

KEEPING UP WITH YOUR READERS

by

PIERRE D. MARTINEAU
Director of Research
THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Here is the full report of the challenging speech which Mr. Martineau gave to the Gannett Conference at Hartford last Fall. Taken from a tape recording, the text has been edited for reading and condensed slightly, but it contains all of the significant quotes. Despite its length you probably will wish to circulate this rather widely among key news and advertising personnel.

Jan. 25, 1957

Just what is the province of the research man on the Chicago Tribune?

We're not in a product research area at all. What we think about is researching the consumer -- researching people. We started out working for the advertising department and we have come to be used all over the paper.

Many of you could ask: Why do I need research? You've gotten along perfectly well without any such fancy gadgets. But research comes back, basically, to the problem of human communication, the step of relaying and expressing yourself. But, then there's the other very important factor, and that is what we call "feedback." That is: What does the other person think about my communications? Now, we do that in face-to-face communication. You're talking to somebody else and you can adjust from his gestures, from his general manner, and so on -- what he thinks about, how he is reacting to you. A person who can't do that either is boring you, or else he's crazy. We find, of course, that often there's a tremendous gap between what we're saying -- or what we think we're saying -- and what the audience actually is receiving and also their attitude toward it.

Try to stop and analyze what is the modern scientific attitude, which started about 300-400 years ago: Francis Bacon as opposed to the medieval metaphysician. They used to work up a big story in words (it sounded all right from their logic) and then they'd build a whole universal system on it.

But science, as we understand it, is something very different today. The scientist goes out and deals with dirty little facts. He tries to find out the truth of the situation. He's not setting it up from logic, he's not setting it up from metaphysics, he's not setting it up by preconception, but rather, he is going back and seeing: is this what it actually is.

On a newspaper the editor does have a very crude feedback in terms of overall circulation figures. My experience on a newspaper over 30 years is that if circulation is going up, well, then the editor feels that everything is fine. But if it's going down, well, then he feels there must be something the matter with the circulation department. Sometimes he relies on letters to the editor. He'll get

-more-

three or four letters and then he'll say: "Well, everybody says so and so!" And, he's operating on--or rather, overlooking -- the premise that this is not an accurate picture of what the total population might think. Also, there's the type of person who writes letters. Usually he's the type of a guy who gets up at a meeting and has to make a speech from the audience, and he may not be the average person at all.

Let me make it perfectly clear that research can never replace creativity. When it comes to writing, no research man can help you. But research can be diagnostic in that it can tell you what things are. It also can indicate some broad directions -- that people are this way, and not this way. And then, as another very important step, it can go around to the other side after the message is put together and see what actually is being communicated.

I've worked on a number of newspapers where the editor says: Why do I need all this? I know what people want. I've been in this business. Well, how does he know what they want? Usually he falls back on a kind of intuitive sense. He's been in newspaper business all his life and he's following a certain method. But in every other kind of scientific research you find tremendous gaps between people's preconceptions and what the actuality is. There isn't a single day out of our research experience that we don't have somebody explode our own preconceptions. You can look around and see some of the business guesses that have gone bad because somebody who apparently had an awful lot of experience still made a bad guess.

It wouldn't be human if this weren't true about editors, too, although I think that on a smaller newspaper the editor can be much closer to his audience than the editor of a metropolitan newspaper.

Business today has gone far ahead of the newspaper business in using research. I don't mean just product research. I'm thinking of market research -- trying to find out what the consumer thinks of the product. If you were to talk to General Electric, Proctor & Gamble, or companies like that, you would find that they have these enormous operations going on all the time to find out what people actually think of them before they launch any product.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I have nothing to do with the policy of the newspaper. My task is simply to furnish data: then the editors can make decisions.

The ordinary readership study is very helpful--up to a certain point. But it only leaves you with some numbers, and you have no way of finding out why these numbers are so. You have to read meaning into them. What we have been attempting to do the last six or seven years is to set up a research organization so that we could get at some of these "whys." We could go behind the facade of rationalizations that the ordinary person uses to try to explain his behavior.

