HYPOTHESES REVISITED

"Humanistic Advertising-A Holistic Cultural Perspective" was presented by Judie Lannon and Peter Cooper at the U.K. Market Research Society (MRS) Conference in 1983. The article sets out to challenge existing models of how advertising works by changing the fundamental question from "What does advertising do to people?" (e.g., manipulate, persuade, sell, communicate a unique selling proposition, create a brand personality) to "What do people do with advertising?"

This article drew on the discipline of social anthropology (through the work of Mary Douglas) to explain the social and cultural role of advertising in people's lives. Advertising creates social identification and cohesion, and offers a shared symbolic language for communication in different social contexts. The authors also referenced the theories of Gestalt psychology to explain that a brand is more than, and different from, the sum of its parts.

Linear sequential models of how advertising works first appeared in the 1950s and were derived from classic behaviorist learning theory-namely that effective advertising communication guides the consumer through a series of stages-for example, AIDA (attention, interest, desire, action) or DAGMAR, which proposes a sequence of awareness, comprehension, conviction, and action. Their continual appeal (even today) lies in the control they offer, their behaviorist origin, and their susceptibility to measurement.

The authors accused them of being "seriously flawed," both theoretically and practically, and went on to state that these systems of advertising development "have nothing to do with real human beings and nothing to do with creative advertising."

For the purposes of this article, two of the conclusions reached (among many other valid and interesting ideas) were of particular interest:

- People are not tabula rasa (i.e., blank sheets of paper on which communication messages are indelibly printed).
- People do something with communications-they interact whether consciously or not.

As Lannon and Cooper (1983) state:

Gestalt psychology emphasises perception of totalities rather than a cataloguing of individual elements and the registration of the minimum detail necessary for classification; cognitive theorists stress resistance to change and fragmentation to avoid dissonance; mass communication theorists contribute uses and gratification theories. The everyday experience of interviewers talking to people about advertising regularly demonstrates how people select, distort, and create messages according to their personal perceptions.

"A Great Ad-Pity They Can't Remember the Brand-True or False? The Branding Issue in Contemporary TV Advertising" was presented to the MRS Conference in 1986 by Wendy Gordon and Roy Langmaid. The article was highly controversial and became notorious because the authors devised an experiment using hypnosis that contravened the MRS Code of Conduct.

The central tenet of the article was that it is simplistic and erroneous to conclude that a campaign is "well branded" based on direct questions about the advertising content and/or recall of the brand name.

Using a professional hypnotherapist, a small number of male and female volunteers, and an experimental design, the authors attempted "to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt the existence of 'branding-advertising' associations that are outside the realm of conscious recall" (Gordon and Langmaid, 1986).

All of us are familiar with and observe others daily in a "trance-like" state-when we are on "auto-pilot" in the supermarket, slumped in an "altered state of consciousness" in front of the TV, in another world while running in the park listening to music through earphones, or "vacant and staring at everything and nothing" while traveling on the tube.

These states of mind were well documented in psychological literature at the time the article was written and referred to as "state dependent memory." According to Gordon and Langmaid (1986): "During many ordinary and extraordinary situations our constantly shifting psycho-physiological states can encapsulate memory so that it is not available to our usual conscious frames of reference."

The authors set up an experiment using light hypnosis to mirror this kind of low-attention state of mind. Ten people were asked standard
questions about advertising recall before being hypnotized. In all cases they remembered a great deal more about the advertising (especially the emotional meanings) when they were hypnotized than they did when conscious.

Two fascinating insights were reported as a result of the experiment:
- There is irrefutable proof of the presence in the consumer’s mind of advertising messages linked to a brand that are inaccessible to conscious recall. Furthermore, the advertising associations remembered had an emotional meaning to the individual.
- It is important to create an appropriate context to facilitate recall of advertising, be it a mood of relaxation, an environment such as point of purchase or point of consumption, or a visual stimulus such as the package, a tune, or a sound. Information is state-bound, and contextual triggers must be found to make it available to the conscious mind.

The authors offered a new definition of the process of branding as opposed to the current definition of creating a brand:

Branding may be thought of as the process of creating the totality of meaning which consumers attribute to a brand—the unique and relevant bundle of values that are internalized and combined with past experience and/or current perceptions of the brand itself (Gordon and Langmaid, 1988).

