
In-store Advertising Audience Measurement Principles

Developed by

Doug Adams
President



Prime Consulting Group

Jim Spaeth
President



Developed for



July 2003

As adopted by the ARF Board of Directors

In-store Advertising Audience Measurement Principles

Objective

The objective of this paper is to describe the progress in developing an In-store Audience Delivery measure for the Point of Purchase Advertising International (POPAI). The Audience Delivery measure is being developed to provide the industry with a planning and tracking tool similar to those available for other measured media, such as print and broadcast.

Background

POPAI adopted a major strategic initiative in 1998 to establish in-store advertising as a measured medium, “on par with print and broadcasting.” POPAI and POP producers are to be applauded for their willingness to be measured. No doubt measurement will provide new insights, both positive and challenging as to the placement and value of in-store advertising. Once broadly adopted, these insights will show the industry and its constituents at a crossroads.

Executive Summary

The In-store Advertising industry has begun the process of becoming a measured medium. The independent availability of in-store advertising measurement is expected to significantly increase the productivity and effectiveness of marketer’s and retailer’s spending. In addition, in-store may now be on better footing to earn a larger share of the media budget if advertisers find these results compelling.

The POPAI Measured Medium initiative has broken a log-jamb that has impeded in-store advertising progress for decades. The principles presented in this paper outline the initial blueprint for audience measurement using the Supermarket and Convenience (c-stores) retail channels as the first two examples. The paper explains the measurement methodology for:

- ◆ Weekly Reach (with an Opportunity To See–OTS).
- ◆ Frequency.
- ◆ Impressions/Gross Rating Points (GRP).
- ◆ Cost Per Thousand Impressions (CPM).

Early on the research faced the question of media vehicle. In traditional media the vehicle might be a television program, or a magazine issue, not the ad itself. For in-store advertising, we concluded the store is the vehicle, so an OTS is an exposure to the store, not necessarily the in-store advertising itself. This concept and the resulting measures for the supermarket and c-store channel are explored using chain specific data and channel-wide estimates.

With the first two phases of this multi-phase initiative completed, we can already define the road map to standardized data methods and sources to enable the planning and management of in-store advertising as a measured medium comparable to traditional media. There will be refinements along the way, which tighten precision, extend reach and evolve to measuring impressions. In the meantime, this progress allows marketers and POP producers to allow in-store inclusion in the planning and selection process with other 'traditional' forms of media and to apply the same performance yardsticks.

Approach

While none of the current media measures were found to fit “as is,” the principles that underlie them are readily adapted to a new in-store audience measurement system. At their core, the measures for in-store like other media need to provide a measure of the consumer’s “Opportunity To See” the advertising. This concept has been so ingrained in the media world that it is short-handed: OTS. As the term OTS implies, audience measures don’t guarantee an attentive consumer carefully absorbing the ad message; rather it implies open eyes (or ears) in front of the media vehicle – an *opportunity*. In traditional media the vehicle might be a television program, or a magazine issue – not the ad itself. For in-store advertising today, we consider the store to be the vehicle, so an OTS is an exposure to the store, not necessarily the ad itself. We anticipate that, as POP ad exposure measurement evolves, the vehicle exposure measurement may be refined to an area of the store in proximity to the display through the use of shopper basket analyses or Personal-People-Meter (PPM) panels.

Starting with the basic exposure measure we can build a small number of key media planning and buying measures:

- ◆ *Exposure*: One person with an OTS, also called an Impression.
- ◆ *Audience*: The total exposures or impressions for a specific media vehicle during a defined time-period, e.g., store-week.
- ◆ *Gross Impressions*: The sum of all impressions for a campaign or specified portion of a campaign.
- ◆ *Rating*: Audience as a percent of the target population.
- ◆ *Gross Rating Points, GRPs*: Gross Impressions as a percent of the relevant populations; also the sum of the rating points for a campaign or specified portion of a campaign.
- ◆ *Target Rating Points, TRPs*: Target audience Impressions as a percent of the relevant target population.
- ◆ *Reach*: The net percent of the target population with an “opportunity to see” the advertising (audience reach) in a given timeframe.
- ◆ *Frequency of message delivery among those reached* – Often expressed as an average, but could be a frequency distribution of exposure levels.
- ◆ *Cost per thousand, CPM*: The cost of a vehicle, or campaign divided by the total impressions, in thousands – the basic method of pricing media.