I'm sure that you have had the experience of asking a man why he reads the newspaper and he'll tell you: Well, I have to keep up with things.

"Well, why do you have to keep up with things?

"Why, a man has to do it. It's my duty as a citizen."

Then you look at his reading pattern and it's crossword puzzles, sports page, comics, and so on, and all this international news that he's giving as a rationalization just isn't so.

Ask a woman why she doesn't take our newspaper. She says she can't afford it. There's a \$3,000 automobile in the driveway and a whole flock of new appliances in the house. Obviously she's giving you one set of reasons and acting on another.

We've developed a research organization in the last five or six years. We've about 80 full-time people and about 80 part-time people who work as long as the full-time people do, only they're classified differently. We have our own psychologists (several breeds of them), several anthropologists, sociologists, semanticists, besides all the other types of statisticians. While this might seem a pretty topheavy luxury, I have to justify to my superiors the size of the payroll and they seem to be satisfied.

The Army uses these techniques very extensively and you'll find that Big Business uses them today. For instance, every Sears employe has an interview with a guidance counselor twice a year. And they do research all over the place.

The Telephone Company is a very conservative organization. It's a utility and you can't do much else but buy a telephone. And still, in the last four or five years, they have built up quite an organization to try to understand people. They've learned to their surprise that when you come out with telephones in seven different colors that the demand runs away from them. And what about this whole problem of attitudes of people towards Big Business? Everytime there's a telephone strike, in spite of the fact that they think they've kept their nose clean and been a very fine organization, why they have this terroristic public reaction to them. So they are not happy about their superficial acquaintance with people.

What about the value of some of these things? The observers of our scene, like the 20th Century Fund and some pretty competent writers in Fortune, make the point that we have been experiencing in the last 15-20 years one of the greatest social revolutions in human history. We have watched this enormous exodus to the suburbs. We have watched the downtown areas of one city after another almost become slums. Our notions of security are quite different. Take the old notion that every person had to work hard for a living and save money and when he got to be 60 years old he would be independent, etc. That is scarcely the viewpoint of our society today. Today people lean on pension funds, on unions, on Social Security, and have almost taken the attitude of, well, let's spend it while we have it. But, I'm making the point that all these social changes, these upheavals in society, and the coming of other media of communication are bound to have a certain impact on our role, our function.

I'll just take a minute to show that this isn't just blue sky. For instance, we had a roto section and a Sunday feature magazine. They had a very high readership -- up to about 90 per cent. But we couldn't sell enough advertising in them (apparently they weren't paying out) and they were losing us about \$2-1/2 million a year.

Finally the management said: What should we do on Sunday?

We worked with the social scientists to find out what people wanted on Sunday. We found that Sunday is a very, very different day than it was 30-35 years ago. Then it was a day dominated by Protestant austerity -- the old notion that the family stayed dressed-up all day, very formal.

Well, that isn't true today. People still go to church, but it doesn't dominate their thinking. The modern Sunday is just a complete day of relaxation. It's a very chaotic day in a person's planning. He gets up in the morning, maybe he goes to church, maybe he doesn't go. He sleeps awhile; then he reads the newspaper; then he comes back to it again; he may go fishing; he may visit some friends, and so on. But he wants anything but some very heavy reading.

So we revamped our Sunday magazine along quite a different pattern. We threw out the heavy intellectual articles and designed it more for the kind of day we think it is today. We tried again to bring in these notions about the mass man. Something for him and for his wife to read. We've taken this property from a loss of \$2-1/2 million a year into a very comfortable black figure.

Recently, we brought out a TV Week, modeled something after TV Guide. The management said: Well, before we put something out, go and pre-test to see what they might like to have. Should it be features? Should it be programs?

Some people told us that there was a tremendous interest in FM, so we should have a page devoted to FM. Well, we found out that fewer than 5 per cent of the people are interested in FM. So that went out the window.

