by month, <u>less</u> pointless picture, and <u>more</u> "Reason-Why," though its Adverising Sponsors will hate to admit the change of attitude their later <u>experience</u> has compelled. Pear's soap no longer says "Good Morning," nor quotes, in place of it, any <u>other</u> catchphrase. Yet, their once famous line is enshrined forever in the minds of old Fogy Advertising Men, who swear by the Pear's <u>catch-phrase</u> but who <u>never buy Pears' Soap</u> as a result of it.

Meantime such Stars in the firmament of General Publicity, have lighted the way to ruin for a few dozen flocks of Sheep who <u>thought</u> they were following reliable "Bell-wethers" when they were only following Fads.

And, every <u>new</u> Fad, started in a large way by any big Advertiser (who has money enough to burn

a big Bluff, and pride enough to sustain that Bluff till he can quietly change his play), <u>will</u> be applauded, copied, and "advised" by those who do not themselves <u>understand the</u> <u>Compass</u>, and so must follow the lead of others as incapable as themselves.

But, "is there," you ask, "any reliable Compass by which an Advertiser's barque may be safely steered to success?" There is, Reader, a Guide practically as <u>reliable</u> to the Advertiser as is the Compass to the Mariner.

Its guidance in not based upon mere <u>Opinion</u>, nor on Guess-work, nor on blind following of the Blind. It is based upon carefully tabulated <u>Results</u> derived from Actual Tests made with different kinds of copy, in different mediums, compared year after year on scores of different Advertising propositions.

By this means the exact <u>earning power</u> of <u>each</u> piece of Copy, may be told by the <u>number of Inquiries it produced</u> for a given cost, and the number of direct Sales that resulted from the Inquiries.

Not only this, but the relative <u>earning power</u> of <u>each</u> publication is thereby accurately revealed by the Cost of Inquiries and Sales, through <u>each</u> particular medium in which the <u>same</u> copy is run, without regard to mere circulation claims.

The results from any <u>one</u> Mail-Order account using a given kind of copy, might only indicate the effectiveness of that kind of copy for that particular article.

This would afford no conclusive evidence as to how <u>that</u> kind of copy <u>might</u> work with a <u>different</u> sort of Mail-Order proposition, or in General Advertising. But, when a <u>given kind</u> of copy produces almost a <u>uniform kind of Result</u> for different Mail-Order accounts, and does it <u>consistently</u> for years, it means something <u>definite</u> and indisputable to Advertisers.

And, when the <u>same</u> kind of Copy is tried out in General Advertising, for goods sold through Retailers, with the <u>same consistent</u> sort of Result (judged by Records of

Comparative Sales in different, but equivalent territory), it, too, proves something definite and conclusive that Advertisers cannot afford to ignore, not matter how partial they may be to their own pet fads in Advertising or to friends in the Advertising business.

Chapter VI

"Fortunes Wasted in following Will-o'-the-Wisps"

KEEPING-THE-NAME-BEFORE-THE-PEOPLE, "and keeping – everlastingly – at – it!" <u>That</u>, dear Reader, is "General Publicity" – a Glory-Game, under a convenient alias. "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People," and "Keeping-everlastingly-at-it, "<u>may</u> incidentally "<u>influence</u> the sale" of goods, providing no <u>competing</u> line is being actually <u>Advertised</u> through Reason-Why Salesmanship-on-Paper.

But, the main object of such "General Publicity" may be less mercenary, more altruistic, than mere merchandising.

"Attract Attention;" – "Interest the Public" with pretty pictures and cute catch-words; - "Encourage the Publisher" by paying him for plenty of unoccupied white space; -and lastly, pay some Agency a commission to <u>spend</u> the money with the least effort and the most fireworks. That is "General Publicity." It is well enough, in its way, of course (like the Carnegie Libraries).

But, what is here objected to is that some folks, who ought to know better, call this "General Publicity" by the name of "Advertising."

Now, Advertising is, and should be, simply plebeian "Salesmanship-on-paper" – a mere money-making means of <u>selling goods</u> by the quickest and cheapest method.

There is no Glory in the Reason-Why Salesmanship-on-paper -no applause for it, -no admiration, -just <u>Profit</u>.

