Advertising's Role in Capitalist Markets: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go from Here?

GERARD J. TELLIS
Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
tellis@marshall.usc.edu

Advertising is a rich, multidimensional phenomenon that has been studied in several disciplines. This research has led to an emerging body of findings and some potential generalizations. Even then, misconceptions about advertising persist, and important aspects of the phenomenon have not been adequately researched. Despite advertising's apparent weakness it is essential for free markets.

INTRODUCTION

Advertising is one of the most fascinating phenomena in modern capitalist markets. It is pervasive, perplexing, multidimensional, and unfathomably rich. It is seemingly simple, yet full of paradoxes. Lay people and some experts assume they understand well how advertising works. Yet their simple conclusions may be quite wrong. Decades of research seem to have led to some generalizations. Yet even experts strongly disagree about the meaning and implications of this research. Most importantly, advertising is one business activity that religious leaders decry as amoral, economists analyze as capitalist excess, sociologists dismiss as corruptive, and politicians tolerate as a nuisance. Perhaps none of these groups fully appreciates that advertising is an essential force in capitalist markets, the lubricant of competition, the vehicle for the communication of innovation, and the corollary of a fundamental right of all peoples, free speech. This article summarizes what we know about advertising that disproves many current assumptions and suggests many urgent areas of future research.

WHAT WE KNOW

Both lay people and some experts continue to hold misconceptions about advertising's role in contemporary markets. Here are some assertions about advertising that one often encounters:

1. Advertising is a powerful force in shaping consumer preferences.
2. Even if advertising does not work immediately, repetition will ensure its ultimate effectiveness.
3. Advertisements take time to wearin.
4. The effects of advertising last for years and even decades.
5. Even if advertising seems ineffective, stopping it could be dangerous.
6. Weight (or intensity or frequency) is critical.
7. Advertising is highly profitable.
8. Logic or argument is the most effective advertising appeal.
9. Advertising is amoral in its practice, corrupts people's values, or is unnecessary for free markets.

Each year, when I begin my class on advertising, I poll students about their agreement with these claims. A majority of students agree with a majority of these claims. I suspect that if I ran this poll among lay people, most would agree with most. Various experts have strong opinions about these claims, depending on their training and exposure to various literature on advertising. At least some experts strongly subscribe to some if not many of these claims. However, I propose that all these premises are false. I have made this point in many articles and a couple of books, most recently in Tellis (2004). Let me try to clarify why or how these claims are false.

1. Some advertisements or some advertising campaigns are very powerful. Many of us have our

The author thanks Bob Woodard for triggering reflection on this topic and Cheryl Tellis for comments on an earlier draft. This article draws from the evidence in the authors' recent book, Effective Advertising *(Sage, 2004) and presents ideas from his forthcoming book,* Handbook of Advertising *(Sage, 2005).*

DOI: 10.1017/S002184990505018X

Advertising is one of the most fascinating phenomena in modern capitalist markets. It is pervasive, perplexing, multidimensional, and unfathomably rich.

favorite ones. For example, students cite the following advertisements as highly effective: the advertisement for Victoria's Secret in the 1993 Super Bowl that sent millions of people to their website in the first few minutes; the George Bush, Sr. advertisements that destroyed the Dukakis presidential campaign; the introductory campaign for Altoids that propelled this U.K. brand to prominence in the U.S. market. However, when these and many other successes are averaged over billions of dollars of mundane advertising that saturate our media and permeate our lives, the mean effectiveness drops substantially. [Estimated advertising elasticities average between 0.05 and 0.1, one-twentieth of corresponding price elasticities (Sethuraman and Tellis, 1991; Tellis, 1989).] Indeed, if we were to respond immediately to every advertisement we saw, our lives would be a whirlwind of consumption that would be quite unsustainable, even for a few days! It's not that advertising does not have the potential to be powerful. It's that much advertising gets lost in the noise of competing brands, or what is worse, merely adds to the noise. Every creative artist probably hopes to build a winning blockbuster advertisement. Only a few succeed. And these successes are quickly imitated so their edge is dulled. This is the nature of a free, competitive market.

