REASONS RETAIL MERCHANTS IN TOPEKA, KANSAS, GIVE FOR ADVERTISING OR REFUSING TO ADVERTISE VIA RADIO AND VIA TELEVISION

by

DANIEL BURK HURLEY

B. S., Kansas State College
of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1952

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1956

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The idea of the exchange of goods and services from one person to another is as ancient as man himself. This exchange has passed in subsequent historical ages through many changes. From the individual craftsman at home, exchange moved into small shops under guild groups and finally, in our time, to tremendous world wide enterprises.

As the exchange, or marketing, of goods increased in size and scope, so did the practice of competition. As the craftsman became more proficient in his labors, he found it difficult to market his larger number of products. It was at this juncture in marketing that advertising was born.

Advertising has had a growth paralleling that of marketing and, today, has a place of its own in world economy. Advertising includes those activities by which visual or oral messages are addressed to the public for the purpose of informing it, and influencing it either to buy merchandise or service or to act or be inclined favorably toward ideas, institutions, or persons featured. Advertising messages are identified with the advertiser, either by signature or by oral statement. Advertising is a commercial transaction involving pay to publishers, to broadcasters, or to others whose media are employed.[1]

Decisions by business firms on whether to use advertising, how to use it, and to what extent, are guided almost exclusively

---

[1] Neil H. Borden, MBA, Advertising Texts and Cases, p. 2-3, 1950.

by profit considerations. Along with these profit considerations, must be entered the importance of repeat sales and quick returns on sales transactions at a sacrifice of future patronage.[1]

Purpose of Study

This study was undertaken to delve into certain facets of the advertising field. After study and contact with the field of advertising, it was believed that a certain segment had been long overlooked by researchers. The segment of the advertiser himself has been only conjectured about, with thorough research almost non-existent. In this light, it was decided to explore certain aspects of the advertiser and his reasons for advertising.

The study was limited to a consideration of the advertiser's use or his refusal to use the media of radio and television. This study was made to discover the reasons given by retail merchants in Topeka, Kansas, for advertising or refusing to advertise via radio and via television.

Related Literature

The media of radio and television have been a mecca for researchers of many descriptions during the relatively short lives of these media.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

Researchers in radio and television have concerned themselves almost entirely with the audience and merchandising sides of advertising. The advertiser has been ignored largely by researchers.

The few closely related research projects and materials were tremendous influences in the formulation of this peoject.

"The All Media Survey" by Sponsor magazine was the only research project available for reference. This survey studied the entire field of advertising and analyzed the merits of each individual medium from the standpoint of the advertiser. From this work, the major reasons for advertisers' use of each medium was noted.[1]

The fields of radio and television, when studied from the advertisers' point of view, have certain phenomena that set them apart from all other media. These phenomena must be reviewed to determine the correct approach to the problem set forth in this project.

About certain phenomena Goldsmith, in the Harvard Business Review, said:

> It is unnecessary to stress the importance of sight and sound, since it is well known that the major portion of the available information reaches man through these senses, but it is worth observing that the combination of the two adds more than proportionately to the effectiveness. In addition, motion is an interesting and commanding factor in any viewed scene. The sense of simultaneity of experience in viewing television presentations serve, psychologically, to bind the members of the audience to the program source

---

[1] Sponsor Magazine, All Media Study, New York: Sponsor Publications, Inc., 1952.

and to each other. In certain events, such as horse racing, the element of instantaneous presentation is obviously of outstanding importance.[1]

Another phenomenon concerning radio and television advertising that was important to this work was their effectiveness in reaching the advertiser's market. About this phenomenon Duffy said:

> Although radio and television are comparatively speaking, new advertising media, the innumerable advantages they offer to the advertiser place them today among the major media. The first consideration of radio and television advertising is the opportunity it presents for reaching the people who comprise the advertisers' market.[2]

E. F. Seehafer and J. W. Laemmar had this to say about radio advertising as it affects the advertiser:

> Radio holds certain advantages over many advertising media, has advantages in common with others, and lacks certain virtues. The basic advantages claimed for AM radio as an advertising medium are as follows:
>
> 1. Radio uses the spoken word.
> 2. Radio is intimate.
> 3. Radio permits the sponsor to select program content.
> 4. Radio permits the sponsor to take full credit for all editorial content.
> 5. Radio combines commercial and editorial content smoothly.
> 6. Radio makes every line of commercial copy a headline.
> 7. Radio offers special techniques for more effective commercial presentation.
> 8. Radio is habit forming.
> 9. Radio permits family listening.

---

[1] Alfred E. Goldsmith, Harvard Business Review, Nov., 1953, 18:132.

[2] Ben Duffy, Advertising Media and Markets. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.

10. Radio delivers daytime messages direct to the housewife.
11. Radio advertising is available at practically all hours.
12. Radio has simultaneous rural-urban coverage.
13. Radio has local, regional, and national coverage.
14. Radio permits an important local touch.
15. Radio builds better employer-employee relations.

Since television is both aural and visual, it combines the advantages claimed for several advertising media. It has practically all the basic advantages attributed to AM radio advertising, excluding coverage.

On television a sponsor can illustrate his merchandise. He can demonstrate how the product works and show how to use the product--psychologically sound salesmanship. Television's ability to picture merchandise far exceeds the ability of the newspaper and the magazine to illustrate, since television pictures can be done with motion. When color television is perfected, the ultimate in television advertising will be possible.

In combining sight and sound, television commands attention. The appeal to both the eye and the ear has many times the pulling power of sound or sight alone. By commanding attention, television packs a tremendous sales wallop. High sponsor identification figures are already notable in television programs, and high sponsor identification is a valuable step toward the actual sale of advertised merchandise.[1]

In a survey conducted by Charles Hull Wolfe, it was discovered that radio advertising becomes more successful the longer it is used; that radio is successful when used to move specific items as well as for institutional advertising.[2]

Wolfe, in his final analysis in his research in the field of radio advertising, gave these reasons for the use of the

---

[1] E. F. Seehafer and J. W. Laemmar, Successful Radio and Television Advertising. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951, p. 11, 342.

[2] Charles Hull Wolfe, Modern Radio Advertising. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1949, p. 139-150.

radio medium by the advertiser:

1. Personalized salesmanship.
2. Showmanship.
3. Instantaneous communication.
4. Coverage of all income levels.
5. Psychological advantage of hearing vs seeing.
6. Suggestibility of the typical radio listener.
7. Personal nature of radio programs.
8. Isolation in time of commercial announcements.
9. Selection of audience.
10. National network programs can deliver 189 families for one dollar; newspapers reach 122 families per dollar; magazines reach 114 families per dollar.[1]

Barton in his book, Advertising Handbook, said,

> There are four reasons why retailers use radio as an advertising medium.
>
> 1. The use of sound by personalized and salesmanship--impact of the human voice--showmanship of sound effects and music--immediacy and flexibility of instantaneous communication make radio advertising effective.
>
> 2. The nature of radio listening by penetrating a broad cross section of income levels--exceptional comprehensibility and memorability of oral communication--the psychological suggestibility of the typical radio listener make radio advertising effective for the retailer.
>
> 3. The use of programs by adroitly producing and promoting them--program content either commercial or editorial can make radio advertising successful.
>
> 4. Time vs space argument is in favor of radio advertising. Commercials in time rather than space can be isolated from all other commercials on at the same time. Advertisements can be directed toward certain audience types by the use of time.[2]

With the related material stated here, along with other material for background information concerning the entire fields

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 43-58.

[2] Roger Barton, *Advertising Handbook*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950, p. 486.

of radio and television, formulation of active research procedures for this study was begun.

METHODS AND EXPERIMENTATION

The mechanics of research opened another area for background study. The areas of survey methodology and statistical analysis were studied in preparation for devising an adequate survey method and for the presentation of research data.

To accumulate material capable of answering the purpose of this study, it was necessary to decide upon a survey method combining simplicity of operation with an adequate sample. After weighing the factors of financial resources, time, and experience in the field of advertising research, it was decided to use a personal interview questionnaire.

Brown, in his work on marketing and distribution research said:

> In the survey method, data is gathered by asking questions. This is called the questionnaire technique. The essential element in the survey method is that the data is furnished by an individual in a conscious effort to answer a question.[1]

The type of survey decided upon was the opinion type survey. The opinion type survey was used because an opinion was all that was desired from each individual interviewed.

Brown commented upon the place of opinion type surveys as opposed to factual and interpretative type studies:

---

[1] Lyndon O. Brown, Marketing and Distribution Research. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1949, p. 296.

> In a factual survey, the respondent acts merely as a reporter. When this survey method is employed in this form, its results are subject to many errors. These include errors of memory, the inability to generalize, the desire to make a good impression, and various human tendencies which bias the report.
>
> In an opinion survey, the respondent is asked to express a personal opinion, to make an evaluation or appraisal, or to report his judgment on a particular matter. The errors researchers most often make, using opinion surveys, have to do with the differentiation between opinion and fact, and in the wrong approach for obtaining the respondents opinion or appraisal.
>
> In the interpretative survey the person being interviewed acts as an interpreter as well as a reporter. This survey method is therefore subject to all the errors of both the opinion and the factual methods, plus the inability of an individual consciously to evaluate his own feelings, motives, and other psychological drives.[1]

A questionnaire was developed. First, a tentative questionnaire was drawn up and duplicated. Second, the questionnaire was submitted to reputable persons on the faculty of Kansas State College who were concerned with the field of market research. Next, a professor in the retail marketing end of the advertising field was asked to evaluate and amend the tentative questionnaire. Then, a professor from the college Psychology Department was consulted upon the method of wording the individual questions, and correct question sequence, and a professor of radio--television was consulted concerning correct question content from the educational radio and television point of view.