Because, it is simply common sense brought to bear directly upon the $\underline{\text{selling of Goods}}$. That is its

province-just selling goods over the counter or by mail.

If you want to find out how <u>few</u> goods "General Publicity" Copy ("Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People") will actually <u>sell</u>, test some of what you are now using, in a Mail-Order way, -to sell goods, mark you (not merely to give away Calendars or Samples).

That is the <u>test</u> that shatters advertising Idols and dispels "Publicity" illusions. You may have the smoothest "Catch-phrase" that ever happened, -you may be thoroughly tickled with your Witty Wording, Pretty Platitudes, and Artistic Illustrations.

You may fell Cock-Sure that you have a <u>kind</u> of Advertising which <u>couldn't</u> fail (so long as the Salesmen do its work in addition to their own). <u>But</u>, <u>suppose</u> you should try to actually <u>sell</u> goods by <u>mail</u> with it.

If your World-Beating Advertisement, that "everybody sees" and admires, costs you \$2.00 per Inquiry-and if another kind of advertisement you "don't like at all" brings equally good Inquiries, in the same space and same mediums, at 40 cents each, then you've learned something you can never afford to forget.

That is the kind of <u>experience</u> which makes one "sit up," and think hard, before he recovers from the jolt it gives him. And when he "comes to" he then sees a Great White Light. Under this new light some of the things he <u>thought</u> he knew before fade out into vapory "Will-o'-the-Wisps," and he longs for things <u>tangibly</u> proven.

When he observes now a hoary old Mail-Order Advertisement, that seems at first sight stupidly simple and countrified, he looks <u>twice</u> into it, to see if it isn't carefully loaded with hidden Selling Effect and subtle <u>Conviction</u>, under its guise of rural simplicity.

If he notes it running for years, without change, he no longer jumps to the conclusion that the Man who pays for it is merely a Chump, serving his costly apprenticeship to our own Guild of advanced Advertisers.

No, -he looks closely at it now for the hall-marks of <u>Salesmanship</u>, and where he finds it running for months, without change of copy, he concluded there is <u>some</u> potent reason for it.

Because, he then feels that, had <u>he</u> as sure a means of keeping "tab" on <u>results</u> as this Mail-Order Advertiser, <u>he</u>, <u>too</u>, might be using some "stale" copy in "General Advertising," Instead of changing it often (without evidence) from bad to probably worse.

If he had tried over fifty different changes of copy that had <u>pleased him</u> better than the Stale One, and had found (as others have done) that Inquiries from them cost \$1.20 to \$2.90 each, he would be might glad to go back to the good old "Chestnut" which produced Inquiries regularly at 40 cents average.

He would look upon that Ancient Adlet in the light of a tried and trusted Friend. If he were asked to sell out his business he might well appraise that bit of much-used Ancient History at a price that would make many Ad-smiths gasp. And, why shouldn't he appraise it high up in the thousands?

If we spend \$100,000 per year for Space and fill that Space with copy that costs \$1.20 per inquiry (by mail, or <u>over the counter</u>), we get only 83,334 chances of Sale out of our appropriation.

With the Antique Adlet, or its skilful equivalent, our \$100,000 would have produced 250,000 Inquiries at an average of 40 cents each.

These 250,000 Inquiries <u>would</u> have cost us \$300,000 to secure at \$1.20 each. Why isn't the proven "40-cent" Advertisement <u>worth</u> all it <u>saves</u>, viz., <u>\$200,000</u> per year, so long as it continues to produce Inquiries averaging 40 cents each, instead of at \$1.20 each?

Well,-why <u>isn't</u> such an Advertisement worth <u>more than the space</u> it occupies each time it is published?

What is the "something" in a successful Mail-Order Advertisement that makes it pull equally good Inquiries at a fraction of previous cost?

It is the same "something" that would make Advertising <u>sell goods</u> over the Retailer's counter, through <u>General</u> Advertising, at correspondingly low cost.

That mysterious "something" is just <u>Printed Persuasion</u>, and its other name is "Reason-Why Salesmanship-in-Type."

It is that sapient "something" which makes one Advertiser rich in a few years, while lack of it ruins others who buy their Space equally cheap, pay 5 per cent less commission, and spend equally large appropriations. That "something" is "Reason-Why" and <u>Conviction</u>, saturated into the copy, so that the Reader <u>must believe</u> the statements of merit thus claimed for the article.