2. When advertisements do not work right away, advertisers tend to excuse the nonresponsive rather than pull the advertisement. The easy excuse for nonresponse is that consumers have not seen the advertisement or need time to think about it and respond to it. When an advertiser and its agency have spent months testing and creating an advertisement, it is tough to call it a failure. So, the tendency is to spend a little more money to see if repetition might not achieve the elusive effectiveness. This is a problem that decision analysts in other contexts call entrenchment bias, self-involvement bias, or escalation of commitment. But research shows that if advertising does not work in the reasonably short time (first few weeks), it is unlikely to ever work (Lodish et al., 1995).
3. *Wearin* is the improvement in effectiveness of advertising during the first few weeks of a campaign. *Wearout* is the decline in effectiveness as a campaign ages. While many people assume an advertisement needs to wearin, research suggests that wearin is short or nonexistent and wearout starts right away (Vakratsas and Ambler, 1999). That is, advertisers should be planning how briefly to wait before they pull a campaign, rather than how long to wait for peak effectiveness (e.g., Tellis, Chandy, and Thaivanich, 2000). So, the truth about wearin parallels the truth about repetition in the previous paragraph.
4. The belief that the effects of advertising last years or decades comes from two misconceptions. First, we sometimes remember very old advertising slogans (e.g., AT&T's "reach out and touch someone" or EF Hutton's "When EF Hutton speaks, people listen."). But the futility of memory is evident in that one of these brands is in trouble while the other is dead. Second, economists at one time estimated the effects of advertising with Koyck-type models using (inappropriate) annual data. What they found was the effects of advertising likewise lasted years or decades. The error came from the inappropriate choice of aggregate data (Clarke, 1976). The most appropriate data for analysis of advertising's effectiveness is the unit interval time, which is often in days or hours (Tellis and Franses, forthcoming). As modern researchers have used more refined disaggregate data, they found the effects of advertising were rather fleeting (e.g., Tellis, Chandy, and Thaivanich, 2000; Tellis and Weiss, 1995). Indeed, of the hundreds of advertisements we see each day, how many can we recall and to how many do we really respond?
5. Even when researchers show advertisers or their agencies that their advertising campaign seems ineffective, the latter may be loathe to suspend all advertising (e.g., Eastlack and Rao, 1989). Managers may argue that while current advertising is ineffective, suspension could be disastrous. Alternatively, they may argue that suspension would mean that consumers would be exposed to only the competitors' ad-

Every creative artist probably hopes to build a winning blockbuster advertisement. Only a few succeed.

vertisements, which would then be highly effective. However, before one concludes that advertising is ineffective, one should carefully design a test, one that it takes into account sufficiently long periods of nonresponse, sufficiently deep cuts in advertising, and sufficient exposure to rival brands' advertising. If these tests are well done and advertising still seems ineffective, then managers should have no excuse for not following their implications.

6. By weight, advertisers mean the level of advertising or advertising intensity. The most expensive item in the advertising budget is the media buy expressed as weight. Thus, much research attention, especially of econometric analyses of market data, has focused on testing the effectiveness of the advertising weight, measured in dollars, gross rating points, frequency, or exposures. Yet, research shows that weight per se is not the most important factor in advertising effectiveness. Big changes in weight may not result in even small changes in effectiveness. However, *changes* in target segments, media, message, and especially creative content result in the biggest change in advertising's effects (e.g., Lodish et al., 1995). Thus, managers should plan on developing or adopting new media, segments, message, or content rather than on increasing weight alone. Most importantly, advertising response is highest for product improvement or new products.
7. The misconception that advertising is highly profitable might come from observing the spurious correlation between advertising intensity and market share. The reality might be quite different. Because of the competitive activity, much advertising cancels out. In addition, in competitive scenarios, competitors tend to get caught up in advertising rivalry. As a result, they could overadvertise (Aaker and Carmen, 1982). These or any of the other misconceptions above may lead advertisers to not only indulge in unprofitable advertising but also to add to their costs more than they do their profits.
8. Consumers like to think of themselves as rational decision makers who make good if not wise decisions. They like to think that they respond to reason. As such, they probably believe that advertisements that are simple, clear, and informative would be the most effective. Such advertisements are called logical or informative and use argument appeals. The reality is different. Emotional advertisements are probably the most effective. The reason is that emotional advertisements are more interesting, more easily remembered, more prone to lead to action, and less likely to arouse consumers' defenses than are argument advertisements (Deighton and Hoch, 1993; Deighton, Romer, and McQueen, 1989; Tellis, 2004). An analogy is the courtroom. Lay people assume that lawyers argue and juries decide on logic. In reality, emotions play a big and critical part in swaying juries.
9. Because of all these limitations in the effectiveness of advertising, it has little effect on consumers' values and may be the corruptive force that critics believe it is. However, despite these limitations in effectiveness, advertising is essential for free markets. Advertising is the means by which an innovative firm can communicate its brand's competitive superiority to consumers. Real competitive superiority occurs rarely, though in the present technological age, at increasing frequency (Golder and Tellis, 2004; Sood and Tellis, 2005). Innovators need advertising to persuade consumers of this superiority. However, media are very noisy. Communication is very tough. Consumers are creatures of habit and do not change easily. And when they do switch to the superior brand, competitors jump in with copycat products and imitation advertisements. So the competitive advantage is not permanent. In the current environment, the advantage may be fleeting. However, advertising provides the means to persuade consumers of change. It is essential to communicate a product's advantage. It is the lubricant of competition. It is essential for free markets.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE

We know quite a bit about advertising. But advertising is a rich phenomenon. There is a lot that we still do not know. At least five areas are ripe for the discovery of new findings or for the integration of findings into generalizations or advertising's effect on mental processes, advertising's effect on sales or market share, advertising versus sales promotion, advertising and pricing, and advertising and brand equity.

Advertising's effect on mental processes

In the last 40 years, there has been an explosion of research on the effects of advertising respondent characteristics on respondents' mental processes, such as attention, attitude to the advertisement, attitude to the brand, recall, warmth, persuasion, purchase intention, etc. (e.g., Stewart and Koslow, 1989). Such research has increased since the integrative reviews by MacInnis and Jaworski (1989) and Vakratsas and Ambler (1999). Most of these studies have been experimental, generally using student subjects. The findings from this body of research are quite large and disparate. Indeed, a survey of this research would indicate that the path by which advertising works is rich, varied, and com-

. . . advertising provides the means to persuade consumers of change. It is essential to communicate a product's advantage. It is the lubricant of competition. It is essential for free markets.

plex. The discovery of simple principles or potential generalizations would certainly be of help to managers and future researchers. I would venture to propose some potential generalizations, though these need to be validated and others may be more viable.

One potential generalization that emerges is that there are multiple routes to persuasion. These routes can be broadly classified as either active central processing involving argument and logic, or passive peripheral processing that relies on cues (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986). Various types of visual imagery, music, and emotions could be more important in the latter route than the former. Moreover the latter route of persuasion seems to dominate the advertising media, partly because of the heavy load of competitive advertising and the recipient's limited time. Another potential generalization is that emotional appeals may be more powerful than argument appeals (e.g., Chandy, Tellis, MacInnis, and Thaivanich, 2001; MacInnis, Rao, and Weiss, 2002). 1 Such appeals could vary in intensity, explicitness, and integration with arguments (Deighton, Romer, and McQueen, 1989). A third potential generalization is that consistency among product, price, brand image, appeal, various cues, message, and the respondent's state enhances persuasion.

Recent focus in this field of research has been on ascertaining contingent or interactive effects of advertising among the consumers' states, the advertisement's message, the advertisement's imagery, and the type of product. We need to address three repeated criticisms of this body of research.

First, critics have asked whether researchers should pursue second, third, and fourth order interactions in experimental situations when field researchers have had difficulty finding the main effects of advertising in the market. The answer may well be, precisely so! The heavy use of advertising by competitors dulls the advantage of standard advertising methods. This fact and the complex ways in which advertising works increases the need for managers to use advertising in precisely the manner and mode in which it is most effective. In competitive scenarios, advertising's advantage may be subtle. Experimental research points the way to take advantage of these subtleties.

Second, critics have assailed the use of student subjects and laboratory settings for most experimental research. Such research is inexpensive and convenient. However, managers cannot assess the validity of research that is done solely in the lab. Moreover, researchers cannot translate findings from the lab to meaningful effects in real markets. Some findings in lab settings may be trivial and some quite important. But when tested only in lab settings, the implications for the field remain unknown. While lab research remains an inexpensive means for testing various theories of advertising and generating a rich body of hypotheses, exclusive research in the lab limits its practical relevance.