Professional men from the fields of radio and retail marketing were asked to check the questionnaire for correctness of content.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 301.

Upon completion of these questionnaire checks by individuals educationally and occupationally concerned with the field, the questionnaire was put to its final test before the actual survey was taken.

A pilot study was run in Manhattan, Kansas, during the second week in September, 1955. Twenty retailers were seen. No difficulties due to wording were encounteres and it was decided that the questionnaire was functional and adequate to perform its mission.

The selection of a sufficient number of individuals adequate to meet the requirements of market research was then undertaken.

Four different methods of sampling were taken under consideration. First, the haphazard system was discarded because it did not meet the requirements for adequate market coverage. Second, the area method of sampling was not used because of the difficulty of dividing the universe into units from which samples could have been taken. Third, the method of quota sampling was abandoned in favor of the stratified random sampling technique.

All the retail businesses in Topeka, Kansas, were divided into five groups or strata and quotas for each stratification were set. The random sampling method was then used within each strata to choose those individuals in the five groups to be questioned. The total number in the sample was spread to the five strata so that the number of respondents in each group was in direct proportion to the total number in the universe.

In applying randomness, all business firms in each strata were listed. A book of one million random numbers was used to select from each list the individuals to be questioned.[1] A total of 300 individual retail organizations was selected.

The source of the names of individual retail businesses was the classified section of the Topeka, Kansas, telephone book.[2] There were 4,135 individual retail firms listed after discarding those believed to be non-advertising types of enterprises. For example, medical and law firms were deleted from the list.

With the list of respondents complete, the personal interviews began on Monday, October 17, 1955, and continued until Friday, October 28, 1955.

A total of 300 interviews was planned, but because of lack of time, inability to contact the merchant, and similar reasons, only 264 interviews were completed.

Each of the strata used for random sample selection was again divided into six groups for purposes of analysis. The first method of division was by commodity; the second by dollar cost of purchase items; the third by necessity of purchased items; the fourth by size of purchase items; the fifth by location of firm; the sixth by size of firm in relation to other firms of similar type.

---

[1] The Rand Corporation, A Million Random Digits with 100,000 Normal Deviations. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

[2] Southwestern Bell Telephone Company; Topeka Classified Telephone Directory, July, 1955, p. 1-212.

The five business sub-groups in the commodity group were service, food, apparel, household, and automotive. The three sub-groups in the dollar size of purchase group were small ($.00 to $5.00), medium ($5.00 to $50.00), and large ($50.00 and up). The three sub-groups in the necessity of purchased items group were luxury, staple, and necessity. The three sub-groups in the size of purchased item were small, medium, and large. The three sub-groups in the location of firms group were downtown, residential, and shopping center. The three sub-groups in the size of firm group were large, medium, and small.

After sampling was completed, the findings were subjected to tests for reliability.[1] The reliability of the sample was proven adequate by the use of reliability and proportionality tests. Reliability meant that enough cases were included in the sample to eliminate the possibility of undue distortion in the sample.

Cumulative frequency was the method used to establish the reliability of the sample. The questionnaires were divided at random into five groups. The groups were then applied to a table of cumulative frequencies. In general, the amount of variation found in the last half of the cumulative frequencies gave a rough approximation of the probable limits of the error within the sample. As shown in the table of cumulative frequency in the Appendix, the amount of variation was very small. Reliability

---

[1] Donald M. Hobart, Marketing Research Practices. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950, p. 218.

of the sample was thus established for each question so checked.[1]

In all, three questions (numbers 3, 6, and 8) were tested for reliability of sample size. All three questions were tested by the same system and all showed reliability of sample size.

> Theoretically one might test for the reliability on every question included in the survey. This would be wasted energy, however, for one can readily select a few key questions which will provide an adequate basis for testing the entire job.[2]

Proportionality tests were then run to determine the representativeness of the individual groups. The first division of the sample was by type of commodity and it was used for the proportionality tests. Direct comparisons between the sample and the total universe were made. It was established that the variation found in proportionality tests was not great enough to warrant an adjustment for proportionality.[3]

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The tabulation was accomplished by counting the individual answers in each group. The totals for each group were recorded upon master sheets. These master sheets were then used to construct the explanatory charts shown later in this report. Percentages were used in the charts to afford the reader a quick, accurate knowledge of the relationships between groups concerning

---

[1] Appendix V.

[2] Lyndon O. Brown, Marketing and Distribution Research. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1949, p. 313.

[3] Appendix.

any individual question.

The first question contained in the questionnaire asked the respondent which media of advertising he had used in the last five years. A table was constructed to show the percentages of advertising media users for the last five years for each of the six major sample divisions.

Extent of Use of Radio and/or Television Advertising by Topeka Retailers During Past Five Years

Table 1 shows the differences in percentages of different types of commodity retail firms in Topeka, Kansas, who report having used each of the media for advertising purposes during the past five years. The table shows that within this period, better than one-half of all those contacted had tried radio advertising and nearly one of ten had tried advertising via television. Wearing apparel firms were more likely than others to have used radio and/or television advertising, with three-fourths having used radio and one-fifth having used television. On the other hand, food retailers were the least likely of these classifications to have used either radio or television. Service, household, and automotive firms were about the same in having used radio and television advertising.

Table 2 shows the differences in percentages of different sizes of dollar cost of articles sold by retail firms in Topeka, Kansas, who report having used each of the media for advertising purposes during the past five years. The table shows that within this period, better than half of all those contacted had

Table 1. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past five years by type of commodity.

Type	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	Household	Automotive
DP	92.9	93.3	58.4	100.0	96.2	97.7
Mag	15.2	30.7	--	4.3	7.6	13.6
Radio	53.5	52.4	27.8	78.3	54.5	54.6
Mail	25.0	50.0	--	17.3	15.2	13.6
MC	28.5	29.6	19.4	31.7	24.2	36.2
BB	34.4	55.7	16.4	31.7	22.8	25.0
HB	7.8	1.1	41.6	8.9	3.9	2.5
WP	23.8	22.8	25.0	17.3	22.8	25.0
TU	9.2	11.3	5.5	21.7	7.6	4.6

Table 2. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past five years by size of dollar cost of article.

Type	Total	Small $10 to $15	Medium $15 to $50	Large $50 and up
DP	92.9	83.8	93.8	95.4
Mag	15.2	2.1	23.9	17.4
Radio	53.5	48.4	51.4	61,0
Mail	25.0	3.2	38.0	31.2
MC	28.5	26.8	24.8	34.4
BB	34.4	17.2	43.4	40.6
HB	7.8	18.3	2.7	3.2
WP	23.8	28.0	17.7	25.0
TV	9.2	5.5	10.0	10.9

tried radio advertising, and almost one out of ten had used television advertising. Large sized rollar cost of article firms were more likely than others to have used radio and television advertising, with nearly two-thirds using radio and better than one-fourth having used television. Small and medium sized dollar cost of article firms were both nearly 50 per cent radio users, while small sized dollar cost of article firms were the least likely to have used television advertising the past five years.

Table 3 points out that luxury and staple goods firms are the most likely to use radio and television advertising in the past five years. Essential goods firms are the least likely to use radio and television advertising.

Table 3. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past five years by the necessity of the purchases.

Type	Total	Luxury	Staple	Essential
DP	92.9	98.0	98.4	86.6
Mag	15.2	18.4	8.1	2.9
Radio	53.5	60.3	62.9	38.5
Mail	25.0	40.9	11.3	7.6
MC	28.5	27.6	30.6	19.3
BB	34.4	48.0	35.5	14.4
HB	7.8	--	3.2	11.5
WP	23.8	11.3	22.6	96.0
TV	9.2	11.2	9.7	3.8

Table 4 shows that during the past five years in the size of article group, large size of article firms are the most likely users of radio and television advertising, with 87 per cent using radio and 25 per cent using television. Small size of article organizations were the least likely of this classification to have used either radio or television, with 11 per cent using radio and none using television.

Table 5 shows that during the past five years in the location of firm classification, downtown firms were the most likely to have used radio and television advertising, with 64 per cent using radio and 12 per cent using television. Residential firms were the least likely to have used radio and television

Table 4. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past five years by size of article.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
DP	92.9	80.0	98.2	100.0
Mag	15.2	2.7	5.3	23.7
Radio	53.5	10.7	56.6	86.7
Mail	25.0	12.0	15.9	26.8
MC	28.5	5.3	24.8	44.7
BB	34.4	6.7	24.8	67.1
HB	7.8	5.3	6.2	5.3
WP	23.8	6.7	15.0	19.5
TV	9.2	0.0	1.8	25.0

Table 5. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past five years by location of firm.

Type	Total	Down-town	Resi-dential	Shopping center
DP	92.8	98.3	86.7	90.8
Mag	15.2	16.4	2.2	5.2
Radio	53.5	64.1	22.2	51.6
Mail	25.0	30.4	13.3	12.4
MC	28.5	28.8	15.5	24.7
BB	34.4	39.4	20.0	27.8
HB	7.8	1.6	11.1	8.3
WP	23.8	14.8	8.9	15.4
TV	9.2	11.5	4.4	5.2

advertising, with 22 per cent using radio and 4 per cent using television.

Table 6 shows that during the past five years in the size of organization classification, large and medium sized organizations were the most likely to have used radio advertising, with 100 per cent of each having used radio. Large organizations were the only television advertisers. Small organizations used neither radio or television advertising.

Table 6. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past five years by size of organization.