Mere <u>brilliance</u> in Advertising fails utterly to produce such profitable results (sales) if it lacks <u>conviction</u>. The "seeing," "admiring," or "reading with interest," of an Advertisement by the Public, avails little in dollars and cents, to the man who pays for the space, if it fails to CONVINCE the Public.

And, that conviction <u>can</u> be imparted, without accident, <u>at will</u>, by the few Advertising Men who have closely studied the thought-process through which Conviction is induced, provided they have had the guiding light of experience with the <u>facilities</u> for <u>comparing Results</u> obtained from a large variety of Mail-Order Copy.

These results have invariably shown that it is far better to repeat one single Advertisement fifty times, if it be full of Conviction, than to publish fifty different Advertisements that lack as much Conviction, no matter how attractive, clever, or artistic, they may be.

In other words, <u>one</u> sound, <u>convincing</u> Advertisement will sell more goods than fifty brilliant, catchy, strikingly displayed "Ads" that have less conviction in them.

The only mission of true General Advertising is to <u>Sell Goods</u>, by driving the People to the stores armed with such <u>reasons</u> and <u>convictions</u> that substitution will be difficult or impossible.

When Advertising is not <u>selling</u> goods (through Conviction), it is not doing as much as it <u>can</u> be <u>made</u> to do. So, any Advertiser who accepts mere "General Publicity" or "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People" for his money, when he might have had all <u>that</u> and a <u>positive</u> <u>selling</u> force combined with it, is losing <u>half</u> the results he might have had from the same Space filled with sound Reason-Why Advertising.

Chapter VII

"Why Some Advertisers grow Wealthy while other Fail!"

SIXTY PER CENT of all new Advertisers fail!

Largely because they spend their money for <u>Space</u>, under the delusion that Space filled with anything "Catchy" is "<u>Advertising</u>." They believe "Money Talks" in Advertising, even when it says nothing.

They forget that Space costs the same, whether we fill it with Pictured Nothings or with enduring Convictions.

And the difference, in <u>Results</u>, between two kinds of "copy," costing the same for space, in a single advertisement, has often exceeded 80 per cent, as authenticated Records on test cases prove.

General Advertisers, who have no means of tracing direct <u>results</u>, and who spend their money for "General Publicity", may smile at this. But, Mail-Order Advertisers <u>know</u> it is true. These are the kind of Advertisers to whom Advertising is not a blind <u>speculation</u>, but systematic eye-open <u>investment</u>.

Their records show the precise cost of <u>every</u> inquiry for their goods through advertising, because their every Advertisement in every Medium is separately keyed.

They can thus gauge <u>accurately</u> the relative <u>earning power</u> of each separate bit of copy published at their expense, and of each medium in which that copy has been inserted.

They thus <u>know</u> what kind to <u>avoid</u>, as well as what kind to use. Please note that the current definition of "General Publicity" is "Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People." When we speak of "General Advertising" we mean copy which <u>sells goods</u> through the Retailer. (Note that General Advertisers are NOT hereby "advised" to GO INTO MAIL-ORDER BUSINESS).

However, GENERAL ADVERTISNG should possess as much positive SELLING-FORCE and CONVICTION as it would NEED to actually and profitably SELL Goods direct BY MAIL.

Here is the actual experience of a well-known national Advertiser, who sells a \$5.00 article by mail only.

This Advertiser has proved that a certain fixed average per cent of his Inquiries convert into direct <u>sales</u> through his "follow-up" system.

Each equally good Inquiry is therefore worth a certain fixed price to him, which he can pay with profit.

One single piece of copy has been running for that Advertiser (practically <u>without change</u>), in all mediums used, for over six years. Over \$300,000 has been spent in <u>repeated</u> publication of that single bit of copy.

Why?

Because, it produced <u>results</u> (Inquiries and Sales) at lower cost than any other copy ever run for them in eight previous years. The first month Inquiries from the best prior copy cost about 85 cents each.

Repetition of <u>that</u> copy for two years wore out some of its interest, so that Inquiries from it finally cost an average of \$1.85 each. New "copy" had been tried a great many times during the two-year interval, written by many different Ad-smiths, but no other Advertisement ever produced the Inquiries at less than \$1.85 average.