Third, the large number of findings from experimental research increases the need for an integrative survey that can unambiguously point to what is known from this body of research and what needs to be known. More importantly, the field of lab research has adopted the paradigm from psychology that seeks counterintuitive results rather integrative commonalities. As a result, the field of lab research is diverging rather than converging in the variety of effects it has identified. This situation increases the need for an integrative framework that can pull together all the experimental findings into a unified whole explainable by a single theory.

Advertising's effect on sales and market share

A large body of research has focused on the effects of advertising on sales or market share, using market or field data. This body of research has been highly paradigmatic, usually adopting econometric models to analyze the effects of advertising. The many studies and the vast number of models have enabled researchers to carry out several meta-analyses of findings (e.g., Assmus, Farley, and Lehmann, 1984; Clarke, 1976; Lodish et al., 1995; Tellis and Sethuraman, 1991). 4 Many of the premises stated in the previous section of this article come from these reviews. A detail list of findings is available in Tellis (2004). While fruitful, this body of research suffers from two major limitations.

First, most of the primary studies have used fairly aggregate data. Clarke (1976) among others has shown convincingly that data aggregation upwardly biases the effects of advertising. Clarke assumed that the appropriate data interval was the interpurchase time, and subsequent researchers have embraced his assumption. However, a recent study proves that the appropriate data interval is the unit-exposure time (Tellis and Franses, forthcoming). The unit-exposure time is the largest data interval in which advertising occurs at most once and at the same time in that interval. For TV advertising, this interval could well be the hour or the minute. Intuitively, much behavioral research suggests that consumers respond to advertisements in microintervals, that is, minutes or hours in which they are exposed. Fortunately, new electronic data today allow analyses at these refined intervals. Unfortunately, past research has mostly used aggregate data, with potentially upwardly biased estimates of the effects of advertising. Thus, future research needs to evaluate the effects of advertising using disaggregate data.

Second, most of the econometric studies have estimated the effects on sales or market share of advertising measured in crude terms such as dollars or gross ratings points. Such research focuses our attention on weight. Yet the major effects of advertising probably come from changes in content, message, cues, and creativity, most of which is ignored in econometric studies. Indeed, the econometric paradigm of research on advertising discussed in this subsection and the behavioral paradigm discussed in the previous subsection have proceeded largely independently of each other. The challenge to researchers is to join these two traditions of research. In so doing, researchers can unravel a deep, comprehensive, and insightful picture of how advertising really works (e.g., Chandy, Tellis, MacInnis, and Thaivanich, 2001; MacInnis, Rao, and Weiss, 2002). 2

Advertising versus sales promotion

Over the last 20 years, sales promotions have won an increasing share of the promotional budget at the cost of media advertising (e.g., Tellis, 1998). This shift in expenditures has been motivated by the findings that sales promotions give immediate and strong increases in sales while the advertising's effects on sales are small, often delayed, and difficult to ascertain. The expenditure shift has triggered one of the biggest debates in the field of advertising: whether and when firms should invest in advertising versus sales promotion. Sales promotion agencies assert that the proof of the pudding is in the sales response. Advertising agencies typically take the view that sales promotions increase short-term sales at the cost of long-term loyalty. However, only a few studies have supported the latter premise (e.g., Mela, Gupta, and Lehmann, 1997). 5

The debate misses the point. The real issue is not whether advertising or sales promotion is more important. Both are important. Indeed, the use of both jointly probably increases the impact of each, due to their interactive effect when used jointly (Tellis, 1998). For example, advertising can increase the salience or desirability of promoted brands. Moreover, retailers who see a brand's advertising may pass on more of the brand's trade promotions to consumers as consumer promotions. Similarly, brands purchased on promotion may make users more alert to advertisements from those brands. Alternatively, advertising can help interpret the experience of brands purchased on promotions (Hoch and Ha, 1986). All these 6 effects underscore the importance of the joint use of advertising and sales promotion. The issue is not which of the two to use but how to balance the two creatively and effectively. Unfortunately, research along these lines is currently sparse. Thus, the topic is in need of future research.

The debate about advertising versus sales promotion also misses a deeper point about sales promotion. To explain this point, consider that the competitive price is the price at which the product sells under free competition (when price costs equals cost plus fair profit). Many reporters assume that the list price of the brand is the competitive price, so that marketers who give discounts off the list price are cheapening their brand image. However, I have argued that the discount price may well be the competitive price or at least the competitive price may lie between the list and discount prices (Tellis, 1986). The list price is the price that has been raised over the competitive price to enhance brand image, or make the discount price look attractive, or exploit surplus from wealthy or uninformed consumers who are not interested in finding out the true (discount price) of the product. In this context, sales promotions are not a giveaway. They are a clever means for extracting consumer surplus.