Type	Total	Large	Medium	Small
DP	92.8	100.0	100.0	85.8
Mag	15.2	17.7	0.0	4.7
Radio	53.5	100.0	100.0	0.0
Mail	25.0	29.2	8.3	15.7
MC	28.5	40.6	29.2	11.2
BB	34.4	50.5	29.2	15.7
HB	7.8	4.4	8.3	6.3
WP	23.8	17.7	33.3	7.1
TV	9.2	18.6	0.0	0.0

Question two asked about the use of various media during the year preceding the interview. For purposes of convenience, these tables analyzing the replies have been placed in the Appendix. In general, the tables show that little or no change took place during the past year in the number of merchants using radio or television advertising. The important fact is that the number of firms using radio and television advertising was not as high in question number two as in number one.

Question three asked about the use of radio and/or television advertising during the month and week preceding the interview. Again, for convenience, tables analyzing change in number of merchants using radio and/or television was found from preceding tables covering the longer period.

Types of Radio and Television Advertising Used by Retailers

Question 4 was designed to discover the differences in percentages of different types of commodity retail firms in Topeka, who have used spot or program advertising via radio and/or television. Table 7 shows that 87 per cent of those contacted used spot advertising and 13 per cent used program advertising. Food retailers were more likely to have used spot advertising than the others, with 100 per cent having used spot advertising. Food retailers were least likely than others to use program advertising, with no food advertising having used program.

Table 7. Per cent of organizations who have used spot or program advertising in the past five years by commodity.

Type	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
Spot	87	48.9	100.0	73.7	39.4	54.6
Program	13	11.3	---	4.3	7.6	4.6

Table 8 shows that in dollar size of purchase classification, large sized organizations were more likely than the others to advertise via spot and program with 55 per cent using spot and 14 per cent program television. Small and medium dollar size of purchase organizations were almost the same in their use of spot, but small organizations were the least likely to have used program than any other types in this classification.

Table 8. Per cent of organizations who have used spot or program advertising in the past five years by dollar size of purchase.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
Spot	87	48.4	47.8	54.6
Program	13	2.1	7.1	14.1

Table 9 shows that in the necessity of purchase classification essential purchase item firms were the least likely to have used either spot or program advertising, with 38 per cent and no per cent, respectively. Luxury and staple item organizations were nearly the same in their use of spot and program advertising.

Table 9. Per cent of organizations who have used spot or program advertising in the past five years by necessity of purchase.

Type	Total	Luxury	Staple	Essential
Spot	87	58.2	58.0	38.0
Program	13	11.4	7.9	--

Table 10 shows that in the size of purchase classification the large item organizations were more likely to have used spot and program advertising, with 84 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively. Small item organizations were least likely to have used spot and program advertising, with 11 per cent and no percent, respectively. Table 11 shows that in the location of firm classification, downtown firms were more likely to have advertising via spot and program, with 62 per cent using spot and 8 per cent using program. Residential firms were the least likely to have used spot and program advertising, with 22 per cent using spot and 2 per cent using program.

Table 12 makes it evident that in the size of firm classification, large and medium sized firms were both more likely to have used spot and/or program advertising, while no spot or program advertising was done by the small firms.

Table 10. Per cent of organizations who have used spot or program advertising in the past five years by size of purchase.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
Spot	87	10.7	54.9	84.2
Program	13	--	3.3	19.5

Table 11. Per cent of organizations who have used spot or program advertising in the past five years by location of firm.

Type	Total	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
Spot	87	61.5	22.2	49.4
Program	13	8.1	2.2	3.1

Table 12. Per cent of organizations who have used spot or program advertising in the past five years by size of firm.

Type	Total	Large	Medium	Small
Spot	87	97.3	87.5	---
Program	13	14.3	12.5	---

The Extent of Topeka Retailers' Use of Radio and Television Advertising by Program Types

The totals reported in the tables for question five show that music programs were most often used by Topeka retailers, with 41 per cent using programs. Drama and miscellaneous or others were not chosen by any retailers.

Table 13 points out that in the type of commodity classification, service organizations use more music and news programs than any other organization, while food organizations used no program advertising.

Table 13. Per cent of organizations who used program types of commodity.

Type	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
Music	41	6.8	--	1.0	5.0	2.0
News	35	6.8	--	1.0	4.0	1.0
Sports	15	1.4	--	--	2.0	2.0
Drama	--	--	--	--	--	--
Comedy	9	2.3	--	--	1.0	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 14 makes it evident that in the dollar cost of article classification, large dollar cost of article firms used more music, news, sports and comedy programs than the other two. Small dollar cost of article firms were the least likely to have used any of the program types for advertising.

Table 14. Per cent of organizations who used program types by dollar cost.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
Music	41	1.1	4.4	12.5
News	35	--	6.2	7.8
Sports	15	--	--	6.3
Drama	--	--	--	--
Comedy	9	--	1.3	1.6
Other	--	--	--	--

Table 15 describes that in the necessity of item classification, luxury firms were more likely to have used music and comedy, while staple items were more likely to have used drama. The essential item firms used no program advertising.

Table 15. Per cent of organizations who used program types by necessity of item.

Type	Total	Luxury	Staple	Essential
Music	41	10.2	6.4	--
News	35	7.1	8.1	--
Sports	15	3.1	3.2	--
Drama	--	1.0	3.2	--
Comedy	9	1.0	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--

Table 16 points out that in the size of item classification, the large item organizations were the more likely to advertise by program in every case, while the small item firms were least likely to use program advertising.

Table 16. Per cent of organizations who used program types by size of item.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
Music	41	--	3.5	13.2
News	35	--	1.8	13.2
Sports	15	--	0.09	5.3
Drama	--	--	--	1.3
Comedy	9	--	0.09	2.6
Other	--	--	--	--

Table 17 shows that in the location of firm classification, the downtown organizations were more likely than the others to have advertised by music, news, and sports programs.

Table 17. Per cent of organizations who used program types by location of firm.

Type	Total	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
Music	41	9.0	2.2	2.1
News	35	7.4	2.2	2.1
Sports	15	3.3	--	1.1
Drama	--	--	--	--
Comedy	9	--	--	2.1
Other	--	--	--	--

Table 18 makes it evident that in the size of firm classification, the large firms were not only the most likely users of program advertising, but the only users.

Table 18. Per cent of organizations who used program types by size of firm.

Type	Total	Large	Medium	Small
Music	41	12.0	--	--
News	35	10.6	--	--
Sports	15	4.4	--	--
Drama	--	0.09	--	--
Comedy	9	2.7	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--

Extent of Sales Increases Evidenced by Topeka Business Merchants

The various tables concerned with question number six show in general, that better than half the retailers in Topeka who use radio and/or television advertising evidenced sales increases, while less than half did not.

Table 19 points out that in the type of commodity classification, the service organizations evidenced more sales increase than the other types, with 65 per cent having had evidence of sales increases. The food organizations evidenced the least amount of evidence of sales increase, with 60 per cent showing no evidence of an increase.

Table 19. Per cent of organizations who have had evidence of increases from using radio and/or television advertising by commodity.

	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
yes	57	65.2	40.0	61.2	48.8	58.3
no	43	34.8	60.0	38.8	51.2	41.7

Table 20 shows that in the dollar size of article classification, medium dollar cost of article firms were more likely to have had evidence of sales increases, with 67 per cent saying they have had evidence of this increase. Small dollar cost of article firms were more likely than the rest to have had no evidence of sales increases, with 53 per cent having had no evidence of this increase.

Table 20. Per cent of organizations who have had evidence of sales increases from using radio and/or television advertising by dollar size of purchase.

	Total	Small	Medium	Large
yes	57	46.7	66.6	53.8
no	43	53.4	33.4	46.2

Table 21 makes it clear that in the necessity of purchase classification, all three types are grouped around the 50 per cent mark as to having had evidence of sales increases.

Table 21. Per cent of organizations who have had evidence of sales increases from using radio and/or television advertising by necessity of purchase.

	Total	Luxury	Staple	Essential
yes	57	55.9	46.2	52.5
no	43	44.1	53.8	47.5

Table 22 bears witness that in the size of purchase classification, the large size of purchase firms were the most likely to have had evidence of sales increases from the use of radio and/or television, with almost three-fourths having had evidence of sales increases. Small size of purchase firms were the least likely to have had evidence of sales increases due to radio and/or television advertising, with 86 per cent having had no such evidence.

Table 22. Per cent of organizations who have had sales increases from using radio and/or television advertising by size of purchase.

	Total	Small	Medium	Large
yes	57	12.5	37.5	71.2
no	43	87.5	62.5	28.8

Table 23 shows that in the location of firm classification, downtown firms were the most likely to have had evidence of sales increases due to radio and/or television advertising, with

58 per cent having had such evidence. Residential and shopping center firms both were least likely to have had evidence of sales increases due to radio and/or television advertising, with both having over one-half report evidence of no sales increases due to radio and/or television advertising.

Table 23. Per cent of organizations who have had sales increases from using radio and/or television advertising by location of firm.

	Total	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
yes	57	57.7	40.0	46.0
no	43	42.4	60.0	54.0

Table 24 makes it evident that in the size of firm classification, large firms were more likely to have had evidence of sales increases due to radio and/or television advertising, with 61 per cent having had such evidence. Small firms had no evidence of any sales increases due to radio and television advertising.

Table 24. Per cent of organizations who have had sales increases from using radio and/or television advertising by size of firm.

	Total	Large	Medium	Small
yes	57	61.0	12.5	--
no	43	39.0	87.5	--

Extent of Topeka's Retailers Chief Competitors Use of Radio and/or Television Advertising

The totals from the tables analyzing replies to question 8 showed that 50 per cent of all retail firms chief competitors did use radio and/or television advertising. Thirty-four per cent of their chief competitors did not use radio and/or television advertising, and 16 per cent did not know if their chief competitors used radio and/or television advertising.

Table 25 makes it clear that in the type of commodity classification, apparel groups chief competitors were more likely to use radio and/or television advertising, with 90 per cent having used them. Food organizations chief competitors were the least likely to have competitors using radio and television advertising, with 61 per cent of their chief competitors using radio and television. Automotive organizations were the most likely type to not know if their chief competition used radio and television advertising, with 23 per cent knowing.