To develop this new measure for in-store, media characteristics were examined to develop a comparable basis for in-store measurement. Television, print and radio are targeted vehicles with the marketer expecting to reach a demographically specified audience, segmented by age, and gender. In most instances these are actually surrogates for the marketer's real target, which may be defined in terms of product purchase or usage behavior. Targeting media directly to shoppers [Shoppers vs Users] is actually more effective, but is different from the traditional methods with which media people are familiar. Over the past few years, most media people have adopted Recency Theory, which states that the closer the ad exposure is to the purchase occasion, the more effective it will be. This theory lends support to in-store advertising.

Television, print and radio attract their audience based on content interest. Due to current data limits, marketers today generally accept the programming audience as the commercial audience. For other forms, such as outdoor, there is not a content draw. Therefore, some marketers choose to discount the size of the traffic audience when estimating those actually exposed to the advertising. In-store is more analogous to broadcast or radio in that consumers "tune-in" for the content. In the case of the store the content draw is to purchase products. In fact, in-store advertising, arguably, can be said to have a tighter connection between content and commercial because they relate to a specified product or service in the store.

After reviewing the various measures for other media, the POPAI Measured Medium Task Force focused on measures analogous to those used for print and outdoor. Both of these media rely upon audited and projected components to arrive at a reach measure.

After the methodology discussion is a brief discussion of potential applications for these measures.

Definitions & Data Sources

The development of the in-store advertising audience delivery measures relied upon data from Information Resources, Inc. (IRI) Shoppers Hotline for Supermarkets and individual retailers for Convenience stores, along with various industry statistics as noted. The supermarket data are all household-based, while the convenience store data is transaction-based. While neither is person-based, what they may lack in demographics they more than compensate for in propinquity.

The measures and examples, which follow, use weekly or average weekly as the unit of measure to match the way the medium is planned. Accumulation rules are as follows:

- ◆ Impressions are additive across stores, chains, geographies and time.
- ◆ Weekly Reach: not additive across stores, chains, time, or products. These must be *unduplicated* or *netted-out* to avoid counting the same household more than once. Reach among geographies can be weight-averaged.

Potential Weekly Reach is defined as the maximum reach achievable by an in-store message. The maximum assumes 100% store penetration.

Actual Weekly Reach is defined as Potential Reach adjusted to reflect the actual store penetration level achieved. This reflects the fact that not every store will execute the campaign. The execution level, or *proof of performance*, is a critical element in this in-store audience measurement methodology.

To develop the Potential Reach measure for in-store, two approaches were developed. The first approach (Approach A) assumes the availability of consumer-based information, while the second (Approach B) uses store measures and reasonable averages and approximations. While Approach A is the more accurate, and therefore preferred, the data are not always available.

Potential Weekly Reach – Approach A

To derive the number of households that shop in a store or chain in a week (or an average week) several sources can be used including:

- ◆ retailer tracking
- ◆ household panel services
- ◆ diary panel services
- ◆ custom data collection

In addition, depending upon the unit of measure in the available data the following measures may also be needed on a chain- or channel-specific basis:

- ◆ average number of target persons shopping on a trip (in the example below we use people per transaction as “adults”).
- ◆ estimated number of trips per week per person.

The weekly persons with an opportunity-to-see calculation is shown below using two chains from the Baltimore/Washington market.

Approach A – Supermarket Examples		<i>Chain A</i>	<i>Chain B</i>
	Unique household trips (Avg./store/week) ⁽¹⁾	5,437	8,161
<i>times</i>	Avg. no. of adults per transaction ⁽²⁾	1.25	1.25
<i>divided by</i>	Estimated number of trips per week ⁽²⁾	1.5	1.50
<i>equals</i>	Weekly Potential Reach per store	4,531	6,801
<i>times</i>	Store count	122	160
<i>equals</i>	Weekly Potential Reach for chain	552,782	1,088,160
<i>divided by</i>	Population = Share of market	21.4%	42.3%

⁽¹⁾ Source: IRI. Results for a sampling of chains and markets are shown in Table 1.