Advertising and pricing

Interest in the relationship between advertising and pricing has been far higher in economics than in the fields of advertising or marketing. Economic research has pursued whether advertising brands are higher priced, whether advertising reduces price elasticity, and whether advertising encourages niche marketing of premium-priced brands. However, the findings in this field have been limited by fairly old studies, often with aggregate data, and with very strong priors about what should be found. Research and reviews of research in marketing suggest that the results are contingent on a few factors: informativeness of advertising, content of advertising, and focus on advertising (Farris and Albion, 1980; Kaul and Wittink, 1995). 7

First, advertisements that provide information about longitudinal price cuts or lower competitive prices may well help to lower prices among competing brands or increase consumers' price elasticity. The reverse could well hold for advertisements that differentiate brands (Farris and

Albion, 1980; Kaul and Wittink, 1995; Sethuraman and Tellis, 1991). Second, retail advertisements that promote availability or sales promotions could help to increase retail price competition and lower retail prices or increase consumers' retail price elasticity (Farris and Albion, 1980; Sethuraman and Tellis, 2002). Manufacturer advertising that focuses on brand uniqueness or superiority relative to competitors could help to sustain high prices or reduce price elasticity (Kaul and Wittink, 1995). Third, mass advertising of new products or new-product categories that are taking off could encourage mass adoptions by consumers and enable firms to exploit economies of scale and lower costs (Golder and Tellis, 1997; Stremersch and Tellis, 2004; Tellis, Stremersch, and Yin, 2003). Similarly, comparative advertising among mature brands could lead to lower brand prices or increased consumers' price elasticity. Fourth, manufacturer advertising could trigger interretailer competition as retailers compete to advertise and promote the brand (Steiner, 1973, 1993; Tellis, 1998). This effect could in turn lead to a lowering of retail prices but an increase in manufacturing prices. Thus, generalizations in this area are not obvious nor as simple as assumed in some of the economic literature. The rich effects of advertising in this area warrant much greater research by academics than has taken place so far.

Advertising and brand equity

An important and hot topic today is the impact of advertising on brand equity. This interest is probably triggered by the finding that the book value of firms accounts for an ever smaller fraction of their market value. Financial analysts point out that the difference could be due to the technical and managerial expertise of the firm, the synergy of its various components, or the value in its brand name. Marketers are quick to assert that the gap is due primarily to the value of the brand name. But from where does this value originate? Several researchers have sought to link this value to advertising. The route they have adopted is to analyze annual data of aggregate corporate advertising, R&D expenditures, and market returns (e.g., Ailawadi, Lehmann, and Neslin, 2003; Mizik and Jacobsen, 2003; Simon and Sullivan, 1993). Studies have shown significant effects between advertising and stock market returns (e.g., Agrawal and Kamakura, 1995). While such effects show the importance of advertising to the financial community in terms they understand, the findings still leave a number of important questions unanswered.

First, assume advertising helps to build brand equity. Studies that have showed this effect in real markets have been at the macro level. That is, they have used aggregate brand entities, aggregate data, and aggregate time periods. As such, the natural question is: what is the micro process through which such aggregate relationships occur? This issue is important because managers need to know how exactly advertising builds brand equity over the years, so that they may efficiently invest the huge expenditures in advertising. This question brings us back full circle to the issues addressed earlier in this article. It is imperative that researchers show how advertising works at the micro level; that is, show how advertising affects mental processes, sales, long-term loyalty, and prices. Then it is imperative that researchers show how all these effects translate into the establishment of brand names and the building up of brand equity. In effect a resolution of this puzzle requires that researcher show the link between the micro processes and the macro relationships. Currently research is fragmented. We have abundant research in some of the micro linkages, limited research in some of the macro relationships, but no research linking the micro stages with the macro stages.

Second, a number of variables besides advertising are good candidates for being drivers of brand equity. Among these, we should mention, a firms' reputation for quality, a firm's reputation for innovation, consumers' long-term loyalty for the brand, and a firms' shrewd market segmentation and brand positioning. What role does advertising play among all these variables? To appreciate this point, we should consider the role of advertising in the development of three brand names: Absolut, Intel, and Samsung.