And, furthermore, "Branding is the relevant unit of meaning that is inextricably linked to a brand, awareness of which may be conscious or intuitive."

Branding is therefore a continuous process of creating relevant associations and meanings.

"Love the Ad. Buy the Product" was written by Alex Biel in 1990. The aim of the article was to add further evidence to the highly controversial conclusions of the ARF Copy Validation Study (Haley, 1990). This long-awaited macro study of pretesting measures concluded, unexpectedly, that scaled response about the likeability of a commercial was the best predictor of sales effectiveness (more so than measures such as day-after recall, content recall, persuasion, communication, overall commercial reactions, and other diagnostics commonly found in many pretesting systems).

Biel's article, based on his own forensic and large-scale quantitative work with prime-time commercials and target market consumers, showed that "likeability" is a complex concept made up of five main factors:
- ingenuity-clever, imaginative, original, silly, not dull;
- meaningful-worth remembering, effective, not pointless, not easy to forget, true to life, convincing, informative, and believable;
- energy-lively, fast moving, appealing, and well done;
- warmth-gentle, warm, and sensitive; and
- does not rub the wrong way—not worn out, not phony, not irritating.

The article concluded by exploring hypotheses as to why likeability should be so closely related to sales using explanations of mental processing drawn from cognitive psychology.

- Commercials that are liked are less likely to be avoided (zapped) in reality or mentally.
- Likeability is the "gatekeeper" to further processing. "Consumers first form an overall impression of an advertisement on a visceral or 'gut' level. To the extent that this impression is positive they are likely to continue to process the advertising more fully."
- Commercials as brand personality attributes—in product categories where brands are very similar, the advertising itself may be considered a brand attribute (e.g., Marlboro man).
- Positive effect is transferred from the advertisement to the brand (simple halo effect experiments).
- Commercials that are liked involve some kind of coauthorship in meaning creation. Biel (1990) referred to Jeremy Bullmore, who had previously argued that good advertising entices the consumer into mental collaboration: "He suggested that if an advertisement goes beyond mere message registration to elicit a contribution from the consumer it is likely to be more effective. The consumer has moved from being an observer or maybe even an adversary to become an accomplice or, as Bullmore put it, a 'part author.'"

NEW THINKING

There are several themes that cut across these three articles.

- All implicitly or explicitly challenge the most frequently used advertising measurement and evaluative systems, especially pretesting and tracking methodologies.
- All emphasize in different ways that effective advertising is that which is personally meaningful, culturally relevant, and creates a subjective feeling of warmth and positive affect.
- All acknowledge that what people tell you is not everything in their heads, and what is in their heads is neither available to themselves nor to researchers, no matter what tool is used.
- All grapple with the complexity of human beings concluding that successful advertising is neither easy to create nor easy to measure.
- All struggle with the problem of how advertising (today we would talk more broadly about all of a brand's communication and experiences) enables people to create meaning (the inner world) rather than being simply external stimuli (from the outer world).

Why is it that the ideas, hypotheses, and "proof" from a valid (albeit pilot experiment), specific research projects (ARF Study and Biel's own work at WPP's Centre for Research and Development), or evidence from other respected disciplines (social anthropology and cognitive/Gestalt psychology) failed to convince the advertising, marketing, and research worlds to change their beliefs and practice away from the AIDA model?

RESISTANCE TO NEW MODELS OF THINKING
There are two main reasons to explain why there was resistance to this new thinking:

- the overriding need for measurement and evidence and
- loss aversion—a psychological construct.

### The measurement imperative

The decades of the ‘80s and ‘90s were characterized by an obsession with advertising, especially television.

A great amount of intellectual and pragmatic effort went into the process of advertising—how to create it, how to measure its effectiveness, how best to buy the media for it, how it helps to develop financially (in terms of the balance sheet) valuable brands, and, to a lesser extent, how to target it at the right group of receptive consumers.

The debate about measurement of both short- and long-term effects of advertising was heated, as was the continued argument and competition among suppliers for the best pretesting and tracking systems. Brand equity and the financial evaluation of brands on the balance sheet generated a huge amount of intellectual effort that was supported by the top managers in organizations.