We have done studies on the personality of the Tribune from a competitive point of view. People look at an institution very much the way you look at a person. As a result of this we have mitigated a great many of our viewpoints. We have done a great deal of thinking about bringing ourselves more into line with what people would like from us.

We're doing studies on teenagers. We wonder about them and their reading patterns, and how we're going to convert them to be newspaper readers as they grow up. When they're 15 - 20 they're just too busy to listen to TV. We get them into some parts of the newspaper, the boy likes sports pages and he may read the comics, and the girl likes something else. Today about a third of the girls are married by the time they are 18. They have pushed back the marriage age level and they're ready to move into maturity very early.

We have done some provocative and meaningful studies on the difference in the very social structure of our cities. What about "social class?" Social class, in essence, means who are your friends, to whom would you like to see your daughter married, what kind of a neighborhood do you live in, and so on. We're committed in America to the ideology of a democracy and yet all of us have certain strata of friends.

Let's start at the very top of the system -- the upper class. This is divided into the old families and the entre preneurs -- the recent arrivals -- the people who have been very successful in business or the professions. But the "upper class" people are so small in number that we can hardly find them. In Metropolitan Chicago they add up to 0.9 of one per cent. Yet, these are the people that the society pages are talking about. These are the people to whom our political viewpoint usually is addressed -- these older upper class families.

We're accustomed to think of America as a middle class society. But if you add the upper middle class people who are the successful business people, and the lower middle class with their white collar workers, you still have only one-third of society. Sixty-four per cent of the population of Chicago are not middle-class.

We are not a middle class society. We are a working class society. It's perfectly obvious whose vote the politicians are trying to get. They're not worried about yours and mine, because they know that numerically we're pretty small. They're thinking of this mass man. He has become not only a tremendous political center of power, but an enormous center of purchasing power.

What's true in Chicago would be true of any big industrialized city. We think of the Middle West as agrarian, and yet it has become the most highly industrialized area in the world. And, as these people have poured into towns the rural population has diminished.

I don't think we newspapermen have made much effort to understand these people. We're still thinking of our middle class set of values. We think that our morality, or aspiration system, is what everyone should have. But these people are not committed to that. For instance -- our interest in the American institutions of voting and our various affairs. These people don't feel a responsibility to go out and vote like we do. We come around at election time and we have campaigns to the effect that it's our duty as citizens to vote. They don't vote from those reasons. They vote because of allegiance to some political captain, or to some person who looks out for them in the world. Now, we say that a political boss is a bad thing. But he serves a very necessary function in their life because where we're much more self-reliant, independent, and have windows that look out on society, the political boss often is the common man's contact with the world.

Reading the newspaper -- this reverence for the printed word -- is a middle class value. These people are not necessarily committed to such things. In a society like ours we find that about a third of all the people have difficulty reading. They do not communicate well with words. And where the unions have become a way of life for these people, I think a great many newspapers are guilty of not recognizing this viewpoint.

Here's another area of study that I think is very fruitful: We're trying to get at this new, younger woman. By "younger," I mean any woman under 40. We're doing studies of these new suburbs and we find out that again they are made up of working class people or the smaller white collar people. They decided that this way of life is something that they want today.

I don't think that we, as men, understand women very well. When we're boring our wives to death talking about baseball, about politics, and things like that, they're scarcely listening. Their minds are on something else. If a man happens to stumble in and listen to women talking and it's about babies and somebody's got an operation and how do you collect alimony and all that sort of thing, why he gets indignant and walks out. But they can't. Their role in society is to sit and listen.

We've experienced tremendous changes in the structure of the American family. This old notion of the father as the patriarch (as in "Life With Father") - that's not true today in these younger families. Father's not the head of the family any more -- he's just another member of the family. Actually the children come first - then the mother - and if anything is left over, then it's the man's turn.

We ask the question of many women: What do you think the ideal housewife should be? A third of them did not mention being a good wife. They spoke of being an ideal mother or of being a good housekeeper.