Table 25. Per cent of organizations whose chief competitor uses radio and/or television advertising by commodity.

	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	Household	Automotive
yes	49.7	57.9	19.4	90.0	38.0	31.8
no	34.0	27.3	60.6	4.5	46.8	46.4
?	16.3	14.8	18.1	4.5	15.2	22.8

Table 26 shows that in the dollar cost of purchase classification, large dollar cost of purchase firms chief competitors were more likely to have used radio and/or television

Table 26. Per cent of organizations whose chief competitor competitor uses radio and/or television advertising by dollar size of purchase.

	Total	Small	Medium	Large
yes	49.7	39.9	53.1	60.7
no	34.0	40.0	31.0	31.1
?	16.3	20.1	15.9	8.2

advertising, with 61 per cent having used radio and/or television advertising. Small dollar cost of purchase firms chief competitors were the least likely to have used radio and/or television advertising, with 40 per cent not having used radio and/or television advertising. Small dollar cost of purchase firms were the least likely to know if their chief competitors used radio and/or television advertising, with 20 per cent not knowing.

Table 27 makes it evident that in the necessity of purchase classification, the luxury item firms were the most likely to have chief competitors who advertise via radio and/or television, with 66 per cent of their chief competitors having used radio and/or television advertising. Essential item firms were the least likely to have chief competitors who had used radio and/or television advertising, with 47 per cent having chief competitors who don't use radio and/or television advertising. Staple item firms were the most likely not to know whether their chief competitors used radio and/or television advertising, with 50 per cent not knowing.

Table 27. Per cent of organizations whose chief competitor uses radio and/or television advertising by necessity of purchase.

	Total	Luxury	Staple	Essential
yes	49.7	66.3	8.1	36.3
no	34.0	20.4	41.9	47.2
?	16.3	13.3	50.0	16.5

Table 28 makes it plain that in the size of purchase classification, the large size purchase firms were the most likely to have chief competitors who used radio and/or television advertising, with 84 per cent using radio and/or television advertising. Small size purchase organizations were the least likely to have chief competitors who used radio and/or television advertising, with 57 per cent not using radio and/or television advertising. Small purchase organizations were the most likely not to know whether their chief competitors used radio and/or television advertising or not, with 24 per cent not knowing.

Table 28. Per cent of organizations whose chief competitor uses radio and/or television advertising by size of purchase.

	Total	Small	Medium	Large
yes	49.7	18.7	39.0	84.2
no	34.0	57.3	48.6	11.9
?	16.3	24.0	12.4	3.9

Table 29 makes it lucid that in the location of firm classification, the downtown organizations were most likely to have chief competitors who used radio and/or television advertising,

Table 29. Per cent of organizations whose chief competitor uses radio and/or television advertising by location of firm.

	Total	Downtown	Resi-dential	Shopping center
yes	49.7	48.4	20.0	44.3
no	34.0	43.5	60.0	41.3
?	16.3	8.1	20.0	14.4

with 48 per cent of the chief competitors using radio and/or television advertising. The residential firms were the least likely to have had chief competitors who have used radio and television advertising, with 60 per cent of their chief competitors not having used radio and television advertising. Residential firms were least likely to know if their chief competitors were using radio and/or television advertising, with 20 per cent not knowing.

Table 30 makes it evident that in the size of firm classification, the large firms were the most likely to have had chief competitors who used radio and/or television advertising, with 86 per cent of their chief competitors using radio and/or television advertising. Small firms were the least likely to have had chief competitors who have used radio and/or television advertising, with 61 per cent of their chief competitors not having used radio and/or television advertising. Small firms were the least likely to know if their chief competitors were advertising via radio and/or television, with 20 per cent not knowing.

Table 30. Per cent of organizations whose chief competitor uses radio and/or television advertising by size of firm.

	Total	Large	Medium	Small
yes	49.7	85.8	50.0	18.9
no	34.0	7.1	41.6	61.4
?	16.3	7.1	8.4	19.7

Reasons Retail Merchants in Topeka, Kansas, Give for Advertising or Refusing to Advertise via Radio and via Television

Number seven was rather a lengthy question. It was composed of two parts, each of which dealt with 18 different possible responses. First, through unaided recall, each retail firm was asked to state its reasons for advertising or refusing to advertise via radio or television. Replies were classified at the time of interview in the 18 different categories shown in Appendix I, in the body of the prompting cards.

Second, after unaided recall replies had been entered on the questionnaire, the respondent was handed a card upon which were listed the 18 classifications used in the questionnaire. The respondent was asked to select from this list all of the reasons that he considered applicable to his retail organization.

Both the unaided recall and the aided recall answers were recorded as yes or no on the questionnaire. Replies were converted to percentages, based on the total number of advertisers or the total number of non-advertisers interviewed in each respondent classification. On classifying retailers as either advertisers or non-advertisers for this purpose, replies to question one on the use of radio and/or television were used.

When summarizing the results from replies to the seventh question, because of the magnitude of information, it was decided to interpret the question on the basis of the six major groups, individually. To further simplify the procedure of reporting, the 18 reasons listed on the prompting cards will be referred to only by code words, seen in Appendix II.

Reasons for Advertising or Refusing to Advertise via Radio and/or Television Without Prompting

Public Service. As a reason for advertising, public service was considered important by no classifications types and it was considered important as a reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by all classification types.

Will Advertise Product. This reason was considered important as a reason for advertising by all the commodity classification firms, by the small dollar cost of article firms, by all the necessity of item firms, by large and small size of article firms, by downtown and shopping center firms, and by large sized firms. This reason was considered important as a reason for not advertising by apparel and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by all the necessity item firms, by all the size of article firms, by all the location of firm organizations, and by small sized firms.

Overnight Copy Change. This reason was considered important as a reason for advertising via radio and/or television by none of the commodity classification, by none of the size of article firms, by none of the dollar cost of article classification, by none of the necessity of item classification, by none of the location of firm classification, and by none of the size of firm classification. This was considered an important reason for not using radio and/or television advertising by no commodity firms, by no dollar cost of article firms, by no necessity of item firms, by no size of article firms, by no firms in the location classification, and by no firms in the size of firms classification.

Table 31. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by commodity.* **

Reasons	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
	Per cent				
His customers	46	10	39	47	37
Reputations	38	20	35	35	8
Different groups	33	20	72	40	25
Will adv. product	15	20	56	35	29
Loyal audiences	7	0	11	2	4
Coverage	7	0**	6	2	0**
Expense	4	30	0**	5	0**
Entertainment credit	2	0**	0**	0**	0**
Occupied audience	2	10	0**	2	13
Lasting impression	0**	0**	6	0**	4
Public service	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**	0**	4
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**	2	0**
Good times	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	10	0**	2	13
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**	0**	8
Can fit budget	0**	10	6	5	4
Salesman	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**

* Yes without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Table 32. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or via television by commodity. * **

Reasons	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
	Per cent				
Expense	79	100	100	89	80
Different groups	41	13	0**	31	50
Lasting impressions	36	0**	0**	0**	0**
Will adv. product	17	30	50	29	45
His customers	12	0**	0**	6	30
Occupied audience	5	0**	0**	0**	0**
Can fit budget	5	9	0**	3	5
Reputations	2	0**	0**	0**	0**
Salesman	1	0**	0**	3	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**	3	0**
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**	3	0**
Loyal audiences	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	0**	0**	5
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**

* No without prompting

** None of the sample gave this reason for not using radio and/or television advertising.

Table 33. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by dollar cost of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Will adv. product	51	18	23
His customers	49	36	40
Reputations	36	27	42
Different groups	31	40	40
Expense	8	7	2
Loyal audience	8	0**	7
Occupied audience	8	7	0**
Can fit budget	8	4	0**
Ear and eye	5	2	0**
Blends in adv.	5	0**	0**
Lasting impression	3	0**	2
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	2	0**
Entertainment credit	0**	2	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	4	5
Salesman	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	0**	0**

* Yes without prompting

** None of the sample named this reason

Table 34. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by dollar cost of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Expense	81	100	76
Different groups	35	53	24
Will adv. product	35	29	28
His customers	8	19	8
Occupied audience	4	0**	0**
Can fit budget	4	0**	0**
Reputations	2	0**	0**
Coverage	2	0**	0**
Lasting impression	0**	39	4
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	4
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	4
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**
Salesman	0**	0**	3

* No without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Fits in Budget. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising by commodity firms, by no dollar cost of article firms, by no necessity of item firms, by small size of article firms, by no firms in the location of firms classification, by no firms in the size of firm classification. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising by no commodity firms, by no dollar cost of article firms, by no necessity of item firms, by no size of item firms, by no firms in the location of firm classification, by no firms in the size of firm classification.

Blends in with Other Advertising. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising by no commodity firms, by no dollar cost of article firms, by no necessity of item firms, by no size of article firms, by no firms in the location of firms classification. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising by no classification.

"Salesman Called on Me." This is not an important reason for advertising for any of the commodity, the dollar cost of article, the necessity of item, size of article, location of firm, size of firm classification. This is not an important reason for refusing to advertise by any classification.

Reaches an Occupied Audience. This reason was considered an important reason for using radio and/or television advertising by no classifications. This reason was considered important as a reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classifications.