⁽²⁾ Source: FMI. These national averages will provide reasonable weekly reach estimates, however if more market/account specific data were available, they should be substituted, furthermore, advertisers may refine the audience definition to a more focused target population.

The results show that in-store advertising in all 122 Chain A stores creates a potential reach of 552,782 shoppers in a week or 21.4% of the market, while Chain B's 160 stores creates a potential for almost double (1,088,160) or 42.3% of the market. These two chains represent as much as 63% of the weekly potential reach, yet only 53% of the ACV, reinforcing their importance in delivering in-store ad messages.

In practice, the weekly potential reach of the two chains in our example should not be added together. The duplicated reach between them should be deducted to obtain the net reach of the two-chain combination. As other chains are added to the schedule, the duplication between their reach and the previously combined chains will also have to be factored out. This can be achieved through panel analysis or use of industry averages based on a sampling of consumers. In the absence of market-specific data a reasonable estimate should be used.

Potential Weekly Reach – Approach B

If the needed household data are not available, Approach B provides a close approximation to the preferred approach.

Approach B uses the estimated weekly store All Commodity Volume (total store sales) and average transaction size to calculate the number of transactions. Once transactions are computed, the adjustments for people per transaction and trips per week described above are used to achieve the same Weekly Reach with an opportunity-to-see. An example is shown below.

<u>Approach B</u>		
	<i>Chain C</i>	
	\$286,000	Store weekly ACV
<i>divided by</i>	<u>\$37.18</u>	Transaction size
<i>equals</i>	7,692	Avg. weekly trips – duplicated
<i>times</i>	(est.) 1.25	Adults per transaction
<i>divided by</i>	<u>(est.) 1.50</u>	Trips per week
<i>equals</i>	6,410	Weekly Potential Reach per store

During the POPAI Convenience channel study, participating retailers provided sales, transaction and transaction size information. Applying Approach B methodology provides an average weekly potential reach per store of 3,910 adults. Three chains and industry average information are provided in Table 2.

Actual Reach

Most in-store media planning and purchasing today involves an estimation of actual execution. Monitoring store-level execution ensures placement and provides the data required to adjust Potential Reach to Actual Reach:

- ◆ actual store penetration (execution).

- ◆ display condition (damaged, obscured, fully functional, etc.).
- ◆ proximity of the POP to the product.

The actual store penetration is crucial to developing an accurate actual or realized reach. Today, store penetration levels can only be measured with sufficient accuracy through visual inspection of a store to confirm in-store ad placement. These store audits, conducted routinely, randomly or during key weeks (sweeps concept) should be performed by a variety of third-party services who are independent from those using the audit results.

During the Supermarket Study, sponsor-selected brands from eight categories were audited weekly for 20 consecutive weeks by IRI. Across 10 brands in one of the categories audited, manufacturer pre-printed signage was present on 40% of the displays in Chain A and 50% in Chain B.

<u>Actual Reach</u>		<i>Chain A</i>	<i>Chain B</i>
<i>weekly</i>	Potential Reach – People – % of market	552,782 21.4%	1,088,160 42.3%
<i>times</i>	Audited execution level (% of store weeks) ⁽¹⁾ [what about % ACV for this instead of stores?]	40%	50%
<i>Equals</i>	Avg. weekly Actual Reach OTS – People – % of market	221,113 8.6%	435,264 21.2%

⁽¹⁾ Source: IRI audits.

The resulting Actual Weekly Reach tells a revealing story about audience delivery. Chain B with 30% more stores than Chain A (160 vs. 122) delivers 2.5 times the actual weekly reach. In addition, marketers can now evaluate the cost to reach Chain B’s 435,264 people or 21.2% of the market in a manner similar to broadcast and print.