Then we went at it another way. We asked: Where have you gotten your greatest satisfaction from life? They speak about satisfaction in terms of their children, their friends, or something like that.

My point is that women don't see themselves as just appendages to some man. They see themselves as individuals, with interests of their own. And in terms of these changing women today there is a much greater interchangeability of sex roles. I mean that a woman not only wears a man's costume (blue jeans, man's shirts, etc.) but she has borrowed a great many of his prerogatives. My youngster is 10 years old and this is her second year of taking Shop -- what we used to call Manual Training. Here's a little girl and she's supposed to be able to paint and to use a hammer and a saw. A girl out in the suburbs runs the car and shovels snow and takes care of the tradesmen and has quite a different function in the management of the family. Yet I don't think we know much about what she wants out of a newspaper or out of life.

Because we have a radio station and a TV station we have been trying to get at the exact role of radio today. We find out that it has changed completely in five or six years. Instead of an active medium that people sat down and listened to (and switched stations to follow programs) it has become a passive medium. You turn it on and it's in the background. It plays all day long. If a guy wants to listen to a baseball game, the chances are that he is out hoeing, or washing his car. If his wife turns the radio on in the morning then goes upstairs and when she's cleaning the bedroom she's got a clock radio going up there. Instead of following programs, people are more apt to turn on one station and let it play all day.

This tremendous colossus, TV, came on the scene and it's taken 3-1/2 to 4 hours a day out of the time of the average family. All the other things have to be squeezed in the remaining time. Now it's inconceivable to me that anyone would think that this tremendous medium that's taking as much time as this from the average American family wouldn't have some effect on our role. We have to do some self-criticism and answer some questions.

I don't think that we can compete with the electronic media on a spot news basis -- except for local news, which they don't have the facilities to cover. But our whole emphasis has been the concept of news as something that just happened. It has to be fresh -- it just has to be completely "new." But we find out that news can be what's "new" to me. If I haven't read it before, then it's "news" to me. The scientists who have done a number of studies for me say that newspapers are becoming a highly perishable magazine. We are getting over into the area of something like Time magazine on international affairs. People are looking for more interpretive writing, more feature writing rather than just descriptive, reportorial writing. I dare say that any person who is interested in baseball or basketball or hockey knew who won before he went to bed. He heard it from one of the electronic media. Rather than the mere score which he already knows, now he's interested in the features, the things that happened afterwards, the interpretive writing, the dope behind the scenes.

I recall another readership study that made quite an impact on me. It was done by one of the University of Chicago scientists. He went out and did this work on readership figures. Then he compared these figures on the types of news that people were reading with their real interests. He found out that people were reading about a great deal of things that didn't particularly interest them. In a sense our readers make up rather a captive audience. I buy an evening newspaper to read on the train going home and I've got 40 minutes to spend. So I read about a lot of things that don't really interest me. After all, newspaper reading is simply a habit. Scientists sit on the sidelines and wonder about it. They say they can't understand why when

there are newspaper strikes, people will go out and get old newspapers and read them. This habit has a deep psychological root. Still, as people get into a habit, they can change from a habit.

I am very worried about the number of younger women who read scarcely anything. On this long train ride at night I notice these women. It's inconceivable to me, but either they're reading a 25 cent novel, or they're knitting, or they're just looking out the window. Apparently the drive to read a newspaper is not there.

One of the New York agency men made the point recently that the newspaper is the only medium of mass communication that is essentially aimed at the man. We're treating the woman as a second-class citizen. We have our own brand of segregation -- our own Jim Crow Law. We give the women a few pages in the back that we label "society" and that's it. Whether they are interested in society news or not doesn't matter; that's essentially what they get. Yet, the fact is that in our circulation solicitation effort, it's the woman whose doorbell we have to ring so that we can ask her to subscribe to our newspaper. Eighty per cent of the advertising in the newspaper is addressed to women. Yet, the news slant is almost entirely towards the man.