Little wonder that mental models that argued that the advertising process is complex, nonrational (sociocultural, emotional, unconscious, interactive), and not easy to measure, and that consumers control the process of creating meaning (rather than brand owners and their agencies) were basically ignored.

### Loss aversion

There is a theory in social psychology that Kahneman and Tversky (in Schwartz, 2004) call "loss aversion." This holds that losses have twice the psychological impact as equivalent gains. People hate losses, and this applies not only to financial investment (e.g., giving up all the money spent over the years on pretesting or tracking systems as "sunk costs") but also to the emotional investment in the “rightness of beliefs and mental models” that have for many years determined protocols for decision making.

### NEW EVIDENCE—MORE SCIENTIFIC—to support the new thinking

People who work in organizations have absolute respect for numbers. "Show me the numbers" is the evidence that is most relied upon to support a decision or maintain current behavior in business today. But there is a different kind of hard science—a new and nascent science enabled by technology and by multidisciplinary collaboration. Over the past decade there have been dramatic developments in the field of neuroscience (the study of the brain), which is itself a combination of other sciences.

There are many new books aimed at the layperson (Carter, 1998; Pert, 1999; Draaisma, 2004; Ramachandran, 2004) that cross-reference the following sciences.

- The specialized study of the brain: through functional brain imaging it is now possible to obtain a graphic representation of the brain of a healthy living person and to observe where neural activity is greatest during certain mental states. Detailed study is now possible of the brain’s functional anatomy and metabolism, and also of experimental neuroscientific approaches to the mechanisms of emotion, attention, cognition, memory, and consciousness.
- Clinical neurology: the ongoing analysis of case studies of people (including re-examination of reports of cases from as far back as the 18th century) with dysfunctional brains or bodies due to birth, accident, or illness. The study of the abnormal has always been important in the understanding of the normal.
- Cognitive psychology: controlled experiments, building on each other over the decades, to understand the various aspects of human behavior, such as how human beings make decisions, how we create meaning, and how we function mentally under different conditions.
- Molecular biology: research to understand the interaction between multiple systems that govern our existence as functioning human beings—neurological (brain and nerves), hormonal, vascular, chemical, and immune systems are examples.
- Psychoanalysis: the study of the inner world of human beings, our dreams, conscious and unconscious motivations, ambivalent behaviors and inconsistencies, and so on.

Already there are an increasing number of practitioners (mainly researchers) who have become interested in neuroscience, particularly with reference to the way that advertising really works. There are 70 references on the WARC.com database referencing brain science written by well-known practitioners and academics such as Robert Heath, Erik du Plessis, Alistair Goode, Herbert Krugman, Dr. Max Sutherland, and Gerald Zaltman, all of which have been published in respected international trade journals and magazines.

Many of these articles focus on how stimuli from the external world are processed by the brain—such as information pathways, memory (storage, retrieval, individual, collective, short term, long term, working memory, implicit memory), right- and left-brain processing, and cognitive functioning.

The articles, whether in New Scientist or Admap, are mainly concerned with functionality rather than the mysteries of how all of this makes us, as human beings, feel and think as we do.

In very recent years, eminent neuroscientists-Damasio (1999) and Crick (2000), in particular—have published books on a major conundrum in this field, namely that if the brain is simply an organ like any other, what is the mind? How does the mind emerge from the brain? How does consciousness (the feeling that "I" exist inside my own body) emerge from a bodily organ that is in cellular terms like the stomach or the lungs?
Unconscious processing of external stimuli takes place and influences our actions without our conscious awareness

Freud was a neuroscientist who turned his back on the study of the brain as an organ because he could not account for how this explains the workings of the inner life. He was the first person, over a century ago, to claim that "most of our mental life operates unconsciously and that consciousness is merely a property of one part of the mind" (Solms and Turnbull, 2002).

It is now widely accepted by scientists involved in studying the brain that most mental functioning operates unconsciously and that consciousness is of very little importance in our mental life.

The evidence for this change of heart can be found in split-brain studies and also in the understanding of the tiny capacity of working memory (we can hold only seven units of information in our minds at a time). This means that the vast bulk of the information we need to function must be processed in the unconscious part of the mind. Bargh and Chartrand (1999) concluded that 95 percent of our actions are unconsciously determined.