Table 35. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by size of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Reputations	13	23	36
His customers	13	49	59
Can fit budget	13	6	0**
Will adv. product	13	20	49
Different groups	0**	44	55
Lasting impression	0**	0**	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	2
Expense	0**	6	5
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	3
Good times	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	2	0**
Loyal audience	0**	0**	11
Ear and eye	0**	2	1
Occupied audience	0**	3	5
Coverage	0**	5	5
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**
Salesman	0**	0**	0**

* Yes without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Table 36. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by necessity of item. * **

Reasons	Luxury	Staple	Essential
	Per cent		
Expense	90	100	83
Different groups	46	44	36
Will adv. product	41	4	44
Lasting impression	8	9	2
His customers	7	0**	11
Can fit budget	5	9	4
Good times	3	0**	0**
Salesman	1	0**	2
Reputations	0**	0**	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	2
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Occupied audience	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**

* No without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Gives Wide Coverage. This reason was considered important for using radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classification.

Builds Reputation. This reason was considered an important reason for using radio and/or television advertising by service, food, apparel, and household firms, by small, medium, and large dollar cost of article firms, by staple, item firms, by small, medium, and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by large sized firms. This reason was considered an important reason for not using radio and/or television advertising by no classification.

Reaches Different Groups. This reason was considered an important reason for using radio and/or television advertising by apparel, its most important reason, and by service, food, household and automotive firms, by all the dollar cost of article firms, by luxury, staple, and essential item firms, by medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, by large, medium sized firms. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, household and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by luxury, staple, and necessity firms, by small, medium, and large size of article firms, downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by small sized firms.

Build Loyal Audience. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising via radio and/or television by no

Table 37. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by location of firm. * **

Reasons	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
	Per cent		
Different groups	49	40	44
His customers	45	40	38
Will adv. product	39	10	30
Reputations	26	50	30
Loyal audience	6	0**	4
Coverage	6	0**	2
Occupied audience	4	0**	4
Can fit budget	4	0**	4
Expense	3	0**	10
Ear and eye	3	0**	0**
Lasting impression	0**	0**	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	2
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	4
Good times	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	2
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**
Salesman	0**	0**	1

* Yes without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Table 38. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by size of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Expense	97	84	70
Different groups	30	51	60
Will adv. product	27	37	70
His customers	8	10	10
Can fit budget	3	8	10
Lasting impression	2	10	0**
Reputations	0**	0**	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	2	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Occupied audience	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**
Salesman	0**	2	0**

* No without prompting
** None of the sample named this as a reason

classification. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classification.

<u>Ear and Eye Appeal</u>. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising via radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classification.

<u>Entertainment Credit</u>. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising via radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered an important

Table 39. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by necessity of item. * **

Reasons	Luxury	Staple	Essential
	Per cent		
Expense	63	3	0**
Different groups	31	44	53
Will adv. product	27	34	40
His customers	7	44	35
Lasting impression	5	0**	0**
Can fit budget	3	0**	3
Good times	2	0**	0**
Salesman	2	0**	9
Reputations	0**	36	12
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	3
Entertainment credit	0**	3	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	3
Loyal audience	0**	3	0**
Ear and eye	0**	3	0**
Occupied audience	0**	5	5
Coverage	0**	8	3
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**

* Yes without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classification.

Lasting Impression. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising via radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising via radio and/or television by service firms.

Reaches His Particular Customers. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising via radio and/or television by service, household, and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by staple and essential firms, by small, medium, and large size purchase firms,

Table 40. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by location of firm. * **

Reasons	Downtown	Resi-dential	Shopping center
	Per cent		
Expense	93	92	85
Different groups	50	37	34
Will adv. product	30	43	32
Can fit budget	11	0**	4
Lasting impression	9	3	2
His customers	5	3	17
Salesman	1	0**	1
Reputations	0**	0**	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	0**	2
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	2
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Occupied audience	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**

* No without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

by downtown, residential, and shopping center firms, large and small sized firms. This reason was considered an important reason for not advertising by no classification.

<u>Good Time Periods Available</u>. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classification.

<u>Not Too Expensive</u>. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by food firms, by luxury firms, by medium sized firms. This reason was considered the

Table 41. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by size of firm. * **

Reasons	Large	Medium	Small
	Per cent		
Different groups	54	13	0**
His customers	49	13	0**
Will adv. product	40	0**	0**
Reputations	34	8	0**
Loyal audience	6	0**	0**
Occupied audience	4	0**	0**
Coverage	4	4	0**
Can fit budget	4	0**	0**
Expense	4	13	0**
Entertainment credit	2	0**	0**
Ear and eye	2	0**	0**
Lasting impression	0**	0**	0**
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**
Blends adv.	0**	0**	0**
Salesman	0**	0**	0**

* Yes without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

most important for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household, and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by luxury, staple, and essential item firms, by small, medium and large size of purchase firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by small sized firms.

Can Use Lengthy Copy. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by no classification.

Table 42. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by size of firm. * **

Reasons	Large	Medium	Small
	Per cent		
Different groups	3	0**	32
Reputations	0**	0**	0**
His customers	0**	0**	8
Lasting impressions	0**	0**	4
Public service	0**	0**	0**
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	0**
Expense	0**	0**	79
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	0**
Good times	0**	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**
Loyal audiences	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Occupied audience	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	0**
Can fit budget	0**	0**	5
Will adv. product	0**	0**	30
Salesman	0**	0**	2

* No without prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Reasons for Advertising or Refusing to Advertise via Radio and/or Television with Prompting

Different Groups. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, apparel, and automotive firms, small and medium dollar cost of article firms, luxury, staple, and essential, small, medium, and large size of article firms, downtown, residential firms, and small sized firms. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, apparel, household, and automotive firms, small, medium and large, luxury,

Table 43. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by commodity. * **

Reasons	Service	Food	Apparel	Household	Automotive
	Per cent				
Will adv. product	87	90	95	96	92
Reputations	79	70	91	89	79
Salesman	75	60	91	79	83
Different groups	74	40	89	75	58
His customers	74	70	78	68	54
Public service	72	50	56	79	75
Overnight copy change	65	30	39	63	58
Can fit budget	52	70	62	52	58
Coverage	51	40	34	63	38
Loyal audience	48	50	72	46	71
Occupied audience	48	50	35	67	63
Blends in adv.	46	60	35	51	37
Ear and eye	41	60	28	74	71
Entertainment credit	41	70	72	47	46
Lasting impression	35	20	12	40	29
Good times	23	10	24	23	25
Expense	17	30	0**	5	0*
Lengthy copy	9	0**	6	41	4

* Yes with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

staple and essential firms, medium and large size of article firms, downtown, residential and shopping center, and large sized firms.

Expense. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by luxury firms. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive, small, medium, and large dollar cost of article firms. By luxury, staple and essential item firms, by small, medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by small sized firms.

Table 44. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by commodity. * **

Reasons	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
	Per cent				
Different groups	99	40	50	34	60
Expense	86	100	100	95	95
Can fit budget	77	74	100	56	75
Lasting impression	65	42	100	53	30
His customers	62	50	100	64	100
Wont adv. product	46	65	100	37	95
Salesman	25	36	10	20	15
Lengthy copy	19	12	50	28	15
Blends in adv.	12	0**	0**	3	10
Builds reputations	9	12	0**	6	0**
Occupied audience	7	4	0**	6	5
Overnight copy change	5	4	0**	6	0**
Good times	5	12	50	14	0**
Public service	2	4	0**	8	0**
Entertainment credit	2	0**	0**	8	0**
Loyal audience	0**	4	50	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	4	0**	0**	5

* No with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Can Fit Budget. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by staple, necessity item firms, by small and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center, and by large size firms. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by luxury and necessity item firms, by small, medium and large size

Table 45. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by dollar cost of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Will adv. product	97	79	72
Reputations	92	76	86
His customers	78	62	68
Salesman	77	76	81
Public service	73	74	31
Loyal audience	70	54	35
Ear and eye	63	48	56
Different groups	60	72	81
Occupied audience	59	60	46
Can fit budget	55	62	49
Overnight copy change	51	67	51
Blends in adv.	50	49	36
Coverage	42	50	54
Lasting impression	34	28	66
Entertainment credit	29	51	41
Good times	22	28	15
Expense	10	16	2
Lengthy copy	2	11	5

* Yes with prompting

** None of the sample named this reason

of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by small size firms.

Lasting Impression. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by large dollar cost of article firms. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, apparel and household firms, by small and medium dollar cost of article firms, by luxury and staple item firms, by medium and large size of article firms.

Table 46. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by dollar cost of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Expense	81	100	84
Can fit budget	75	100	48
Won't adv. product	70	75	48
His customers	66	91	60
Different groups	56	86	28
Lasting impression	50	94	36
Salesman	32	0**	18
Builds reputations	10	11	0**
Good times	8	14	8
Occupied audience	8	8	0**
Coverage	4	0**	0**
Public service	4	3	8
Overnight copy change	4	8	0**
Blends in adv.	4	17	0**
Entertainment credit	2	8	0**
Loyal audience	2	0**	0**
Ear and eye	2	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	39	24

* No with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

<u>His Customers</u>. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by staple and essential item firms, by medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by large size firms. This reason was considered important for not advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by luxury, staple, essential item firms, by small, medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and

shopping center firms, and by small size firms.

Table 47. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by size of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Reputations	76	73	77
Public service	75	66	40
Can fit budget	51	47	59
Will adv. product	51	83	91
Overnight copy change	50	42	13
Salesman	50	0**	93
Ear and eye	38	36	21
Coverage	38	35	25
His customers	38	76	92
Different groups	25	67	95
Entertainment credit	25	56	43
Good times	25	36	18
Occupied audience	25	31	28
Blends in adv.	25	30	14
Lasting impression	13	3	3
Loyal audience	13	39	64
Expense	0**	6	5
Lengthy copy	0**	2	0*

* Yes with prompting
** None of the sample named this as a reason

<u>Will Advertise Product</u>. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by luxury, staple and essential item firms, by small, medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, by large and medium sized firms. This reason was considered important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by food, apparel and automotive firms, by small and medium dollar

cost of article firms, by luxury and essential item firms, small, medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by small sized firms.

