

Rough Vs. Finished Commercial Testing--

A Point Of View From Analysis Of 60 Rough vs.

Finished Commercial Pairs Using Mapes & Ross'

Natural ExposureSM Test Methodology

The issue of **rough** vs. **finished** commercial testing continues to be surrounded in controversy. Logically this makes sense, as most would agree “why spend a significant amount of money on **finished** executions when an inexpensive animatic achieves the same performance results?” However, the issue is somewhat complex.

For instance, though **rough** commercials are, for the most part, predictive of their **finished** counterparts, Mapes & Ross feels that the long-term effect of running a commercial that does not have positive imagery associations with the brand/company could be detrimental. It is reasonable to assume that **rough** commercials would be more prone to imparting negative images about the brand/company via repeated exposures than professionally-finished executions.

It is interesting to note that the predictiveness of **rough** commercial executions is one of the few areas where all the major copy testing services are in agreement.

Mapes & Ross, in the course of testing over 25,000 TV commercials, has had the unique opportunity to examine performance of 60 pairs of commercials, where first the **rough** commercial was tested and, with no substantive changes, the e version of the same commercial was tested again. In fact, some of the pairs were tested in reverse order: the client tested the **finished** commercial first and then constructed an animatic version of the commercial in an attempt to ‘hold our feet to the fire.’ The following analysis is based on a close examination of these 60 commercial pairs.

DATA SET:

Overall, there are 16 different and diverse product categories in the data set of 60 pairs (120 commercials):

Air Fresheners	Household Cleaners
Appliances	Insect Sprays
Automobiles	Laundry Products
Automotive Parts	Men's Underwear
Bathroom Tissue	Paper Towels
Beverages	Panty Hose
Drug Products	Power Tools
Foods	Shampoo & Hair Prods.

PERFORMANCE:

Performance of the **rough** is extremely predictive of the performance achieved in the **finished** version. The tests of “identical” **rough** vs. **finished** commercial pairs shows that the average performance for day-after recall and day-after persuasion in the Mapes & Ross *Natural Exposure*SM methodology is extremely close.

	<u>ANIMATIC</u>	<u>FINISHED</u>
Average Proven Recall:	24.2%	25.0%
Average Persuasion:	+11.4%	+11.3%

For **rough/finished** "identical" pairs, the coefficients of correlation for the performance measures are:

Proven Recall:	r = .86
Persuasion:	r = .84

Interpretation:

Interpretation of the performance results of “identical” **rough** vs. **finished** pairs requires a certain amount of caution in differentiating:

FORM

vs.

SUBSTANCE

That is to say, though the performance of the **rough** is extremely predictive of performance achieved by the **finished** version, viewers still can tell the difference between **rough** and **finished** commercials.

Mention of form by proven recallers is usually at a noticeable level in communication data from **rough** commercial tests. This level of mention depends on the degree of finish, i.e., the roughness of the execution.

Mention of form is tabulated in the visual communication (presentationals) table of the standard Mapes & Ross report and is not used as a unique point of proof when determining the recall performance for the commercial. The average reference to the **rough** form is 32%. The range is from 0% to 76%, and depends primarily upon the degree of finish.

The evaluative criteria used to measure performance indicate the commercial's ability to:

- Register the Name of the Advertiser (Proven Recall)
- Communicate
- Persuade

The Mapes & Ross *Natural Exposure* methodology is designed to measure the effectiveness of the content and execution factors used in the commercial in terms of the commercial's ability to achieve these goals. Because these measurements are made on a day-after exposure basis, it is possible to concentrate on these content and execution factors which indicate importance to the consumer.

The extreme predictiveness of the **rough** performance compared to the **finished** performance suggests that ultimately viewers' reaction to the content that is meaningful and rewarding is more important and lasting than reaction to form, which may be more superficial and temporary.

High-Scoring Vs. Average/Low-Scoring Commercials:

Rough performance tends to be predictive of **finished** performance for high-scoring commercials as well as average or low-scoring commercials.