Here's a typical newspaper. All of the advertising on this page is addressed to women, yet the story is headed: "Baum Aims for Votes at Democrats, Presses Drive for Surrogate." Now I could tell you from readership studies how many women would read that news -- fewer than 5 per cent.

The woman buys most of the merchandise. Most of our advertising is addressed to her, and yet the only way we're building readership for that advertising is through the advertising itself. It may surprise a lot of editors who send men to Moscow and to Suez when their stories don't get anywhere near the readership of the department store ad or shoe ads. One of the most valuable components of the Chicago Tribune from a circulation standpoint with the women is its volume of advertising.

Mr. Tripp made the point that readership of foreign affairs is very low. The average person's world begins to fade out when he gets to the end of the block. He's thinking about his own town, his own world, his own friends, his own family problems, and so on.

We find that the suburban woman isn't the least bit interested in Chicago politics. We run a lot of it, but she doesn't care. She's turning her life over to her community, to her friends, and so on. Editors with whom I have discussed this always seem to think of "women's news" as "human interest news" and they say: "Oh, yeah, I can get a lot of that if I want to fill my newspaper with rape and murder and crime, and so on." Well, women do show a high readership for that sort of thing, but it seems to me that we could do a great deal to develop other kinds of human interest material that would appeal to a woman. The Ladies Home Journal, Better Homes & Gardens, Holiday magazine, have tremendous readership with women and their "human interest" material is not crime and sex.

Let's talk again about the whole concept of the newspaper. It seems to me that we are still using the same approach that was set up in the days of Benjamin Franklin in the sense that we consider politics and public affairs as primary news. Yet all the research that I have seen and done indicates that American interest in politics is decreasing all the time.

When all three networks were broadcasting the 1956 Democratic Convention the ratings were something like 29 per cent. Radio had its biggest audience in 10 years.

People were complaining "give us something else, we don't want that politics business."

When the Suez crisis erupted we went around and asked people what they thought about it. Ten per cent of them said: "Suez? What's Suez? I never heard of it."

We did a study about a year earlier as to whether the United States should withdraw from the United Nations. A very sizeable segment of these people thought that the United Nations was the United States. And while the politicians were out campaigning (September 1956) I listened to people on the train, and in barber shops and all the talk was about baseball, not politics.

Our concept of news must be re-examined in this light: A century ago in the small towns there weren't the interests that we have today. Politics was a sort of a game that people could identify themselves with. They took sides and they got real worked up about it because they acted just as though they were rooting for a baseball team. In a small town people were quite excited about who was going to be assessor. But in a bigger city today we have too many other interests. All these other things have come along, like all the time we spend at our work, the interests in sports that has developed in 100 years -- all these have intervened between us and politics.

Then, there is the anonymity of big city life. Outside of a few national candidates we are scarcely aware of the issues. And so interest in politics essentially is a holdover from the old rural days.

Senator Dirksen told me that the highest percentage of voting came from South Dakota -- because they haven't got anything else to do out there. But in a big city there are many other interests that a person is identified with. And when I talk about women not reading political stories a man will pipe up and say: "Well, why exclude me. I don't read them either."

Then we should go into this problem about how much we influence people. Dr. Lazarsfeld at Columbia University has done some very penetrating studies of how people make up their minds to vote. The great majority of people apparently make up their minds six months in advance. From then on they listen to the candidates that they have decided to support. What does seem to cause people to change their votes at the last minute comes from their friends. Yet these people who have made up their minds in advance are the most responsible, the most secure, the best-balanced people psychologically. They have the most self-confidence. Don't we all do it? I promise you I haven't read a single Democratic speech. We run them right side by side in the newspaper, but I read the one I want to and skip the other. I don't read the Nation. I don't read the New Republic. I read the things that agree with me. And so I ask: How much do we really influence people?

We come back to this problem of the woman and her reading. What comics interest her? Most of us who have Sunday newspapers have witnessed quite a falling out of comic advertising. We've gone in there and found that nine out of ten of the comics are addressed to men. So, we've been experimenting to see if we couldn't come up with a different formula for comics that would be more interesting, and we have been developing some for women.