Table 48. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by size of article. * **

Reasons	Small	Medium	Large
	Per cent		
Expense	99	86	70
Can fit budget	76	77	50
His customers	56	86	90
Won't adv. product	55	64	70
Different groups	51	84	70
Salesman	47	16	10
Lasting impression	35	61	60
Builds reputations	10	6	10
Good times	5	8	0**
Lengthy copy	5	35	0**
Public service	2	2	0**
Entertainment credit	2	6	0**
Occupied audience	2	2	10
Coverage	2	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	2	6	20
Overnight copy changes	0**	4	0**
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**

* No with prompting
** None of the sample named this as a reason

Salesman. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by large, medium and small dollar cost of article firms, by luxury and staple item firms, by small and large size of article firms, by downtown and shopping center firms, by large and medium size firms. This reason was considered important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by residential firms and small size firms.

Lengthy Copy. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by no classification. This reason was considered important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by apparel firms.

Blends in Advertising. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by food and apparel firms, by small and medium dollar cost of article firms. This reason was considered not important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by no classification.

Table 49. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by necessity of item. * **

Reasons	Luxury	Staple	Essential
	Per cent		
Salesman	84	84	9
Will adv. product	78	83	95
Different groups	65	77	75
Expense	63	3	0**
Reputations	48	69	70
Can fit budget	45	51	58
Loyal audience	41	67	28
Entertainment credit	39	54	53
Public service	37	62	68
His customers	34	75	68
Ear and eye	22	42	25
Coverage	19	49	43
Occupied audience	17	51	21
Good times	16	39	35
Blends in adv.	15	36	16
Lasting impression	7	0**	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	3

* Yes with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Builds Reputation. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by large, medium and small dollar size of article firms, by luxury, staple and essential item firms, by small, medium and large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by large and medium size firms. This reason was not considered important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by any non-advertising classification.

Occupied Audience. This reason was considered important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, food, household and automotive firms, by small and medium dollar cost of article firms, and by staple item firms. This reason was not considered an important reason for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by non-radio and/or television advertisers.

Overnight Copy Change. This reason was considered to be important for advertising via radio and/or television by service, household and automotive firms, by large, medium and small dollar cost of article firms, and by small size of article firms. This reason was not considered an important reason for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by non-radio and/or television advertisers.

Good Times. This reason was not considered an important reason for using radio and/or television advertising by all radio and/or television advertising classifications. This reason was considered important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by apparel firms.

Table 50. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising refusal via radio and/or television by necessity of item. * **

Reasons	Luxury	Staple	Essential
	Per cent		
Expense	100	100	91
Can fit budget	85	27	63
His customers	76	65	66
Different groups	67	61	66
Lasting impression	62	64	35
Will adv. product	51	21	79
Lengthy copy	23	17	13
Good times	19	0**	0**
Salesman	18	16	7
Blends in adv.	8	0**	4
Entertainment credit	5	9	0**
Public service	3	4	0**
Overnight copy change	3	0**	2
Occupied audience	3	0**	3
Builds reputations	0**	4	16
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	2

* No with prompting
** None of the sample named this as a reason

Public Service. This reason was considered an important reason for using ratio and/or television advertising by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by small and medium dollar cost of article firms, by staple and essential item firms, by small and medium size of article firms, by staple and essential item firms, by small and medium size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by large size firms. This reason was not considered to be important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by any classification.

Entertainment Credit. This reason was considered an important reason for using radio and/or television advertising by apparel, household and automotive firms, by medium dollar cost of article firms, by staple and essential item firms, by medium size of article firms, by residential and shopping center firms, and by large size firms. This reason was not considered to be important for refusing to advertise by non-radio and/or television advertisers.

Table 51. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by location of firm. * **

Reasons	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
	Per cent		
Salesman	89	40	80
Will adv. product	84	70	90
Different groups	81	70	72
Reputations	75	80	80
His customers	59	80	70
Can fit budget	52	70	52
Public service	48	60	62
Loyal audience	46	60	54
Entertainment credit	38	50	52
Coverage	29	40	40
Ear and eye	25	40	34
Occupied audience	25	30	36
Lasting impression	22	30	34
Good times	20	10	42
Blends in adv.	13	20	36
Expense	3	0**	10
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	2
Lengthy copy	0**	10	10

* Yes with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Loyal Audience. This reason was considered an important reason for using radio and/or television advertising by service, food, apparel, household and automotive firms, by small and medium dollar cost of article firms, by staple item firms, by large size of article firms, by downtown, residential and shopping center firms, and by large size firms. This reason was not considered important for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by non-radio and/or television advertisers.

Table 52. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by location of firm. * **

Reasons	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
	Per cent		
Expense	97	95	94
Different groups	86	64	47
Can't fit budget	84	60	76
His customers	71	60	77
Lasting impression	64	25	50
Won't adv. product	64	69	47
Lengthy copy	20	6	21
Blends in adv.	12	0**	2
Salesman	12	57	20
Reputations	5	17	6
Occupied audience	5	2	0**
Entertainment credit	3	0**	6
Good times	2	3	11
Public service	0**	0**	4
Overnight copy change	0**	3	2
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	2

* No with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Table 53. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television by size of firm. * **

Reasons	Large	Medium	Small
	Per cent		
Will adv. product	92	54	0**
Salesman	89	100	0**
Different groups	83	46	0**
Reputations	79	58	0**
His customers	77	46	0**
Can fit budget	58	25	0**
Public service	57	42	0**
Loyal audience	55	29	0**
Entertainment credit	53	25	0**
Occupied audience	32	17	0**
Coverage	32	21	0**
Ear and eye	32	17	0**
Good times	30	13	0**
Overnight copy change	28	25	0**
Blends in adv.	22	21	0**
Lasting impression	4	0**	0**
Expense	4	13	0**
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	0**

* Yes with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

Ear and Eye. This reason was considered an important reason for radio and/or television advertising by food, household and automotive firms, by small, medium and large dollar cost of article firms. Non-radio and/or television advertisers did not consider this reason important for refusing to use radio and/or television advertising.

Coverage. This reason was considered an important reason for advertising via radio and/or television by service and household firms, by medium and large dollar cost of article firms, by staple item firms. Non-radio and/or television advertisers did not consider this reason important for refusing to use radio and/or television advertising.

Table 54. Per cent of organizations who gave these reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television by size of firm. * **

Reasons	Large	Medium	Small
	Per cent		
Different groups	3	0**	64
Can't fit budget	2	0**	8
Builds reputations	0**	0**	56
His customers	0**	0**	60
Lasting impression	0**	0**	39
Public service	0**	0**	2
Overnight copy change	0**	0**	2
Expense	0**	0**	86
Entertainment credit	0**	0**	2
Good times	0**	0**	3
Lengthy copy	0**	0**	12
Loyal audience	0**	0**	0**
Ear and eye	0**	0**	0**
Occupied audience	0**	0**	0**
Coverage	0**	0**	0**
Blends in adv.	0**	0**	5
Won't adv. product	0**	0**	51
Salesman	0**	0**	56

* No with prompting

** None of the sample named this as a reason

CONCLUSIONS

This study attempted to examine the reasons retail businessmen in Topeka, Kansas gave for advertising or the refusal to advertise via radio and/or via television.

From the 264 completed survey questionnaires, a great amount of information stemmed. Considering the tests the sample and the questionnaire were subjected to, this information can be assumed to be accurate within the limits of this study.

A scrutiny of the results of the percentages run on the questionnaire replies gave an indication of the relative importance of each of the individual reasons for retail firms advertising or refusing to advertise via radio and/or via television.

Assuming that the more frequently an item in a group is selected over other items in the same group, the more important that item seemed to Topeka retailers in relationship to the other items in that group. Certain items contained in this study were selected more frequently than other items. Therefore, certain items in this study were considered by more retailers to be important than were other items.

The individual classifications showed very similar selections as to the more important reasons for advertising or refusing to advertise via radio and/or via television. The advertisers of every group chose these reasons for advertising; builds business reputations and can advertise the merchandise or service. Five of the six classifications selected these reasons for using radio and/or television advertising; is effective when aimed at different buying groups, reaches your customers, performs public services, can fit the advertising budget, and has approached you through a salesman. The six groups were even more nearly identical in their selection of reasons for refusing to advertise via radio and/or television. The more important reasons for not using this advertising were; isn't effective when aimed at different buying groups, doesn't reach your customers, messages don't create lasting impressions, is expensive, can not fit the advertising budget, and can not advertise the merchandise or service.

The general conclusions can be summed up rather simply.

Those businessmen in Topeka, Kansas, who advertise via radio and/or television believed, with and without prompting, that the most important reasons for using radio and/or television advertising, were that radio and/or television build business reputations and are effective when advertising a merchandise or a service. These same retail businessmen selected as important reasons of a lesser degree than the two named above; radio and/or television is effective when aimed at different buying groups, reaches the customers, can fit the budget, has approached one through a salesman, and performs public service.

Those businessmen in the same locality who did not advertise via radio and/or television stated in general that the reasons they refused to use this type of advertising was because radio and/or television isn't effective when advertising a merchandise or a service, when aimed at different buying groups, doesn't reach the customers, messages don't create lasting impressions, is expensive, can't fit the budget.

The differences of opinion on reasons for and against radio and/or television advertising stated by these two retail business groups brings forth this one conjecture.

The underlying reasons, could be one of, experience. The experience of radio and/or television advertisers as opposed to the inexperience of non-radio and/or television advertisers as concerns the merits of these media may account for differences of opinions found by the study. Those who have advertised via radio and/or television have been in a position to collect first hand evidence concerning their reasons for the use of these media, while those non-advertisers very likely have no first hand information or evidence of the merits of these media.