Some of the copy that <u>looked</u> good enough to try, <u>cost</u> \$14.20 <u>per Inquiry</u>. And <u>that</u> was better <u>looking</u> copy than half of what fills "General Publicity" space in costly mediums <u>at this very minute</u>. Consider what the knowledge derived from a large collection of certified data, like the above, would mean, if placed at the disposal of General Advertisers who now "go it blind" on copy.

If the \$5.00 article had been sold through Retailers, in the usual way, without accurate means of checking <u>results</u> from every advertisement, it is more than probable that the \$14.20 kind of copy would have been used continuously.

Because, that was the "catch" kind, so much favour with "General Publicity" Advertisers. And, it would have been considered <u>good</u> copy so long as the <u>salesmen</u> did its work, in addition to their own, The <u>General Results</u> being credited in a <u>general</u> way to "General Publicity."

But, it would clearly have required <u>fourteen times as much</u> of that "\$14.20 kind" of alleged "Advertising" to produce the same amount of <u>selling effect</u> upon the public as the "85-cent kind" of copy (which averaged about \$1.00 per inquiry over the two years) actually <u>did</u> produce.

Let us figure this out more conclusively: The Blank Company spent \$75,000 per year, for space, with copy producing Inquiries at about \$1.00 average.

It would thus have cost them about fourteen times as much, or \$1,050,000 per year, to sell as many of their \$5.00 articles through the \$14.20 kind of "catchy" copy as it actually <u>did</u> cost them to sell the same quantity with the "\$1.00-per-Inquiry" kind of copy.

Good Reader, get that thought clearly into your mind, for we're talking cold facts now.

What was it worth to the Blank Company to get a <u>new</u> Advertisement which would pull Inquiries at the old rate of 85 cents each, when its most successful copy had worn out, after two years' use, so that Inquiries were finally costing it \$1.25 each on average?

Figure it out and you'll see that <u>one</u> single piece of such copy would be worth a third of their \$75,000 yearly appropriation, viz., Inquiries for their goods and resulting Sales.

But "Reason-Why" Copy did better than that, when applied, on test.

It reduced the cost of Inquiries, for the selfsame \$5.00 article, to <u>41 cents average</u>, during the first two years it had been running, (<u>It is still running</u>, <u>after six years' use</u>).

The earning power of every dollar <u>trebled</u> by the mere substitution of Reason-Why Copy for the <u>best</u> copy the Advertiser had used in eight years prior to that substitution.

An Advertising appropriation of\$75,000 made equal in <u>proven earning power</u> to what \$225,000 <u>would have</u> earned with the copy which preceded it, and which was producing Inquiries at \$1.25.

That single piece of Reason-Why copy, which ran practically <u>without change</u> for about four months, had in that time produced approximately 60,976 Inquiries. These were <u>worth</u> \$1.25 each to the Advertiser (or \$91,464 in all), though their cost was reduced to 41 cents each, with an actual outlay of about \$25,000.

In four months that one piece of copy had thus earned \$66.466 more, for the Advertiser, than the \$1.25 kind of Copy used immediately before it had produced from the same investment.

And, what <u>made</u> it pull Inquiries <u>by mail</u> is precisely what <u>would make</u> it produce Inquiries <u>verbally</u> for the goods through Retailers, by the use of intelligent <u>Reason-Why</u> and <u>Conviction</u> in the Copy.

This is only one of many actual instances that could be cited

Chapter VIII

Making Sure of Results from General Advertising

THE first tangible <u>Return</u> from the Advertiser's money, when invested in Space, (whether that Space be filled with "General Advertising" or with "Mail-Order Advertising,") Is an <u>Inquiry</u> for his goods.

That Inquiry may be <u>verbal</u> to a Clerk over the counter, or-it may be by <u>Mail</u>, in a written, stamped, and posted letter.

But, in either case, it is just an <u>Inquiry</u> for the goods, of one sort or another. It is the first practical evidence that the money spent is earning something tangible in return.

Now-it may take twice or three times as much <u>Conviction</u> in Copy to make a Consumer <u>write</u> an Inquiry for goods, and post it, as it would have taken to make that same Consumer inquire <u>verbally</u> for the goods advertised, when passing a store that should sell them.

