Metrics that Matter - to Marketing Managers
by Neil Bendle, Paul Farris, Phillip Pfeifer and David Reibstein

In a sample of 194 senior marketing managers we found that financial metrics are widely regarded as the most useful metrics. Of metrics traditionally thought of as marketing metrics, only Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty make the top ten list of metrics that senior managers found very useful. We also found that relatively new metrics, such as Customer Lifetime Value and Net Promoter Score, have some way to go before they can compete with the traditional financial metrics as the key metrics that managers want to see. Despite some academic discussion over its usefulness, Market Share remains a metric that is highly valued by senior marketing managers, as well.

Overall our research gives a better idea of what metrics senior marketing managers value in managing and monitoring their businesses. This allows us to better understand the needs of users of marketing metrics. A better understanding of what marketing managers currently value allows us to identify gaps between current academic thinking and actual management practice with the idea of closing those gaps either through teaching opportunities (where researchers attempt to convince managers of the usefulness of some of the underused metrics) or research opportunities (for academics to better understand, perhaps, why managers find some of the underutilized metrics less useful.)
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1. Introduction

In recent years the clamor for wider use of metrics has been noticeable amongst both marketing practitioners and academics. The Marketing Science Institute (MSI) designated “Accountability and ROI of Marketing Expenditures” as a top priority for 2008–2010. It has been at the top of MSI’s research priorities for the past ten years. This has stimulated considerable work on the topic of metrics use and how to tie marketing back to shareholder value. There is, however, less work on the topic of how marketers should communicate with senior managers about these measures. As marketers, we should be focused on the needs of the customers for the information we provide. Customers of marketing metrics are usually at a senior level in an organization and as such this research considers what metrics these senior managers find useful. Put simply we wanted to answer the question for marketers: “what does your boss want you...
to know”? Of course by surveying senior managers, we cannot hope to comment on an objective standard of what are the “optimal metrics” to report. We do not claim our list is a normative description of what senior managers should value – only what they currently do value. As such there are undoubtedly some useful metrics that are undervalued currently by senior managers. While we have appreciation for the use of more customer-based financial measures, such as Customer Lifetime Value or brand equity measures, this research suggests that the message of the value of such metrics still needs to be communicated more vigorously to the end users. Much work still needs to be done to market marketing metrics. As marketers we should welcome this challenge.

2. Survey of Senior Managers

Our survey was administered to senior marketing managers and executives to discover what they consider to be important metrics to manage their business. At a pragmatic level we can help those marketer’s who compile metrics. Our work helps them to see what the senior managers find useful in making the important decisions. This research helps to answer the question as to what metrics senior managers find useful and what metrics they currently do not value.

We surveyed 194 senior marketing managers and executives. The sample was drawn from managers attending executive education courses at three highly ranked US business schools over the last five years. Of the respondents more than 100 held the title of Vice President/ Director/ Managers or “Head” of Marketing. Many of the respondents reported that they had global responsibility. The seniority of the sample can be seen from that fact that there were no less than ten corporate presidents and C-level (e.g. CEO) managers who responded. These top-level executives all had marketing responsibilities that made up a significant part of their duties. The remaining managers involved in a range of roles such as trade and account managers. Typically they held titles such as Assistant or Associate Vice President. The key conclusion is that the responses we received reflect what those at the very senior levels of marketing decision-making report as valuable in monitoring and managing their businesses.

The respondents came from a very wide range of industries. Indeed no more than ten responses were recorded from a single industry. Our respondents came from such diverse fields as aerospace, automobile, banking, chemicals, consumer goods, construction, computers, consulting, education, industrial distribution, investments, government, health care, housing, insurance, information technology, manufacturing, materials, medical devices, paints, pharmaceuticals, retailing, software, telecommunications and transportation.

The majority of respondents came from large firms as 52% reported revenues above $1 billion (see Tab. 1).

The sample was composed of a large percentage of B2B respondents with nearly half the respondents coming from companies that sold to other businesses (see Tab. 2).

The service sector was well represented in the sample as 20% of respondents reported that the businesses they worked for supplied services (see Tab. 3).

Finally the companies in the sample were relatively successful as reflected by the fact that 76% of respondents reported their business had grown by more than 3% in the past year (see Tab. 4).

The survey was conducted on-line. Prospective respondents were invited via emails, phone calls, and in-class requests to participate in an online survey asking their opinion on the usefulness of a wide range of metrics. Cleary, the sample is a convenience sample, but drawn from a relevant and relatively highly motivated group of managers. The list of metrics evaluated is attached in Tab. 5.