Future Measurement of Execution (and Reach)

While today’s monitoring requires store audits, various technologies are under development, most notably at the MIT Auto-ID Center, which may provide passive yet accurate and independent verification of placement. Such methods to confirm placement will probably require years of development and implementation. As a result, measurement approaches must be flexible to accommodate a variety of data sources. But in the short run, credibility will suffer unless more traditional means are used in some efficient way.

Frequency

As with outdoor, online and print media, a consumer can be exposed to an in-store ad message multiple times in the week measurement period.

Weekly frequency measures, by chain by market, can be obtained from:

- ◆ household panel services.
- ◆ individual retailers, primarily from frequent shopper data.

Retailer-specific information, eventually at store-level, is needed to avoid “averaging away” important distinctions and valuable information.

According to the Food Marketing Institute, the average shopper makes 1.5 trips to Supermarkets in a week. The comparable number for Convenience stores is 1.7 trips per week according to NACS. In the absence of market-store-type and chain-specific data, this provides a reasonable estimate.

Rating Points

Once reach and frequency are developed, a Gross Rating Points measure can be easily computed. To distinguish between in-store and out-of-store media, a separate name has been developed: **In-store Rating Points (IRP’s)**.

IRP’s are defined as reach(%) times frequency. Using the reach example earlier, assume the following in-store conditions:

	<i>Chain A</i>		<i>Chain B</i>
In-store ad vehicles	Pre-printed sign & standee		Pre-printed sign
Length of placement	2 weeks		1 week
Reach for the event:	<i>week 1</i>	<i>week 2</i>	<i>week 1</i>
Actual Execution (% of stores)	40%	40%	50%
<i>reach</i>	8.6	8.6	15
<i>Frequency</i>	1.5		1.5
<i>IRP’s</i>	12.9	12.9	22.5
<i>2 week total IRP’s</i>	25.8		22.5

Over the two weeks, each chain generated roughly 25 IRP’s but most likely at different costs. Marketers and retailers can use IRP’s to value the advertising audience delivery and judge the respective payouts (Table 4 provides a calculation worksheet).

Cost per Thousand Impressions (CPM)

Understanding the cost of delivering impressions to the audience is just as important as being able to measure the audience. Cost per thousand impressions (CPM) is the common denominator for comparing different media cost. This measure is used to allocate media budgets across different media, along with the tracking of actual performance.

A sampling of in-store advertising vehicle costs was gathered for this analysis from sponsors of the In-store Advertising Supermarket Study in early 2001. No representation is being made as to the representative nature of these costs for the industry at large. Rather they are used as examples to demonstrate the calculations and make comparisons to other media CPM.

$$\text{CPM} = \frac{\text{POP cost per event}}{\text{Audience}/1000}$$

The POP cost per event includes the cost of POP material, any specific ad placement fees, and the labor cost for setting up the material in-store for all the stores with placement. The audience, also known as reach, represents the actual number of people (in a week) who have the opportunity-to-see the material.

Carrying forward the example from the two Baltimore/Washington, DC chains above, the CPM for each Chain and their specific execution can be calculated, as shown below.

CPM Calculations		<i>Chain A</i>	<i>Chain B</i>
POP Cost	Total stores	122	160
<i>times</i>	% with placement	40%	50%
<i>equals</i>	Stores with POP material	49	80
<i>times</i>	POP cost per store ⁽¹⁾	27	15
<i>equals</i>	Total Cost	\$1,323	\$1,200
Audience	<i>Week 1</i>	221,113	435,264
	<i>Week 2</i>	221,113	---
		442,226	436,264
CPM = $\frac{\text{POP Cost per event}}{\text{Audience (in thousands)}}$		\$2.99	\$2.75

⁽¹⁾ Include POP material cost at store level, ad placement fees, and labor to setup in-store.

Once CPM measures are calculated, in-store CPM can be compared to other media. Table 3 recaps the Fall 2000–Summer 2001 CPM projections for five media as published by Media Dynamics, Inc.

Application of Audience Delivery Measures

The application of audience delivery measures will be far reaching. In-store advertising can now be evaluated and planned with the same discipline afforded print and broadcast. The methodology outlined in this paper will provide reasonable audience estimates, on a par with those used for traditional media. It can also be used in a variety of settings including those that are data-rich and those less well measured.