	<u>PERSUASION</u>	<u>PROVEN RECALL</u>
<u>High-Scoring Commercials:</u>		
Pantyhose "A" - animatic	+21.5%	47%
Pantyhose "A" - finished	+16.4	49
Glass Cleaner - animatic	+18.9	33
Glass Cleaner - finished	+18.4	34
<u>Average/Low-Scoring Commercials:</u>		
Pantyhose "B" - animatic	+6.8	20
Pantyhose "B" - finished	+8.3	20
Cereal - animatic	+0.9	13
Cereal - finished	+3.0	10

Conclusions:

- I. Because the findings indicate that **rough** commercials are highly predictive of their **finished** counterparts, Mapes & Ross recommends that **rough** commercials be produced and tested.

- II. THE BENEFITS INCLUDE:
 - A. Reduced expenditures to produce and test different concepts and executions to increase the chances of finding “winners.”
 - B. Go/No-Go decisions made easier with **rough** executions than with **finished** executions because of a substantially reduced financial and psychological commitment.
 - C. More flexibility and latitude for creatives in experimenting with different creative approaches in order to produce the most effective commercial that fulfills the brand strategy/objectives.
 - D. Areas of concern easier to identify before final execution is shot.

ROUGH vs. FINISHED

“DAY-AFTER” BRAND PREFERENCE CHANGE (PERSUASION)

60 ROUGH/FINISHED PAIRS

<u>PRODUCT</u>	<u>ROUGH</u>	<u>FINISHED</u>	<u>PRODUCT</u>	<u>ROUGH</u>	<u>FINISHED</u>
Jelly	+11.7%	+11.8%	Pantyhose	+4.4%	+5.4%
Appliance	+7.2	+3.7	Pantyhose	+5.2	+4.3
Razor Blade	+6.2	+8.7	Shampoo	+6.1	+7.8
Razor Blade	+9.6	+10.9	Bathroom Tissue	+15.2	+15.3
Air Freshener	+8.2	+8.1	Snack Cake	+8.0	+7.6
Pantyhose	+7.4	+9.4	Grape Juice	+16.4	+20.5
Pantyhose	+9.3	+11.1	Pantyhose	+11.4	+16.4
Pantyhose	+8.4	+6.5	Pantyhose	+9.7	+16.6
Pantyhose	+14.7	+19.3	Shock Absorbers	+9.6	+7.7
Automobile	+12.0	+11.9	Pantyhose	+9.5	+6.7
Automobile	+10.0	+11.7	Hair Coloring	+5.4	+4.7
Glass Cleaner	+18.9	+18.4	Men's Underwear	+13.4	+13.5
Laundry Additive	+8.6	+15.8	Frozen Dinners	+4.5	+7.1
Household Cleaner	+24.1	+17.5	Ice Cream Product	+19.3	+18.1
Pantyhose	+15.7	+20.5	Facial Care Product	+7.3	+5.9
Pantyhose	+11.9	+11.1	Mayonnaise	+11.9	+10.5
Pantyhose	+19.9	+13.8	Frozen Breakfast	+7.0	+6.7
Pantyhose	+13.7	+13.9	Power Tool	+16.6	+16.2
Insect Spray	+6.9	+5.5	Bathroom Tissue	+4.5	+3.5
Skin Care Medicine	+8.3	+6.5	Paper Towel	+15.9	+15.9
Cereal	+0.9	+3.0	Bathroom Tissue	+16.7	+15.5
Pantyhose	+21.5	+16.4	Bathroom Tissue	+9.1	+5.6
Pantyhose	+6.8	+8.3	Bathroom Tissue	+8.8	+8.0
Pantyhose	+11.5	+9.8	Paper Towel	+13.6	+11.2
Pantyhose	+11.3	+9.9	Paper Towel	+17.1	+15.2
Pantyhose	+8.8	+5.4	Bathroom Tissue	+11.9	+14.7
Pantyhose	+13.6	+9.4	Juice Product	+15.1	+15.5
Skin Care Medicine	+15.6	+12.7	Juice Product	+16.2	+15.5
Grape Juice	+12.8	+11.7	Juice Product	+17.7	+18.9
Shortening	+7.1	+8.0	Paper Towel	+17.1	+18.4

ROUGH

FINISHED

AVERAGE:

+11.4%

+11.3%

CORRELATION:

r = .84

ROUGH vs. FINISHED

DAY-AFTER PROVEN RECALL

60 ROUGH/FINISHED PAIRS

<u>PRODUCT</u>	<u>ROUGH</u>	<u>FINISHED</u>	<u>PRODUCT</u>	<u>ROUGH</u>	<u>FINISHED</u>
Jelly	36%	34%	Pantyhose	29%	34%
Appliance	32	33	Pantyhose	24	24
Razor Blade	35	29	Shampoo	24	24
Razor Blade	32	37	Bathroom Tissue	30	38
Air Freshener	26	24	Snack Cake	15	13
Pantyhose	42	39	Grape Juice	26	39
Pantyhose	23	21	Pantyhose	21	27
Pantyhose	25	26	Pantyhose	21	35
Pantyhose	16	13	Shock Absorbers	14	21
Automobile	16	18	Pantyhose	19	15
Automobile	14	20	Hair Coloring	23	18
Glass Cleaner	33	34	Men's Underwear	24	22
Laundry Additive	12	20	Frozen Dinners	18	17
Household Cleaner	20	20	Ice Cream Product	29	29
Pantyhose	28	28	Facial Care Product	18	22
Pantyhose	26	26	Mayonnaise	10	11
Pantyhose	22	21	Frozen Breakfast	25	28
Pantyhose	30	37	Power Tool	41	46
Insect Spray	22	18	Bathroom Tissue	16	17
Skin Care Medicine	32	29	Paper Towel	18	15
Cereal	13	10	Bathroom Tissue	22	25
Pantyhose	47	49	Bathroom Tissue	18	15
Pantyhose	20	20	Bathroom Tissue	18	16
Pantyhose	24	26	Paper Towel	26	24
Pantyhose	22	22	Paper Towel	26	25
Pantyhose	20	18	Bathroom Tissue	32	31
Pantyhose	31	31	Juice Product	20	32
Skin Care Medicine	19	20	Juice Product	19	17
Grape Juice	31	27	Juice Product	18	17
Shortening	30	30	Paper Towel	25	26

ROUGH

FINISHED

AVERAGE:

24.2%

25.0%

CORRELATION:

r = .86

ROUGH vs. FINISHED

DISTRIBUTION OF DAY-AFTER BRAND PREFERENCE

CHANGE (PERSUASION) SCORES

:30 COMMERCIALS - WOMEN

<u>BRAND PREFERENCE</u> <u>CHANGE PERFORMANCE</u>	<u>% OF</u> <u>ALL</u> <u>COMMERCIALS</u>	<u>% OF ALL</u> <u>ROUGH</u> <u>COMMERCIALS</u>
(NEGATIVE)	5.1%	3.0%
0.0 - 1.9	10.6	6.5
2.0 - 3.9	10.4	9.7
4.0 - 5.9	11.9	11.7
6.0 - 7.9	12.3	11.9
8.0 - 9.9	11.0	11.1
10.0 - 11.9	10.2	11.1
12.0 - 13.9	8.3	9.2
14.0 - 15.9	6.2	7.5
16.0 - 17.9	4.7	5.9
18.0 - 19.9	3.3	4.2
20.0 OR MORE	<u>5.8</u>	<u>8.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%
(NUMBER OF COMM'L'S)	(14,039)	(2,836)

ROUGH vs. FINISHED

DISTRIBUTION OF PROVEN RECALL SCORES

:30 COMMERCIALS - WOMEN

<u>PROVEN RECALL PERFORMANCE</u>	<u>% OF ALL COMMERCIALS</u>	<u>% OF ALL ROUGH COMMERCIALS</u>
0 - 4.9	5.6%	2.1%
5 - 9.9	11.6	8.1
10 - 14.9	16.6	17.9
15 - 19.9	17.8	20.5
20 - 24.9	16.7	19.4
25 - 29.9	13.1	14.0
30 - 34.9	8.5	8.8
35 - 39.9	4.8	4.3
40 - 44.9	2.9	2.6
45 - 49.9	1.3	1.2
50 - 54.9	0.7	0.7
55 - 59.9	0.3	0.3
60 +	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%
(NUMBER OF COMM'LS.)	(20,115)	(2,877)