Human beings may not know or be able to explain why they do what they do (or are thinking what they think); what they "remember" is not the whole story

The term "memory" covers many different functions. Textbooks today describe dozens of different aspects of memory but, for our purposes, thinking about memory in three ways is most helpful.

- Semantic memory is the network of associations and concepts that support our knowledge of the world-facts, word meanings, grammatical rules of language, propositions, and so on. It is rather like an encyclopaedia of third-person facts. These are relatively easy to retrieve consciously, although everyone knows what it feels like to forget a name or fact.
- Procedural memory is the "bodily" memory responsible for habitual motor skills or for how to do things. Procedural memory functions implicitly and thus explains habitual behavior. It is executed automatically and unconsciously. Driving a car, making dinner, and changing a baby are all examples of "how to do something" without paying conscious attention to each second of activity.
- Episodic, or autobiographical, memory is the re-experiencing of past events "the bringing back to awareness of previous experiential episodes" as in "I remember...." According to Schacter (1996) the episodic memory system "allows us to explicitly recall the personal incidents that define our lives." These memories are intrinsically subjective and intrinsically conscious.

Solms and Turnbull (2002) have this to say about memory:

A central point to grasp is that the multiplicity of long term memory storage systems makes it a commonplace for experiences to influence our behavior and beliefs without us consciously remembering the experiences in question. The fact that you cannot explicitly bring something to mind does not mean that you do not know (unconsciously, implicitly) what happened, nor that you will not act on the basis of this knowledge. What you remember consciously or unconsciously depends solely on which memory systems are engaged when the memories are being encoded and retrieved. Only when the episodic memory system is involved in the encoding (and early consolidation) of the experience can we explicitly remember that experience. If this system is not engaged, then the event will disappear from consciousness, even though its implicit effects on behavior and beliefs may well endure.

The first two points listed above support the findings of Gordon and Langmaid (1988) about the existence of "advertising-branding" associations that are not available to conscious recall. They also add further weight to their idea that memory retrieval is facilitated by enabling the person to re-experience (autobiographically) the moment of interaction with the brand (e.g., buying it, using it, or the mood accompanying it).

What we now know about unconscious processing and memory also supports the theory, first described by Robert Heath (2000, 2001) and now embraced by others, of low-attention processing. The fact that one cannot remember a brand or communication when directly questioned does not mean that it has not been encoded. It may well influence behavior.

People do not passively receive information about brands and communications-they transmute it into something personally relevant

Some sort of alchemy is going on. The association cortex of the brain is involved in integrating the information derived from different sensory input systems (visual, auditory, etc.). Memories (semantic, procedural, and episodic) are laid down over time because a system designed to recognize the outside world must also store knowledge about that outside world.

Not all types of memory are stored in the associative cortex; many other brain regions are involved in the totality of mental processes included under the term "memory." In particular, the systems that are responsible for emotion are intrinsically involved as well as the parts of the brain that drive us to action.

Continual exposure to a range of perceptual experiences allows for the development of well-developed memories. On the basis of millions of experiences, we gradually build up a reliable and stable picture of the outside world.

We learn to recognize a dog by any breed, any angle from which we see it, near or far, by smell, visual information, auditory sounds, touch, and so on.

What is "I" in "I feel," "I think," and "I remember"?
The brain mediates between two worlds: the external and internal environments of the body. The external environment is easy to understand. It involves all the stimuli outside the confines of our bodies that we process. The internal milieu refers to those systems that keep us alive: respiration, body temperature control, digestion, sexual reproduction, the hormonal, chemical transmission of messages to different parts of the body, and so on.

The internal milieu also includes the limbic system, which is described by some authors as "the centre of emotions" (Franzen and Bouwman, 2001):

The limbic system is the powerhouse of the brain—the place where the desires, motivations, emotions and moods that steer our behaviour are awakened ... it is a very complicated body of interconnected structures that are responsible for our emotional reactions and also plays an important role in the selection of stimuli for our attention and in the formation of long term memory.

Solms and Turnbull explain that the internal processes of the viscera are critically important to understanding our subjective experience: "The perception of visceral information is registered consciously as a feeling of emotion and (via association) as reminiscences, in the form of: ‘I saw that, and it made me feel like this’" (Solms and Turnbull, 2002).