When we look at sports pages, we see that most of them are committed to pretty much the same old mold. Sports are essentially professional baseball, college football, some professional football, boxing and, in big cities, where you get a lot of sin, racing. Sports writing is essentially descriptive and reportorial writing. The average youngster working on a college newspaper could do most of this descriptive writing -- a guy flied out, somebody else stole third, and so on.

We are generally overlooking the tremendous growth of participation sports. One of the industries that is real sick is the whole business of paid-admission sports. Think of the growth of leisure. We have a full two-day weekend now. We're going to have a four-day week pretty soon. The man who has the most leisure in our society is the man who carries a union card. The moralists used to worry that he'd go over to the tavern and get drunk all day with this extra time, but he uses it very constructively. That's why there has been a tremendous growth of interest in bowling, fishing, hunting, skiing, ice-fishing, skating, boating and in women's sports that we all overlook (women buy one-third of the sports equipment). Yet most of these things get completely blotted out in our adherence to the older sports.

There's a vast interest in travel, with motels sprouting up all over the country. Yet what I see in most newspapers is a handout from a hotel or a railroad and we think we're doing them a great big favor. Holiday magazine has grown up right under our noses because it is talking to people and their interest in travel.

We're doing a great deal of thinking right now about Saturday. It seems that Saturday is very much in a state of change right under our noses. The newspaper that we should be thinking about is patterned for Saturday. With the Chicago Daily News its best circulation day is Saturday. They've made a package out of their Saturday edition, charged 10 cents for it, thrown in a few more features and print it early in the morning. It's in tune with the fact that people today start their weekend on Saturday. People also are doing a great deal of husband-and-wife shopping out in the suburbs on Saturday and generally it's a disorganized, chaotic day.

I don't mean to be too upsetting about all this. I merely have asked you some questions which I hope will lead to some healthy discontent and curiosity. I think that that's the role of all of us.

The newspaper is the only one of the major media which hasn't kept pace with population growth. Since 1950 Chicago has grown by 800,000, and yet the total of Chicago newspaper circulation is exactly the same, which means that we haven't kept pace. Yet we have these magazine success stories like Life, like Better Homes & Gardens, like the chain store magazine, like TV Guide (What better circulation story could you ask for than that!) like True, like Holiday, like Sports Illustrated, which has carved out a niche for itself because there was a vacuum of interest that apparently wasn't being satisfied by us, or by anyone else.

Many of you will disagree. The scientists who have done these studies for me say that this is their interpretation of the data. I hope that I have stimulated your thinking. It's too easy for all of us to insulate ourselves so that we aren't exposed to new ideas. As we get older and as we get successful we find ourselves doing some incestuous thinking. We're with our own friends and our own people and our own clubs, our own subordinates -- who pretty much agree with us. They make it a business to find out what they think we would like to be thinking and so we don't get this infusion of disturbing ideas from the outside.

I promised to talk about our use of research techniques in advertising.

This work started in advertising and the largest part of it still is done there. We've been trying to give a salesman some kind of tool that he could take to the advertiser in terms of the advertiser's business, so that he isn't just talking in terms of OUR business. He should have more equipment than a rate chart and a lineage sheet. We don't want our salesmen to be just meter readers and servicemen picking up advertising copy -- we'd like to have them be in a position to make a real contribution. We do this by supplying them with first rate data on the market -- the Chicago market -- and on a man's business. I have found that if we have something first rate, that is worthwhile, we have no trouble getting an audience with any advertiser in the United States.

It seems to me that the advertising agency has become so much more sophisticated than the general level of our keeping up with them. The average advertising agency has a market research department, a copy research department, a motivation research department, and a media research department. Nobody goes in there anymore and just waves his arms around unless he has something that is really significant to say. Unfortunately, too many people in the newspaper business have nothing but circulation figures and lineage figures. They don't get to the policy makers in the advertising agency, to the men who say whether the money is going to go into television or magazines or something of the kind. We would like to try to equip our people so that they can talk and make some contribution to the agency's thinking.