Marketers will be able to include in-store advertising vehicles as part of the media planning process. Marketers and retailers will both be able to judge the reach of in-store activities along with the cost of delivering that reach. These measures may also extend into sales force and third-party support service applications focused on the importance of retail execution. After those will come scorecard development and negotiated levels of performance in both execution and audience delivery. In the future, we might expect a marketer to offer incentives to a retailer for providing a desired level of impressions for a target consumer segment.

But how likely are marketers to do so? Will the interest in measuring in-store advertising develop? Marketers have mixed thoughts about whether POP material is helpful in adding to the excitement or entertainment value of an off-shelf display or main shelf placement. Until the POPAI Measured Medium channel studies, there was little evidence confirming the value of individual or multiple POP material usage.

When armed with independent statistically valid evidence of the sales response from a particular combination of POP materials, marketers, sales forces and retailers will have compelling reasons to focus on execution and measurement – to achieve the maximum potential incremental sales, fully leverage both the promotional event or product placement and leverage the POP expenditure. At the same time, some of the learnings may cause a redirecting of spending from less efficient and effective materials into those with a track record of delivering incremental sales profitably. This shifting, based on knowledge, is healthy for POP producers, delivers greater value to marketers and retailers and is rewarded by the consumer who drives the entire process with the additional product purchases.

It will still be important to conduct the types of communications studies done for other media to answer the “why” questions. Even with a direct link between campaign and performance the understanding of what drove success or failure may not be apparent. Marketers hoping to repeat successes and avoid repeating failures are advised to seek the reasons why. In turn, this research can only build market’s knowledge, enhance the quality of in-store advertising and increase the value of the medium.

In-store advertising will now not only be measured, but will set the standard for planning and tracking the link between audience delivery and short-term sales response. As companies begin to experiment with audience delivery and sales effectiveness measures new insights will be developed, which will likely refine this methodology and extend the various applications.

Defining the Next Goal

The POPAI/ARF Measured Medium Studies have broken a log-jamb that has impeded in-store advertising progress for decades. With only the first two phases of this multi-phase study completed we can already define the road map to standardized data methods and sources to enable the planning and management of in-store advertising as a measured medium, comparable to all the traditional media. There is a good deal of work ahead to complete this project and fully implement its findings. Nevertheless we can already begin to define the next set of goals. These fall into three categories: (1) tightening precision, (2) extending reach estimates and (3) moving up the ARF Media Model's hierarchy of relevance from vehicle exposures to advertising exposures. Let's consider each of these briefly.

Tightening Precision

There are a number of factors that go into this methodology. Some rely upon generalized learning to provide a sound estimate, but could be made more precise if more situation-specific data were available. These are:

- **Cross-chain shopping:** These factors are needed to “de-dupe” the sum of individual chain reach estimates. Third-party purchase panel and/or retailer frequent shopper data are good sources for this information.
- **Trips per Week:** The FMI national estimate of 1.5 trips per week in Supermarkets could be replaced with a market-specific and chain-specific estimate produced from third-part purchase panel or retailer frequent shopper data. NACS (NPD) data projects Convenience store trips at 1.7 per week.
- **Persons per transaction:** the FMA national estimate of 1.25 adults could be replaced with a market-specific, chain-specific, time/day-specific estimate. Syndicated sources do not readily provide this information at a chain or local level, but a periodic custom survey could. Syndicated media measurement services based around personal meters are currently under development and may greatly improve demographic, and time/day-specific estimates, and perhaps even chain-specific estimates for POP ad exposure.
- **Level of execution:** the potential to automate this in the long-term has been mentioned. The need to employ current technology to cost-efficiently achieve this monitoring today cannot be overstated.

In addition to tightening quantitative precision, there are several areas of qualitative precision, which should be addressed as the measurements are refined. These are:

- **Quality of time exposure:** The exposure length of time and the length of the shopping trip should be factored into the measurement. Syndicated sources could provide a periodic custom survey.