But, when he does inquire <u>verbally</u> from a Retailer, there are twice or three times as many chances of <u>substitution</u>, of "Don't-keep-it" or "Here's-something-better," as there would have been if that same Consumer had written direct for it by Mail.

Therefore, the Advertisement which sends Consumers to Retailers, should be as full of Conviction as the successful Mail-Order Advertisement, in order to fortify that Consumer against substitution, "Don't-keep-it," and "Here's-something-better."

Because, if the Advertisement <u>fails</u> to thus <u>fortify</u> the Consumer with "Reason-Why" and conviction, it may simply send him to the Retail Store to be switched on to a <u>competing</u> line of goods with which the Retailer is heavily stocked, or which his Clerks favor the sale of in preference to ours.

In that case the Advertising <u>we pay for</u> would sell goods <u>for our non-advertising</u> competitors.

Half the money spent to "Keep-the-Name-before-the-People" results to-day in this <u>substitution</u> of non-advertised articles for the articles advertised through General Publicity.

"General Publicity" Copy, when tested, is found in almost every case <u>too Weak</u> to sell goods profitably by Mail. And, any copy which is not <u>strong</u> enough, or <u>convincing</u> enough, to <u>sell goods by mail</u>, is not strong enough to make the Consumer <u>resist substitution</u>, and the "Don't-keep-that-kind" influence of Retail conditions.

"General Advertising" copy, to succeed, profitably, must therefore cause not only a <u>verbal</u> Inquiry for the goods, but must also have enough strong <u>conviction</u> saturated into it to make the Consumer <u>insist</u> upon getting the goods he asks for, against probable substituting influence.

It must therefore give him better "Reason-why" he should buy <u>our</u> goods than he is likely to hear from the retail Salesman for the competing goods that Salesman may want to substitute.

And, it must give him these "reason-why" in such lucid thought-form that he can understand without effort, so impressively that he will believe our reasoning Claims. It must accomplish this in spite of his natural distrust of all Advertisement statements.

This means that we must put into General Advertising Copy the precise qualities that would be necessary to <u>sell goods</u> profitably <u>by mail</u>. More than half the people who <u>inquire</u> for Advertised goods <u>out of Curiosity</u> as a result of "General Publicity" ("Keeping-the-Name-before-the-People," etc.) do not <u>buy them</u> when they see them.

Because the <u>competing</u> goods <u>look</u> just as fine when shown and recommended by the Substituting Salesman. The Curiosity Inquiry having no firm <u>foundation</u> of "Reason-Why" under it cannot combat the personal influence of the Salesman.

This is why not more than a fourth of those who, out of mere <u>curiosity</u>, buy the <u>first</u> package, through "General Publicity," ever buy the second or third consecutive package of the same article. Because they do not buy on <u>Conviction</u>

Meantime, it usually takes about all the profit in the <u>first</u> purchase of any "Generally Advertised" article to pay the cost of introducing it to the Consumer's notice, through Advertising.

But, with "Reason-Why" Salesmanship-on-Paper, results are <u>insured</u> and far more cumulative. Because, a Consumer need only be convinced <u>once</u>, through "Reason-why" "Salesmanship-on-paper," that the article is what he should, for his own sake, buy and use.

When we thus convince him, we achieve more than fortifying him against substitution.

We also help his imagination to <u>find</u> and <u>recognize</u>, in the article advertised, the very qualities <u>claimed</u> and <u>proved</u> for it in the Copy. These qualities he might never have discovered for himself, nor appreciated if he had casually discovered them, in a mere "<u>Curiosity</u>" purchase.

Because, through General Publicity, his attention had only been "attracted," not <u>compelled</u> and enduringly <u>impressed</u> with a logical understanding of these qualities.

But, when once <u>convinced</u> in advance of purchase, through "Reason-Why" Salesmanship-in-Type, that the qualities <u>claimed</u> for the article <u>do</u> exist in them, he starts using that article with a mental acceptance of these qualities.

And, because he begins using the article with <u>an advance knowledge of</u>, and <u>belief in</u>, its good points, his appreciation becomes permanent if the goods merit it.

He therefore makes a <u>second</u>, <u>third</u>, and further consecutive purchases of the article as a result of having once read a <u>single</u> convincing "Reason-Why" advertisement about it.