Absolut Vodka grew from an unknown brand in the United States to one of the major hard liquor brands over a period of some 20 years. After careful consideration of the history, I tend to conclude that advertising played a critical role. Yet all my prior assertions of adverting are true. The elasticity of advertising to sales for Absolut Vodka is quite small; that is, big increases in advertising expenditures led to small increase in sales (e.g., Tellis, 2005). When aggregated over 20 years and accompanied with massive advertising, the Absolut campaign led to the development of a substantial market share and a well-recognized brand name. At the same time, the advertising expenditures per se would have been mute if not accompanied by unusually and sustained creative copy. The advertising campaign adopted consistent repetition of the brand name, tag line, and advertising appeal, yet maintained novelty in its use of an ever-changing execution. It was weak in argument but strong in cues. It was poor in logic but rich in humor and imagery. Third, combination of pricing, segmentation, and positioning targeted the brand to a segment that was most responsive to the unique genre of advertising appeals. In conclusion, advertising intensity was important, but advertising creative was

. . . advertising intensity was important, but advertising creative was critical, and segmentation, positioning, and pricing were necessary to create the winning campaign.

critical, and segmentation, positioning, and pricing were necessary to create the winning campaign.

Intel grew from a new brand in the 1970s to be one of the largest firms in terms of capitalization at the peak of the internet boom in 2000. In the 1990s, it ran a major advertising campaign, "intel inside," which is credited for transforming a popular branded product, the personal computer, into a commodity, while transforming an unknown component, the microprocessor, into a recognized and desired product. This is one of the greatest transfers of wealth and power from retailers and competitors to a manufacturer in the history of advertising. However, this simple assertion ignores several other factors that may have been equally or more responsible than advertising for Intel's success (Tellis and Golder, 2001). First, Intel's innovation created the microprocessor industry. Second, through relentless innovation it stayed one step ahead of its nearest rival, AMD. Third, through patents and economies of scale, it held a near monopoly in this market. Fourth, the advertising strategy triggered massive cooperative advertising by dealers, whose advertising was subsidized if it included the "intel inside" logo in their advertisements. Fifth, advertising probably led OEMs to include the Intel chip as much or more so than it led consumers to demand the chip. Finally, some analysts claim that even without the advertising campaign, Intel's superiority in quality, innovation, and price would have guaranteed its sales and market share. So, while advertising may have played an important role in developing Intel's brand equity, advertising analysts have not closed the argument with compelling scientific evidence.

Samsung has shot up from an image of being a relatively lowly supplier of low-priced electronic products of mediocre quality to an image of being a prestigious high quality, highly innovative brand. In the 1990s, Samsung made a concerted effort through modern marketing and heavy advertising to develop the latter image. It seems to have succeeded quite well, providing strong testament to the power of advertising. It seems to have succeeded so well, that even Intel, which itself had a pretty good brand story to tell, hired Samsung's director of marketing. However, this simple story ignores some major facts. The electronic industry is a highly competitive, fast-changing industry, where leadership is never secure. To achieve its current position in the industry, Samsung launched a massive internal effort to produce products of the highest quality in the market and at the forefront of innovation. For example, Samsung has surpassed long-term innovative star, Sony, as a manufacturer of state-of-the-art displays and threatens long-term industry leader, Nokia, as a supplier of state-of-the-art cell phones. In Samsung's case, just as for Intel, advertising probably played a critical role. But it did not succeed in a vacuum. Innovation and quality control are important components of the puzzle. Advertising analysts have still not carried out formal econometric analyses of the role of advertising in building brand equity in such complex but realistic scenarios.

More often than not, advertisers find themselves in the shoes of the American auto firms: They have to advertise products, of former reputed brands, which are currently just a step behind the market leader in quality, features, or innovativeness. Massive advertising expenditures do not do much in terms of sales, brand image, or brand equity. Such advertising may get a bum rap and may merely add to the noise in the market. Advertising's failure to move sales leads these firms to resort to massive sales promotions. Then analysts bemoan the misplaced effort on sales promotion rather than on advertising. The weakness is not the advertising or the overemphasis in sales promotion. The weakness is in quality, innovation, and value. Managers must not use advertising bandages over deep strategy wounds. But some advertising agencies and advertisers attempt to do so, adding to the misperception of advertising's role in capitalist markets.