Aside from this one conjecture, this study merely attempted to report the facts concerning the use and non-use of radio and/or television advertising as a basis for further research into the underlying mental acts that promote the statements given by retail merchants in Topeka, Kansas, on their reasons for using or refusing to use radio and/or television.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank two wonderful educators in the Kansas State College Speech Department.

To Dr. Keltner who on many occasions with scientific research in mind, set this study course, and allowed but few deviations from that course.

To Dr. Whan, who was responsible for the selection of the study topic, and who was with me on each step of the way right to the conclusion.

Each of these members of the educational field have my deepest respect and gratitude.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agnew, Hugh E., and Dale Houghton. Marketing Policies. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941.

Agnew, Hugh E., Robert B. Jenkins, and James C. Drury. Outlines of Marketing. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1942.

American Marketing Association. The Technique of Marketing Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937.

Barton, Roger. Advertising Handbook. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.

Blankenship, Albert B. Advertising Media and Markets. New York: Harpers, 1946.

Borden, Niel H. Advertising Texts and Cases. Chicago: Richard Darwing, 1950.

Bradford, E. S. Marketing Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.

Brennen, Ed. Advertising Media. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.

Bridge, Harry E. Practical Advertising. New York: Rinehart Co., 1949.

Brown, Lyndon O. Marketing and Districution Research. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1949.

Clark, Charles E. An Introduction to Statistics. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1953.

Deming, William E. Some Theory of Sampling. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1953.

Duffy, Ben. Advertising Media and Markets. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.

Fryer, H. S. Elements of Statistics. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1954.

Goldsmith, Alfred E. Harvard Business Review. November 1953, 18:132.

Hepner, Harry W. Effective Advertising. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949.

Hobart, Donald M. Marketing Research Practices. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950.

Johnson, Palmer O. Descriptive and Sampling Statistics. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947.

Joughin, G. Louis. Basic Reference Forms. New York: F. S. Croft Co., 1941.

Kelley, Truman L. Statistical Methods. New York: Macmillan Co., 1924.

King, W. T. Elements of Statistical Methods. Macmillan Co., 1920.

Lutz, R. R. Graphic Presentation Simplified. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1949.

Miller, Merle. The Judges and the Judged. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1952.

Peatman, John Gray. Statistical Methods. New York: Harpers, 1947.

Schmid, Calvin F. Handbook of Graphic Presentation. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1954.

Seehafer, E. F., and J. W. Laemmar. Successful Radio and Television Advertising. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.

Sponsor Magazine. All Media Study. New York: 1952.

The Rand Corporation, A Million Random Digits With 100,000 Normal Deviations. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Wolfe, Charles H. Modern Radio Advertising. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1949.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Study questionnaire and prompting cards

THESIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Card No.______________________ Type of bus.__________

Name of business______________ Position______________

Address_______________________

1. Have you in the past five years advertised in, or on, the following:
   1. D. paper 2. Mag 3. Radio 4. Mail 5. M. Cover
   6. B. Board 7. H. Bill 8. W. Paper 9. TV
2. Have you in the last one year advertised in, or on, the following:
   1. D. paper 2. Mag 3. Radio 4. Mail 5. M. Cover
   6. B. Board 7. H. Bill 8. W. Paper 9. TV
3. Have you advertised on radio or TV in the last month? Yes___ No___ In the last week? Yes___ No___
4. What type of radio or TV advertising do you use? Spot___ Program___
5. What type of program do you sponsor? music___ news___ sports___ drama___ comedy___ other___
6. Have you any evidence that your sales have been increased by your TV or radio advertising? Yes___ No___
7. In your opinion or experience, what are the chief reasons why you (do) (don't) advertise on radio and/or TV?

	With prompting		Without prompting	
Reasons	Yes	No	Yes	No
A				
B				
C				
D				
E				
F				
G				
H				
I				
J				
K				
L				
M				
N				
O				
P				
Q				
R				

8. Does your strongest competitor advertise on radio or TV? Yes___ No___ Don't know___

QUESTIONNAIRE CARD
#1

IN YOUR OPINION OR EXPERIENCE, WHAT ARE THE CHIEF REASONS WHY YOU ADVERTISE ON RADIO AND/OR TV?

Such advertising:

A. builds business reputations.
B. is effective when aimed at different buying groups.
C. reaches your customers.
D. messages create lasting impressions.
E. perform public services.
F. copy can be changed overnight.
G. is not too expensive.
H. gives credit for entertainment to advertiser.
I. has good advertising times available.
J. can use lengthy advertising copy with success.
K. builds faithful, loyal audiences.
L. appeals to the ear and eye.
M. appeals to listeners or viewers otherwise occupied.
N. has local, regional, and national coverage.
O. blends advertising and entertainment.
P. can fit your advertising budget.
Q. can advertise your merchandise or service.
R. has approached you through a salesman.

To provide greater accuracy in the field survey, the author used six affirmative prompting cards. The only differences in the cards were the placement of the reasons for the use of radio and/or television advertising. The arrangement of the reasons was rotated by two after each interview.

QUESTIONNAIRE CARD
#7

IN YOUR OPINION OR EXPERIENCE, WHAT ARE THE CHIEF REASONS WHY YOU DON'T ADVERTISE VIA RADIO, VIA TV?

Such advertising:

A. doesn't build business reputations.
B. isn't effective when aimed at different buying groups.
C. doesn't reach my customer.
D. messages don't create lasting impressions.
E. doesn't perform public services.
F. can't change it's overnight copy.
G. is expensive.
H. doesn't give credit for the entertainment to the advertiser.
I. is limited in good advertising time.
J. can't use lengthy advertising copy successfully.
K. can't build faithful, loyal audiences.
L. does not appeal to the ear and eye.
M. does not appeal to listeners or viewers otherwise occupied.
N. does not have local, regional, and national coverage.
O. does not blend advertising and entertainment.
P. can not fit your advertising budget.
Q. can not advertise your merchandise or service.
R. has never approached you through salesman.

To provide greater accuracy in the field survey, the author used six negative prompting cards. The only differences in the cards were the placement of the reasons for the use of radio and/or television advertising. The arrangement of the reasons was rotated by two after each interview.

APPENDIX II

Abbreviations for questions 1 through 6, 7, and 8.

Table 55. Abbreviations for reasons in questions 1-6, and 8.

Abbreviation	Reason
DP	Daily paper
Mag	Magazine
Radio	Radio
Mail	Mail
MC	Match cover
BB	Billboard
HB	Handbill
WP	Weekly paper
TV	Television

Table 56. Abbreviations for reasons in question seven.

Abbreviation	Reason
Reputations	Builds business reputations
Different groups	Is effective when aimed at different groups
His customers	Reaches your customers
Lasting impressions	Messages create lasting impressions
Public service	Perform public services.
Overnight copy change	Copy can be changed overnight
Expense	Is not too expensive
Entertainment credit	Gives credit for entertainment to advertiser
Good times	Has good advertising times available
Lengthy copy	Can use lengthy advertising copy with success
Loyal audiences	Builds faithful, loyal audiences
Ear and eye	Appeals to the ear and eye
Occupied audience	Appeals to listeners or viewers otherwise occupied
Coverage	Has local, regional, and national coverage
Blends in adv.	Blends advertising and entertainment
Can fit budget	Can fit your advertising budget
Will adv. product	Can advertise your merchandise or service
Salesman	Has approached you through a salesman

APPENDIX III

Tables related to questions 2 and 3

Table 57. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past one year by commodity.

Type	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
DP	90.8	91.0	55.5	100.0	96.2	93.2
Mag	14.5	28.4		4.3	7.6	13.6
Radio	48.8	46.6	19.4	73.8	50.6	52.3
Mail	25.0	50.0		17.3	15.2	13.6
MC	28.5	29.6	19.4	30.4	24.2	36.2
BB	32.7	51.1	16.4	21.7	22.8	22.7
HB	7.2	1.1	36.1	8.9	13.9	2.5
WP	20.0	20.5	19.4	13.0	19.0	25.0
TV	9.2	11.3	55.0	21.7	7.6	4.6

Table 58. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past one year by dollar cost size.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
DP	90.8	82.8	91.5	93.8
Mag	14.5	2.1	22.1	17.4
Radio	48.8	42.0	46.0	57.8
Mail	25.0	3.2	38.0	31.2
MC	28.5	26.8	24.8	34.4
BB	32.7	17.2	39.8	39.1
HB	7.2	16.1	2.7	3.2
WP	20.0	23.7	15.8	21.9
TV	9.2	5.5	10.0	10.9

Table 59. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past one year by necessity of items.

Type	Total	Luxury	Staple	Essential
DP	90.8	97.0	95.1	81.6
Mag	14.5	18.4	8.1	2.9
Radio	48.8	51.0	51.6	29.8
Mail	25.0	40.9	11.3	7.6
MC	28.5	27.6	30.6	19.3
BB	32.7	48.0	33.9	14.4
HB	7.2		3.2	10.0
WP	20.0	6.1	16.1	4.8
TV	9.2	11.2	9.7	3.8

Table 60. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past one year by size of article.

Type	Total	Small	Medium	Large
DP	90.8	78.6	94.6	100.0
Mag	14.5	2.7	5.3	23.7
Radio	48.8	5.3	40.7	84.2
Mail	25.0	12.0	15.9	26.8
MC	28.5	5.3	24.8	44.7
BB	32.7	6.7	24.8	65.8
HB	7.2	5.3	5.3	5.3
WP	20.0	2.7	9.7	10.5
TV	9.2		1.8	25.0

Table 61. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past one year by location of firm.