This is where large and cumulative <u>profits</u> must come to the General Advertiser-on the second, third and <u>continued</u> purchases by Readers of the <u>first</u> advertisement that reached their Convictions.

These <u>conviction</u> qualities in copy are shown, by test, to be just as necessary in Advertising design to sell goods profitably today, <u>through Retailers</u> to Consumers, as they are to sell goods direct by mail to Consumers.

That is why <u>every</u> Advertisement for goods to be sold through Retailers (against substitution, and "Don't keep-it" influences), should have as much <u>positive selling force, "Reason-why" and conviction</u> in it, as would be necessary to sell the goods <u>by mail</u> direct to Consumers.

The difference in <u>Results</u> from Space in which this <u>direct selling</u> force of "Reason-Why" has been used, and in results from similar space filled with "General Publicity," is often more than 60 per cent. Conclusive <u>tests</u> on Copy have clearly proved this, and preceding article cites a vivid example of it from actual experience.

Any Advertiser who uses mere "General Publicity" when he might have all <u>that</u> and, in addition, a positive <u>Selling force</u> combined with it is losing 50 percent to 80 per cent of the <u>results</u> he might have had from the same identical appropriation.

Selling tests made on various kinds of Copy and Mediums have <u>proved</u> this for "Reason-Why" which is the Heart and Soul and Essence of all <u>good</u> Advertising.

Chapter IX

How Mail Order Advertising is Tested

CHOOSE a list of reliable Publications, for a representative month's advertising.

Run Current copy in <u>half</u> the number of these publications for that month. Key each advertisement, in each publication separately, so you will know just <u>which advertisement</u> and <u>which publication</u> each <u>Inquiry</u> results from.

Then, run Reason-Why Salesmanship-in-Type copy in the remaining half of the publications, keying each advertisement separately, in each publication so you will know which advertisement and which medium each Inquiry comes from.

By "keying" is meant that you change the reply address in each advertisement, and in each publication.

Thus, in Munsey's you say "Address 86 State St."; in Woman's World, "75 State St."; and in Wallaces' Farmer you say "6th floor 86 State St."; while in another you say "8th floor 75 State St.," for instance.

By arrangement with the Post Office all replies to these different addresses will be put into your Letter-box, regardless of street address on envelope.

Now, you can <u>tell</u> by the envelope address on each Reply or Inquiry <u>which</u> publication, and which particular piece of copy in that publication produced it.

Then, when the Inquiries from the competing advertisements cease coming, you can total up the number of Inquiries each publication produced from each particular <u>advertisement</u>.

Now, having the total number of Inquiries from each <u>individual</u> advertisement in each medium, you divide that number into the <u>cost of the Space</u> used for each piece of copy, in each publication.

This will give you the exact <u>cost</u>, per Inquiry, from <u>each</u> separate piece of copy, in <u>each</u> publication. The <u>cost</u> per Inquiry with your other <u>current</u> Copy may then be intelligently <u>compared</u> with the cost per Inquiry through Reason-Why Salesmanship-on-Paper.

Now, cross the copy for the second month's Advertising Test.

By this is meant, -insert your other current Copy, which appeared last month in Munsey's in this month's Wallaces' Farmer, for instance. And, the "Reason-Why" copy which appeared last month in Woman's World you now insert in Munsey's of this month. This gives a fair distribution of Mediums to each <u>competing</u> Advertisement.

When the Inquiries cease coming from this second month's insertion, make the same record as before of <u>Cost per Inquiry</u>, for <u>each</u> piece of competing copy from each publication.

Then, add the total number of Inquiries obtained from your other current Copy, during the same period. Then divide that total <u>number</u> into the total <u>expenditure</u> for Space used in publication of that Copy.

This will give the <u>average cost per Inquiry</u>, with the kind of copy you have been regularly using.

Now, compare <u>this</u> with the <u>average cost per Inquiry</u> obtained from the <u>same</u> publications, at the same identical periods, with "Reason-Why" results.

The <u>difference</u> between the <u>cost per Inquiry</u> with the two kinds of Copy will then be a reliable Index to the relative Earning Power of the two competing kinds of copy.

Now, use the same "Follow-up" (Booklets and Letters), on <u>all</u> the Inquiries from <u>both</u> Sources.