. . . while advertising may have played an important role in developing Intel's brand equity, advertising analysts have not closed the argument with compelling scientific evidence.

CONCLUSION

Research on advertising started almost as far back as mass advertising—that is, around the second half of the 19th century. Since then, we are fortunate to have accumulated a great body of findings. It's not that we do not know much about advertising. Rather, it's that many lay people and some experts hold on to erroneous priors without an adequate appreciation of the whole body of research. Also, many experts disagree about the implications of some of these findings and the best path of future research.

This article attempts to summarize the key findings about advertising in the realm of its effectiveness. As is typical of most disciplines (Kuhn, 1996), the strongest evidence comes from certain narrow paradigms of research. While these findings are useful and can form the basis for potential generalizations, the paradigmatic nature of the research yields pockets of knowledge amidst fields of unknown. I hope this article will motivate researchers to agree on the major findings, attempt to build generalizations, and focuses their efforts on the exciting opportunities for discovering the unknown. JAR

Gerard J. Tellis (Ph.D., University of Michigan) is professor of marketing, Neely Chair of American Enterprise, and director of the Center for Global Innovation, at the Marshall School of Business, the University of Southern California, Los Angeles. He has been visiting chair of marketing, strategy, and innovation at the Judge Institute of Management, Cambridge University, United Kingdom; a distinguished visitor, Erasmus University, Rotterdam; and sales development manager for Johnson & Johnson. Prof. Tellis specializes in the areas of advertising, promotion, pricing, global innovation, market entry, new-product quality, and growth. He has published over 70 articles and books on these topics (see http://www-rcf.usc.edu/~tellis/publicat.htm). His articles have won numerous awards, including four of the most prestigious awards in the field of marketing: the Frank M. Bass, William F. Odell, Harold D. Maynard (twice), and AMA-Berry awards. He has published two books on advertising that have been translated into four languages worldwide. Prof. Tellis consults with major multinational corporations and has been on the editorial review boards of the *Journal of Marketing Research*, the *Journal of Marketing*, and *Marketing Science* for several years.

REFERENCES

Aaker, David A., and James M. Carman. "Are You Over Advertising?" *Journal of Advertising Research* 22, 4 (1982): 57–70.

Agrawal, Jagdish, and Wagner A. Kamakura. "The Economic Worth of Celebrity Endorsers: An Event Study Analysis." *Journal of Marketing* 59, 3 (1995): 56–62.

Ailawadi, Kusum L., Donald R. Lehmann, and Scott A. Neslin. "Revenue Premium as an Outcome Measure of Brand Equity." *Journal of Marketing* 67, 4 (2003): 1–17.

Assmus, Gert, John U. Farley, and Donald R. Lehmann. "How Advertising Affects Sales: Meta-Analysis of Econometric Results." *Journal of Marketing Research* 21, 1 (1984): 65–74.

Chandy, Rajesh, Gerard J. Tellis, Debbie MacInnis, and Pattana Thaivanich. "What to Say When: Advertising Appeals in Evolving Markets." *Journal of Marketing Research* 38, 4 (2001): 399–414.

Clarke, Darral G. "Econometric Measurement of the Duration of Advertising Effect on Sales." *Journal of Marketing Research* 13 (1976): 345–57. 10

Deighton, John, and Stephen J. Hoch. "Teaching Emotion with Drama Advertising." In *Advertising Exposure, Memory, and Choice*, Andrew A. Mitchell, ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1993.

———, Daniel Romer, and Josh McQueen. "Using Drama to Persuade." *Journal of Consumer Research* 16, 3 (1989): 335–43.

Eastlack, Joseph O., Jr., and Ambar G. Rao. "Advertising Experiments at the Campbell Soup Company." *Marketing Science* 8, 1 (1989): 57–71.

Farris, Paul W., and Mark S. Albion. "The Impact of Advertising on the Price of Consumer Products." *Journal of Marketing* 44, 3 (1980): 17–35.

Golder, Peter N., and Gerard J. Tellis. "Will It Ever Fly? Modeling the Takeoff of New Consumer Durables." *Marketing Science* 16, 3 (1997): 256–70.

———, and ———. "Going, Going, Gone: Cascades, Diffusion, and Turning Points of the Product Life Cycle." *Marketing Science* 23, 2 (2004): 180–91.