Type	Total	Downtown	Resi- dential	Shopping center
DP	90.8	94.3	84.5	88.7
Mag	18.5	16.4	2.2	5.2
Radio	48.8	53.4	22.2	39.2
Mail	25.0	30.4	13.3	12.4
MC	28.5	28.8	15.5	24.7
BB	32.7	39.4	20.0	26.8
HB	7.2	0.082	11.1	8.2
WP	20.0	5.7	4.4	12.4
TV	9.2	11.5	4.4	5.2

Table 62. Per cent of organizations who have advertised in the past one year by size of business.

Type	Total	Large	Medium	Small
DP	90.8	100.0	100.0	79.6
Mag	14.5	17.7		4.7
Radio	18.8	100.0		
Mail	25.0	29.2	8.3	15.7
MC	28.5	40.6	29.2	11.2
BB	32.7	49.6	29.2	15.7
HB	7.2	4.4	4.2	6.3
WP	20.0	10.6	20.8	3.2
TV	9.2	27.6		

Table 63. Per cent of organizations who have advertised on radio or TV in the past week or month by commodity.

Month	Total	Service	Food	Apparel	House-hold	Auto-motive
yes	76	78.1	71.4	82.4	62.5	91.3
no	24	21.9	28.6	17.6	37.5	8.7
<u>Week</u>						
yes	59	63.5	71.4	70.6	45.0	65.2
no	41	36.5	28.6	29.4	55.0	34.8

Table 64. Per cent of organizations who have advertised on radio or TV in the last month or week by dollar cost.

Month	Total	Small	Medium	Large
yes	76	79.5	75.0	73.0
no	24	20.5	25.0	27.0
<u>Week</u>				
yes	59	56.4	61.5	59.5
no	41	43.6	28.5	40.5

Table 65. Per cent of organizations who have advertised on radio or TV in the last month or week by necessity of item.

Month	Total	Luxury	Staple	Necessity
yes	76	84.0	75.0	83.9
no	24	16.0	25.0	16.1
<u>Week</u>				
yes	59	64.0	56.3	61.4
no	41	36.0	43.7	38.6

Table 66. Per cent of organizations who have advertised on radio or TV in the past month or week by size of item.

Month	Total	Small	Medium	Large
yes	76	25.0	69.5	92.2
no	24	75.0	30.5	7.8
Week				
yes	59	25.0	47.8	71.9
no	41	75.0	52.2	28.1

Table 67. Per cent of organizations who have advertised on radio or TV in the past month or week by location of firm.

Month	Total	Downtown	Residential	Shopping center
yes	76	90.8	40.0	73.9
no	24	9.2	60.0	26.1
Week				
yes	59	72.3	50.0	47.3
no	41	28.7	50.0	52.7

Table 68. Per cent of organizations who have advertised on radio or TV in the past month or week by size of firm.

Month	Total	Large	Medium	Small
yes	76	81.4	---	---
no	24	18.6	---	---
Week				
yes	59	61.1	---	---
no	41	38.9	---	---

APPENDIX IV

Cumulative frequency table, proportionality table, and a table for computing one standard error

Table 69. Cumulative frequency.

Group number	Frequency of occurrence	Cumulative frequency of occurrence	Cumulative number of cases	Cumulative % of occurrence
1	30	30	88	34.0
2	4	34	121	28.1
3	11	45	141	31.9
4	21	66	220	30.0
5	14	80	264	30.3

Table 70. Proportionality table.

Group number	Commodity group	Distribution of "universe"	Distribution of sample
		Per cent	
1	service	32.9	33.4
2	food	11.9	12.5
3	apparel	6.7	7.2
4	household	30.2	30.2
5	auto	18.3	16.7
Total		100.0	100.0

Table 71. Table of one standard error.

	Size sample	99 1	98 2	97 3	96 4	95 5	90 10	85 15	80 20	75 25	70 30	65 35	60 40	55 45	50 50
1. A	88	1.05													5.34
B	33	1.6													8.3
C	20	2.07													10.4
D	79	1.1													5.65
E	44	1.48													7.45
2. A	90	1.03													5.2
B	113	0.94													4.7
C	61	1.22													6.25
3. A	98	1.01													5.06
B	62	1.26													6.3
C	104	0.97													4.9
4. A	75	1.14													5.77
B	113	0.94													4.7
C	76	1.14													5.77
5. A	122	0.90													4.5
B	45	1.48													7.45
C	97	1.01													5.06
6. A	113	0.94													4.7
B	24	2.07													10.4
C	127	0.89													4.4

Table 72. Table of one standard error.

	Size sample	99 1	98 2	97 3	96 4	95 5	90 10	85 15	80 20	75 25	70 30	65 35	60 40	55 45	50 50
1. A	46	1.48													7.45
B	10	3.15													15.8
C	18	2.35													11.8
D	43	1.70													7.5
E	24	2.07													10.4
2. A	45	1.48													7.45
B	57	1.31													6.65
C	39	1.58													8.0
3. A	59	1.31													7.07
B	39	1.58													8.10
C	40	1.50													7.9
4. A	8	3.52													17.4
B	64	1.22													6.25
C	66	1.22													6.19
5. A	78	1.1													5.65
B	10	3.15													15.8
C	50	1.41													6.65
6. A	113	0.94													4.7
B	24	2.07													--
C	--	--													--

Table 73. Table of one standard error.

	Size sample	99 1	98 2	97 3	96 4	95 5	90 10	85 15	80 20	75 25	70 30	65 35	60 40	55 45	50 50
1. A	41	1.55													7.8
B	7	3.76													18.9
C	17	2.35													11.8
D	40	1.61													7.9
E	23	2.07													10.44
2. A	39	1.58													8.0
B	52	1.35													8.83
C	37	1.6													8.3
3. A	50	1.31													6.65
B	39	1.58													8.0
C	37	1.76													8.83
4. A	4	4.98													25.0
B	46	1.48													7.45
C	64	1.22													6.25
5. A	65	1.22													6.25
B	10	3.15													15.8
C	47	1.45													7.28
6. A	113	0.94													4.7
B	24	2.07													10.4
C	--	--													--

Table 74. Table of one standard error.

	Size sample	99 1	98 2	97 3	96 4	95 5	90 10	85 15	80 20	75 25	70 30	65 35	60 40	55 45	50 50
1. A	46	1.40													7.45
B	23	1.95													10.80
C	2	4.45													30.4
D	36	1.6													8.3
E	20	2.23													14.49
2. A	48	1.45													7.28
B	36	1.6													8.3
C	25	2.0													10.0
3. A	39	1.68													8.0
B	23	2.07													10.4
C	64	1.22													6.25
4. A	67	1.18													6.1
B	64	1.22													6.25
C	10	3.15													15.8
5. A	44	1.48													7.45
B	35	1.6													8.3
C	47	1.45													7.28
6. A	113	0.94													4.7
B	24	2.07													10.4
C	127	1.92													7.7

REASONS RETAIL MERCHANTS IN TOPEKA, KANSAS, GIVE FOR ADVERTISING OR REFUSING TO ADVERTISE VIA RADIO AND VIA TELEVISION

by

DANIEL BURK HURLEY

B. S., Kansas State College
of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1952

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1956

This study was undertaken to delve into certain facets of the advertising field. The segment of the advertiser himself has been only conjectured about, with thorough research almost impossible to discover. In this light, it was decided to explore certain aspects of the advertiser and his reasons for advertising.

This study was limited to a consideration of the advertiser's use or his refusal to use the media of radio and/or television.

To accumulate material capable of answering the purpose of this study, it was necessary to decide upon a type of material collection method that would provide adequate facts upon which analysis could be made. The opinion type survey was used for this purpose, because an opinion was all that was desired of each individual respondent.

A questionnaire was devised and tested in a pilot survey run in Manhattan, Kansas, on the ninth, tenth, and eleventh of September, 1955. The questionnaire was found adequate.

A stratified random sampling technique was used to choose appropriate and sufficiently large sample.

The sample of 264 respondents was selected from the 4,135 individual retail firms listed in the classified section of the Topeka, Kansas, telephone book. These 264 subjects were then individually interviewed.

The sample was divided into six classifications for the purposes of analysis. These divisions were by commodity firms, dollar cost of purchased item firms, necessity of item firms, size of purchase item, location of firm, and size of firm.

The cumulative frequency method was used to establish the reliability of the sample. Proportionality tests were then run to determine the representativeness of the individual classifications. The sample was proved to be reliable and representative.

To further eliminate errors, aided and unaided recall were used to determine what was uppermost in the respondent's mind, and what reaction he made upon being prompted.

Assuming that the more frequently an item in a group is selected over other items in the same group, the more important that item can be considered in relationship to the other items in that group. Certain items contained in this study were selected more frequently than other items in this study. Therefore, certain items in this study were considered by retailers to be more important than were other items.

The individual classifications showed very similar selections as to the more important reasons for advertising or refusing to advertise via radio and/or television. The radio and/or television advertisers of every classification chose these reasons for advertising via radio and/or television: 1) radio and/or television build better business reputations, and 2) can advertise your merchandise or service. These same advertising retailers selected as important reasons of a lesser degree than the two named above, radio and/or television is effective when aimed at different buying groups, reaches your customers, can fit your budget, has approached you through a salesman, and performs public service.

Those businessmen in the same locality who did not advertise via radio and/or television stated in general that the reasons they refused to use this type of advertising was because radio and/or television isn't effective when advertising a merchandise or a service, when aimed at different buying groups, doesn't reach your customers, messages don't create lasting impressions, is expensive, and can't fit your budget.

This study merely attempted to report the facts concerning ths use and non-use of radio and/or television advertising as a basis for further research into the underlying mental acts that promote the statements given by retail merchants in Topeka, Kansas, on their reasons for using or refusing to use radio and/or television advertising.