-
- Quality of POP placement in-store: This is the combination of proximity of the ad to the product and the quality of the store location. More heavily visited locations in the store, where shoppers stop – and therefore can be reached by an ad – are more valuable. Examples include the front lobby, front endcaps and service counters. This is discussed further in the ad impressions section.
 - Quality of audience: The ability to reach a specific target audience will be an important refinement needed by advertisers. Demographic information about a store’s shoppers is readily available from syndicated services. Eventually target shopper information could be connected to specific store locations (for example pet owners and the pet food aisle).

Extending Reach

The current methodology provides for weekly reach estimates. Media planners need to extend these estimates over longer time-frames and combine them with other media to fully evaluate the contribution of various levels of in-store activity to the media plan. This will generally be handled as two related but separate projects.

The first, extension of in-store reach estimates over time, could be accomplished through further tabulation of purchase panel or frequent shopper panel data. Multiple week reach estimates would be most useful, especially when tailored to the duration of the retail and media plan. The usual execution patterns of POP should inform this process and may make it fairly straight-forward.

The second requires some measurement of in-store exposure via the same method of measuring the other media to be considered. A number of such syndicated surveys exist, some on a national and others on a more regional level. For example, circulation per copy is to print what the portion of traffic at a given store location is to in-store. Development of such in-store measures seems reasonable. Questionnaire specifications would need to be worked out, as would the sources of support for the added measurement cost.

Advertising Exposure

The recently revised ARF media model¹ underscores the value of distinguishing between vehicle exposure and advertising exposure.

There is a general industry interest in moving the media currencies forward from vehicle exposure to advertising exposure. For example, in Out-Of-Home media practitioners use traffic counts as they relate to specific ad placement to translate vehicle exposure to ad exposure measures. In Online Media, too, practitioners are recognizing the distinction between vehicle and exposure. We can look forward to all media employing the same currency standard. Such a move on the part of the in-store media would be highly advantageous.

¹ [Making Better Media Decisions](#), ARF, 2002

While not readily available today, chain-specific, or market-level-by-store-type data could be collected on a periodic basis to map the traffic flow through the store and create exposure factors for various store-parts. So we may learn that for every 100 shoppers, 95 are exposed to POP in the dairy section, while only 73 find themselves in front of the fish department.

Table 1
Weekly Reach Potential per Store*
Supermarkets

		<i>Weekly Reach Potential per Store</i>	<i>Average Annual Trips per Shopper</i>
per chain	Supermarket	5,916	25.2
	Average Supercenter¹	29,319	18.4
	<u><i>Chain</i></u>		
Atlanta	<i>A</i>	5,441	29.0
	<i>B</i>	2,326	11.1
	<i>C</i>	5,013	24.5
Baltimore/Washington	<i>A</i>	4,531	21.8
	<i>B</i>	6,801	31.3
Boston	<i>A</i>	8,039	27.2
Buffalo	<i>A</i>	8,163	38.3
Charlotte	<i>A</i>	2,446	28.6
	<i>B</i>	3,459	17.3
	<i>C</i>	4,488	18.5
Chicago	<i>A</i>	7,425	29.4
	<i>B</i>	7,296	23.4
Cincinnati	<i>A</i>	5,860	29.0
	<i>B</i>	3,222	11.1
Columbus	<i>A</i>	5,864	32.8
Denver	<i>A</i>	4,100	20.2
	<i>B</i>	7,854	35.5
Houston	<i>A</i>	6,498	27.0
Los Angeles	<i>A</i>	5,926	20.4
	<i>B</i>	4,837	26.6
Miami	<i>A</i>	7,344	43.7
San Antonio	<i>A</i>	5,661	14.9
	<i>B</i>	7,759	45.9

* Source: IRI Shoppers Hotline & PCi estimates and analysis

¹ Based on sampling of one retailer in three different markets.

Table 2
Weekly Reach Potential per Store*
Convenience Stores

	Average Weekly Store		<i>Potential Reach</i>
	<i>Sales</i>	<i>Transactions</i>	
Industry Average**	\$15,600	4,470	2,660 people
B	13,700	3,920	2,450
D	19,900	3,430	2,020
F	64,000	15,340	8,520
Study Average	\$25,975	6,670	3,910

* Source: Individual retail chains & PCi estimates and analysis.
 ** Source: NACS State of the Industry Report, 2002.