Hoch, Stephen J., and Young-Won Ha. "Consumer Learning: Advertising and the Ambiguity of Product Experience." *Journal of Consumer Research* 13, 2 (1986): 221–33.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Lodish, Leonard M., M. Abraham, S. Kalmensen, J. Livelsberger, B. Lubetikin, B. Richardson, and M. Stevens. "How T.V. Advertising Works: A Meta-Analysis of 389 Real World Split Cable T.V. Advertising Experiments." *Journal of Marketing Research* 32, 2 (1995): 125–39.

MacInnis, Deborah J., and Bernard J. Jaworski. "Information Processing from Advertisements: Toward an Integrated Framework." *Journal of Marketing* 53, 4 (1989): 1–23.

———, Ambar G. Rao, and Allen M. Weiss. "Assessing When Increased Media Weight of

Real-World Advertisements Helps Sales." *Journal of Marketing Research* 39, 4 (2002): 391–407.

Mela, Carl F., Sunil Gupta, and Donald R. Lehmann. "The Long-Term Impact of Promotion and Advertising on Consumer Brand Choice." *Journal of Marketing Research* 34, 2 (1997): 248–61.

Mizik, Natalie, and Robert Jacobson. "Trading Off between Value Creation and Value Appropriation: The Financial Implication of Shifts in Strategic Emphasis." *Journal of Marketing* 67, 1 (2003): 63–75.

Petty, Richard E., and John T. Cacioppo. *Communication and Persuasion*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1986.

Sethuraman, Raj, and Gerard J. Tellis. "An Analysis of the Tradeoff between Advertising and Pricing." *Journal of Marketing Research* 31, 2 (1991): 160–74.

———, and ———. "Does Manufacturer Advertising Suppress or Stimulate Retail Price Promotion? Analytical Model and Empirical Analysis." *Journal of Retailing* 78, 4 (2002): 253–63.

Simon, Carol J., and Mary W. Sullivan. "The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity: A Financial Approach." *Marketing Science* 12, 1 (1993): 28–52.

Sood, Ashish, and Gerard J. Tellis. "Technological Evolution and Radical Innovations." *Journal of Marketing* 69, 3 (2005): 152–68.

Steiner, R. L. "Does Advertising Lower Consumer Prices?" *Journal of Marketing* 37, 4 (1973): 19–26.

———. "The Inverse Association Between the Margins of Manufacturer and Retailers." *Review of Industrial Organization* 8 (1993): 717–40. 11

Stewart, David W., and Scott Koslow. "Executional Factors and Advertising Effectiveness." *Journal of Advertising* 18, 3 (1989): 21–32.

Stremersch, Stefan, and Gerard J. Tellis. "Managing International Growth of New Products." *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 21, 4 (2004): 421–38.

Tellis, Gerard J. "Beyond the Many Faces of Price: An Integration of Pricing Strategies." *Journal of Marketing* 50, 4 (1986): 146–60.

———. "Advertising Exposure, Loyalty and Brand Purchase: A Two Stage Model of Choice." *Journal of Marketing Research* 15, 2 (1988): 134–44. 9

———. "Interpreting Advertising and Price Elasticities." *Journal of Advertising Research* 29, 4 (1989): 40–43.

———. *Advertising and Sales Promotion Strategy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1998.

———. *Will and Vision: How Latecomers Grow to Dominate Markets*. New York: McGraw Hill, 2001.

———. *Effective Advertising: How, When, and Why Advertising Works*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004.

———. "Absolut Success," teaching case developed for class room discussion, Marshall School of Business, University of California, Los Angeles, 2005.

———, Rajesh Chandy, and Pattana Thaivanich. "Decomposing the Effects of Direct Advertising: Which Brand Works, When, Where, and How Long?" *Journal of Marketing Research* 37, 1 (2000): 32–46.

———, and Philip Hans Franses. "The Optimal Data Interval for Econometric Models of Advertising." *Marketing Science* (forthcoming).

———, Stefan Stremersch, and Eden Yin. "The International Takeoff of New Products: Economics, Culture and Country Innovativeness." *Marketing Science* 22, 2 (2003): 161–87.

———, and Doyle Weiss. "Does TV Advertising Really Affect Sales?" *Journal of Advertising* 24, 3 (1995): 1–12.

Vakratsas, Demetrios, and Tim Ambler. "How Advertising Works: What Do We Really Know?" *Journal of Marketing* 63, 1 (1999): 26–43.