Those are the problems. We have done a great many of these studies and have had a very significant reception to them at the department store level. I don't know about your cities but as an industry the department store business is having its troubles at the present time. They haven't kept up with the sales increases in their cities. People have tended to go to outlying stores and to different types of stores and the average department store is hobbling along with considerably less than one per cent profit. They are very seriously concerned about it and we should be concerned about our major source of income. We have done some studies lately that try to get at this department store personality. People respond to a store not only in terms of its price and values but in many other dimensions. We put all these attitudes together and say this is a personality just like we have a personality as a newspaper. We took the advertising of all the Chicago department stores to several other cities where people weren't aware of what the stores were at all. We masked the names of the stores and we asked women to tell us what kind of a store it was. We found that department store advertising -- the mere physical look of it -- has become a language all of its own to the American woman. As a result, we have been able to take out the personality profiles to the department stores and to point out their strong points as well as their weak points, and we have done a first-rate job at the management level, talking to the presidents of stores.

Out of this type of study, we also have been able to demonstrate that advertising, which they think of only in terms of paying off tomorrow, has a long range value of building up the store's character. A woman actually responds to that character more than she does to the immediate value or bargain. She won't go to a store unless that store is acceptable to her. So we have been able to put a completely different dimension on the value of advertising.

Well, how can you use this? One of the larger department stores in Chicago has been having trouble because its big market, which is the very bottom of the social structure, now has more money and would like to wander away to other types of stores.

Their problem is to hold onto their old market. It isn't just the problem of getting new customers, it's entrenching themselves with their older customers who now have quite different tastes and are looking around at different types of stores.

We carry these studies over into a great many classifications. We did one last Spring on building materials. We pointed out that the traditional retail building materials dealer is doing a miserable job of keeping up with his potential. This movement out to the suburbs has created a new class of amateur builders who would like to do many of the maintenance jobs, not only because they have to but because it's an outlet for their creativity. We also pointed out that almost a third of the people who are buying in these stores are women and that the women initiate more of the home maintenance projects than the man does. She may not be doing the painting, but she at least tells the man he has to do it. These stores just are not geared to sell the woman. A woman goes into this old dark lumber yard and says "I want a board" and a guy tells her to go on out in back there and look around and find something. Women aren't used to that kind of shopping. They're used to shopping in stores that have modern merchandising. We have done quite an educational job for these people.

Does this sort of thing pay off? Well, we had a tremendous increase in our dollar volume this year from that very classification.

We've done a great many of these product studies. For instance, we pointed out to the beer industry about five years ago that much of their advertising showed a lot of people in tuxedos and on yachts, at club dances, and all that sort of thing, toasting each other with beer. Well, it simply is absurd. Then they were using a lot of Broadway actors for testimonials and the guy who was their beer market never heard of them.

We're doing one study now at the request of the gasoline industry. We find out that this is a case of bad communication. It's a case of one set of gasoline refiners talking to another set of gasoline refiners. When they come out with Power X, with the X chemical, and OPB 70, nobody knows what they're talking about. All this business of additives and the whole notion of power, power, power that they're all hollering -- they're simply scaring people to death. The things that they should be talking about -- because gasoline is just gasoline to the average person -- are the competence, the reliability, the trust of the station and they aren't talking about that at all.

Our whole notion of selling advertising seems to have been to just go out and sell white space. Then we don't worry about what goes in this space. We have found out to our dismay that very often a campaign shows no increase in sales.

We think that research has been a tremendous assist to us in our creative selling and advertising. Our dollar volume has gained more since the war than any other newspaper and we probably will hit \$70 million in revenue this year (1956). We feel that this is a very profitable tool.

As Mr. Tripp said, if we go back to what people expect from us--local news coverage--they won't get that from any of the other media.

But we also have this problem of changing as people change. I think that this means doing a very healthy job of examining our role and our function, and as I said, with this healthy curiosity and discontent.