Consciousness enables us to know how we feel. It is introspective and evaluative, and tells us when something feels "good" or "bad" or "in between."

Intuition has now been explained. It is not magic or "women's stuff," it is simply the result of the implicit learning system that relies on a "feeling" that is emotionally mediated. Intuition is not immediately susceptible to proof, nor is it easy for people to explain why they have a "good feeling" or a "bad feeling" about something or somebody.

This affective knowledge is central to learning, problem solving, and decision making.

Alex Biel's work (1990) on the factors that make up liking is linked to this newly developing knowledge of subjective experience and inner life. Liking is a subjective feeling. It is tied up somehow with consciousness. Because it is a feeling inside the body, it is therefore the consequence of emotional processing systems.

Emotions and feelings are understood and explored completely differently by neuroscientists compared to market researchers. There are only four or five core emotion systems common to both humans and animals (rage, fear, seeking/reward, panic, and play). These determine behavior (they make us do something) that makes sure the species survives.

Everything else described as an emotion is a cognitive process of attaching language to feelings. Feelings are the result of the molecules of emotion that have their own particular pathways and ways of action throughout the body as well as the brain. We are able to talk about feelings ("I feel uptight, angry, sad, upset, nervous, depressed") without always knowing what internal physiological processes have been taking place, although these feelings are communicated, both to ourselves and to others, quite clearly through body language.

Every person we come across in our lives, every event we experience is accompanied by an internal visceral/physiological pattern or anchor. We feel warm to some people and cool or indifferent to others. We are drawn toward certain activities or experiences and "pushed away" by others. We cannot necessarily explain why. It is intuitive.

**HOW SHOULD WE THINK ABOUT ADVERTISING NOW?**

There are many kinds of information that human beings cannot retrieve at will. Unconscious processing happens, as its name suggests, unconsciously, and it is simply unavailable to efforts at remembering.

- Most of what business people are interested in—how brand (company, institution, product, service) experiences and communications influence people—happen unconsciously unless there is a particular event or autobiographical memory we can release.
- It can be inferred from behavior that there has been an influence, but it is not easy to prove in advance that marketing interventions will have the desired scale and nature of effect.
- Memory is dynamic. What we remember is not laid down as a permanent record. Every time we remember, we reconstruct the memory depending on where we are, what we are doing, who we are with, why we are there, and what else is going on around us. What this means is simply that people do not remember accurately, no matter how you ask them.

We learn about a brand through the multiple experiences we have with it in different ways and conditions over time. Each exposure or experience is integrated with those memories that are already embedded—to create a totality of meaning. This meaning is personal but it is also shaped by broader sociocultural influences and contexts. Human beings are both individual organisms and social animals—without either, human beings are inhuman.

- People do something with brand communications and experiences. It is not a one-way process. Coauthorship of meaning is a reality because the external stimulus of a brand does not fall on virginal ground; complex associations to the category, to competitive brands, to brands in noncompetitive categories, and to the particular brand in question already exist.
- That is why concentrating on advertising/paid-for communication is a tiny part of the way we coexist with brands. Multiple touchpoints-accidental and planned-shape the meaning of the brand. Advertising is only one input among many.

We "like" (using Biel’s definition) some brands and feel drawn toward them, and we are indifferent to or actively dislike others. Brands are anchored by a feeling-difficult to articulate in words but accessible nonetheless. It is an intuitive and simple relationship.

"Liking" a brand means that we
- are more open-minded about its communications and initiatives,
- notice it among a mass of competitors,
- use it as a heuristic (rule of thumb) to make a quick decision,
- forgive it if it makes mistakes (within limits),
- transfer our liking onto other initiatives connected with the brand (e.g., new products/brands or to the company itself),
- become advocates for it and help to promote it through our networks,
- are more tolerant of its advertising,
- remember more about it for longer periods of time, and
- integrate it internally with other positive associations so that it is likely to trigger in more situations.

### RECONSTRUCTING BASIC PRINCIPLES

The 1980s and 2000s are different worlds. Advertising is no longer king. Brands have taken center stage and are built and maintained through multiple channels of activity—internet, word of mouth, direct marketing, PR, brand experience, retail environments, service, design, sponsorship, partnerships, and so on. "Getting closer to the consumer" has moved up the agenda of importance to reach the ears of senior management. There are visible signs of "customer-centric" thinking both in large organizations and small ones that are mandated from the boardroom.