The percentage of <u>Sales</u> which results from each of the <u>two competitive</u> groups of Inquiries and Follow-up will then determine the relative Profits to the Advertiser <u>from each kind</u> of Copy.

No Test on earth can be more <u>conclusive</u> than this, and none is easier made. And, what such a Test <u>reveals</u> (in difference between Results from two different kinds of Copy) would "stagger" the average Advertiser.

An extensive series of such Tests, carried over a long period of Time, with many differing propositions, has proved a fine <u>consistency</u> in Results.

It proved that the Reason-Why <u>kind</u> of Advertising which <u>sold</u> Washing Machines <u>by mail</u> at <u>one-third</u> the cost of other copy sold them, would, when applied according to the individual needs of the different articles, also sell Violins, Shoes, or Pianos, in about the same ratio.

Moreover, it has been found that the "something" in Copy which sells these Goods by Mail (at one-half to one-third of the cost other Copy sells them), will also sell them through Retailers over the counter. That "something" is Selling force, -Conviction-Salesmanship-saturated into the Copy, with sound Reasons-Why as the foundation.

It is the salient "something" which makes millionaires of some Advertisers in a few years, while other Advertisers, spending the same amount of money for equally good propositions, "go broke."

Now the <u>kind</u> of Advertising which works these Miracles of Success may be the kind you personally <u>like</u> least, quite contrary to your preference in fact.

But, Advertising is not really intended to merely <u>please</u> the Advertiser's fancy. Its first, last and <u>only</u> duty is to <u>Sell Goods</u> for him, and to sell them at less cost than they can be sold without it.

The kind of Advertising which will be found to do this at lowest cost is Reason-Why Salesmanship-on-Paper. Which is based not on what you <u>like best to read</u> but on what records prove will sell the most Goods to Readers, per dollar of outlay.

Chapter X

How to Test Out General Advertising

SELECT two Cities of about the same population, in approximately the same climate, and with equally good newspapers.

St. Paul and Minneapolis are fair examples, -but scores of other equivalents can be named or chosen.

Check up carefully the quantity of the Advertised Goods in these two cities which the Retailers have on hand at a given date.

Then ask them to keep record (on a blank form you supply) of the goods in your advertised lines which they stock within the next four months.

Then, run in <u>one</u> of the two competitive cities the "General Publicity" you have already been using.

At the same time run in the <u>other</u> competitive city Reason-Why Salesmanship-on-Paper. Spend for each kind exactly the <u>same</u> appropriation, and make is sufficiently liberal to show some results on the second month.

Continue this <u>competitive</u> copy for four months, which is the minimum time on which General Advertising can be made to produce a fair measure of Results.

Then, on a certain day, send out enough men to <u>check up</u> the amount of the Advertised goods in the hands of each Retailer at the end of the four months.

Add to the total of goods on hand, at time of starting Test, the goods since stocked in each City.

Then subtract from this total the Advertised goods remaining on the Retailers' Shelves, in each City, at end of the four months' Advertising tests.

The <u>difference</u> between will show the quantity of your Advertised goods <u>actually sold</u> to Consumers, in each city, during the four months' period of actual selling test.

The difference between the Value of goods sold in each City during the test period will then be a reliable <u>index</u> to the relative <u>Selling Power</u> of the two Competing kinds of Advertising used.

Now, <u>cross</u> the copy in each City for four months longer. Use "Reason-Why" in the City where you previously used only current "General Publicity," and vice versa.

Check up the goods on hand at end of the second four months again, <u>as before</u>. When you find the <u>difference</u> in Sales (with the same expenditure for Advertising) to be <u>again</u> heavily in favor of the Reason-Why copy (as in the first four months), you will have made a

<u>Copy Test</u>, that may save you over 25% to 50% of you National appropriation <u>every year afterwards</u>.

This test may, at first sight, seem a lot of trouble to undertake. But, is not 25% per annum of your Advertising Appropriation worth that trouble?

And, what is it worth to know conclusively for all time, the relative value of "General Publicity" As actually compared with Reason-Why advertising in a downright Selling Test?

A difference of 66 per cent between two such kinds of Copy on equivalent tests has often been <u>proved</u>.

Isn't <u>that</u> a sufficient difference to make you sit up and think hard about <u>what fills the Space</u> you pay for monthly?