Table 3
Cost-per-1000 Projections for Five Media*
Fall 2000 – Summer 2001

	<i>Ad Unit</i>	Cost-Per-1000	
		<i>Men</i>	<i>Woman</i>
TV			
Early AM (Major Networks)	:30	\$15.60	\$10.05
Daytime (Major Networks)	:30	---	5.60
Early Evening (Spot)	:30	15.00	12.70
Early News (Major Networks)	:30	12.95	9.90
Primetime (Major Networks)	:30	24.05	19.05
Primetime (Cable)	:30	10.75	10.40
Late News (Spot) ¹	:30	25.90	20.10
Late Fringe (Major Networks)	:30	22.90	19.90
Sports (Major Networks) ²	:30	21.70	---
Radio			
Network	:30	6.55	5.40
Spot	:30	8.75	7.90
Magazines³			
Business	P4C	22.50	---
Mass Dual Audience	P4C	7.45	5.25
Newsweeklies	P4C	9.35	---
Sports	P4C	8.50	---
Selective Men's Interest	P4C	11.95	---
Selective Women's Interest	P4C	---	9.95
Women's Fashion	P4C	---	12.50
Women's Service	P4C	---	5.75
Newspapers⁴			
Dailies	1/3 P B&W	21.70	20.95
Out-of-Home			
	30 sheet	4.10	4.35

*Source: Media Dynamics, Inc.

¹ ABC/CBS/NBC affiliates.

² All-sports average.

³ Assumes through-the-book readership levels and negotiated off-card rates.

⁴ Top 50 markets.

Glossary of Terms

- ◆ *All Commodity Volume (ACV)*: Total store sales from all products. ACV is often expressed on an annual basis or average week.
- ◆ *Audience*: The total number of people or impressions for a specific media vehicle during a defined time-period, e.g., store-week.
- ◆ *Cost per Thousand (CPM)*: The cost of a vehicle, or campaign divided by the total impressions, in thousands – the basic method of pricing media.
- ◆ *Display*: Refers to the merchandising of product available for sale to a shopper.
 - *Secondary Display*: Refers to a display of product at a separate location from the main stocking location (also called main aisle) where all products from the same category are stocked. Secondary displays are most often found on end caps, in open floor areas or near the checkout.
- ◆ *Exposure*: One person with an OTS, also called an Impression.
- ◆ *Food Marketing Institute (FMI)*: The international trade association for supermarket operators.
- ◆ *Frequency of message delivery among those reached* – Frequency is the average number of times people are exposed during a set time period.
- ◆ *Gross Impressions*: The sum of all impressions for a campaign or specified portion of a campaign.
- ◆ *Gross Rating Point (GRP)*: Gross impressions equal to one percent of the intended population; also the sum of the rating points for a campaign, or specified portion of a campaign.
- ◆ *In-store Rating Point (IRP)*: Reach (%) times Frequency.
- ◆ *National Association of Convenience Stores (NACS)*: The trade association for convenience store operators.
- ◆ *Opportunity To See (OTS)*: A single opportunity to view an ad—used interchangeably with exposure and impression.
- ◆ *Point-of-Purchase (P-O-P) Advertising*: A product or service including displays, signage and in-store media, purchased by retailers and/or brand marketers for placement at the point of sale for promotion of goods and services.
- ◆ *Rating*: Audience as a percent of the target population.
- ◆ *Reach*: Reach is the total number of people exposed to a message at least once in a set time period. Reach is the broadcast equivalent of circulation for print advertising. Often referred to as the net percent of the target population with an “opportunity to see” the advertising (audience reach) in a given timeframe.
 - *Actual Weekly Reach*: The audited actual number of people reached.
 - *Potential Weekly Reach*: The planned, based on projections, number of people reached.
- ◆ *Target Audience*: the intended audience for a media vehicle or ad defined in terms of specific demographic(s) (age, sex, income etc.), product purchase, product usage and/or media usage characteristics.

Target Rating Point (TRP): One percent of the target audience.