For practitioners, especially qualitative researchers, it is possible (at last) to explain rationally and logically what we intuitively know about people, and how and why they say and do what they do. This new science also offers quantitative researchers the opportunity to be creative and to design new ways of measuring the consequences of brand-consumer interactions.

Jim Carroll, chairman of the agency BBH, laid down a challenge:

There was a time when an advert's effectiveness was judged on whether it was saying the right thing, to the right people, in the right way. The sugar-coating was whether the ad was entertaining and engaging. That's all changed. The ability to engage, inspire and entertain is now at the heart of strategy. Have you (researchers) the tools to measure emotion? (Carroll, 2004)

This challenge is not simply one for advertising research or for researchers. It is one for the whole marketing community. Can everyone embrace the idea that engagement, inspiration, and entertainment lie at the heart of successful brands, and that the challenge for those responsible for brands is to embrace a different model of thinking with different principles at its center?

Here are 10 very simple (but scientifically proven) principles:
- People do not say what they mean or mean what they say. Most of what drives attitudes and behavior is not accessible to conscious introspection. "Reasons why" are postrationalizations to make sense of our actions to ourselves (and others) because we may not know, other than intuitively, why we do what we do. Providing rational "reasons why" helps people to explain a choice (useful in commodity categories with poor brand differentiation) but it does not necessarily alter motivation or behavior.
- People dance with brands fleetingly. It is estimated that each of us has about 10,000 brands stored in our heads, along with every person we meet, place we visit, or event that happens. Simply, brands are unimportant in the fabric of everyday life except for the fractional moments people interact with them. It is important to look at people in their real lives and figure out where the most powerful touch points with the brand lie—whether this is the people who represent the brand, other brand users, packaging lying in the street, word of mouth, or call center operators.
- Brands are emotionally anchored. A brand in the brain is made up of sets of cells that communicate with each other situated in different parts of the brain. This is called a brand representation. Brands are cognitively and emotionally encoded in the brain. It is the emotional anchoring of the brand that determines how we process information about it, what we notice about it, and how open we are to its initiatives. The more positively the brand is anchored, the better its chances of achieving its ambitions.
- Words are poor tools. There is no objective meaning of a word. Words are fuzzy and imprecise. It is difficult for people to articulate thoughts and feelings (internal milieu processes) when they are asked. People's vocabulary is often limited, especially compared to that of university graduates who work in marketing, advertising, and research. Words need help.
- The unconscious exists. Accept it. Even if hypnosis were an accepted everyday practice, it does not tap the unconscious.
- Intuition exists. Trust it and learn how to use it in your work. Whether you work in marketing, advertising, or research (or any other discipline), find ways to tap into people's intuitive responses to what you are planning. "It feels right," "It feels wrong," "Not sure" are good signposts.
- Emotions rule. "Emotions constitute an integrated element of the seemingly most rational decision-making. Whenever thinking contradicts with emotions, emotions win" (Franzen and Bouwman, 2001). There is no such thing as "rational" versus "emotional"—the two are intertwined. Sometimes "rational" appears to take the high ground, but "emotional" is the underlying force.
- Behavior and attitudes are context dependent. People behave differently in different circumstances. Behavior and attitudes change depending on the "where," "why," "what," and "who" of the situation. The same is true of recalling activities or associations connected with a brand. Different contexts enable different memories to arise.
- Memory is dynamic. Memory is not static and fixed like a photograph. Memories can be distorted or changed. Brand associations are like memories and change too. While some associations are "hard-wired" and deeply embedded, new associations can be built that, over time, create a different brand meaning.
- There is no such thing as absolute truth. Statistics lie. People in focus groups are influenced by the laboratory-like setting, by the personalities of other members of the group, and by the moderator and observers. What they say in this context is not "the truth." Interviewing people at home gives certain insights but is not "the truth" either. Nor is pure observation "the truth," as you cannot know why someone is behaving as they do unless you are in their head. Semiotics does not give you "the truth," nor does interviewing experts.
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