### Respondents By Company Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Type</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $10 million</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 - $100 million</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101 - $500 million</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501 million - $1 billion</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 billion</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Respondents Reports of Company Revenues**

### Respondents By Customer Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Type</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Mix</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Respondents Came from Both B2B and B2C Companies**

### Respondents By Sales Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Type</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Mix</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Respondents Came from Both the Product and Service Sectors**

### Respondents By Company Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Respondents Report Coming from Growing Companies**
The respondents were asked whether each of a list of metrics was useful on a three-point scale – “very useful,” “somewhat useful,” or “not at all useful”. They were also given the opportunity to signal that the metric was not applicable to their business. We selected our metrics to cover the full range of metrics used in marketing. We asked the managers to consider 110 metrics. We used metrics that were explained in Farris et al. (2006) and added Net Promoter Score to this list (Reichheld 2003). This broad focus allowed us to consider the relative popularity of a wide number of metrics, allowing us to understand the areas in which those making the most significant marketing decisions rely upon marketing metrics.

The article is organized as follows. In section 3 we consider how finance metrics tend to dominate in perceived usefulness. In section 4 we consider the fate of potentially useful but relatively new metrics and show that adoption of a number of metrics has been slow. We go on to consider the fate of market share and show that despite all the controversies about the usefulness of market share, it is a metric that is still deemed very useful by the majority of senior managers. In section 5 we consider what metrics are likely to be valued conditional upon other metrics being valued – i.e., what sets of metrics do senior managers want to see. Finally we end with a discussion of the results.

### Table 5: Metrics in Survey (% rating “very useful” shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share Of Hearts, Minds &amp; Markets Metrics</th>
<th>Margins And Profit Metrics</th>
<th>Sales Force And Channel Management Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>Sales Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Target Revenues</td>
<td>Sales Potential Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Market Share</td>
<td>Target Volumes</td>
<td>Sales Force Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Market Share</td>
<td>Unit Margin</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>Variable And Fixed Costs</td>
<td>Sales Funnel, Sales Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness To Recommend</td>
<td>Marketing Spending</td>
<td>Inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Of Mind</td>
<td>Average Price Per Unit</td>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Beliefs</td>
<td>Contribution Margin %</td>
<td>Total Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Penetration</td>
<td>Contribution Per Unit</td>
<td>Out Of Stock %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Market Share</td>
<td>Break-Even Sales</td>
<td>Product Category Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Habits</td>
<td>Channel Margin</td>
<td>Direct Product Profitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Price Per Statistical Unit</td>
<td>Markdowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Break-Even Number Of Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numeric Distribution%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Penetration</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Commodity Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy Of Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td>GMROI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetration Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Development Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness To Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Promoter Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Development Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Of Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Usage Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion Metrics</th>
<th>Advertising And Web Metrics</th>
<th>Marketing And Finance Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Sales Or Promotional Lift</td>
<td>Effective Reach</td>
<td>Net Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Sales</td>
<td>Impressions</td>
<td>Return On Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Sales On Deal</td>
<td>Effective Frequency</td>
<td>Return On Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemption Rates</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>Return On Marketing Investment ROMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Of Coupons/ Rebates</td>
<td>Share Of Voice</td>
<td>Net Present Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Sales With Coupon</td>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>Economic Profit (EVA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Time On Deal</td>
<td>Clickm throughput</td>
<td>Payback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Through</td>
<td>Net Reach</td>
<td>Internal Rate Of Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Deal Depth</td>
<td>Cost Per Customer Acquired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing Strategy Metrics</td>
<td>Average Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Premium</td>
<td>Cost Per Thousand Impressions (CPM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Price</td>
<td>Pageviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Elasticity</td>
<td>Cost Per Click</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation Price</td>
<td>Abandonment Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Good Value</td>
<td>Cost Per Order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Elasticity</td>
<td>Gross Rating Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The article is organized as follows. In section 3 we consider how finance metrics tend to dominate in perceived usefulness. In section 4 we consider the fate of potentially useful but relatively new metrics and show that adoption of a number of metrics has been slow. We go on to consider the fate of market share and show that despite all the controversies about the usefulness of market share, it is a metric that is still deemed very useful by the majority of senior managers. In section 5 we consider what metrics are likely to be valued conditional upon other metrics being valued – i.e., what sets of metrics do senior managers want to see. Finally we end with a discussion of the results.
3. Financial Metrics Are Much More Commonly Used

Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is traditional finance-related metrics that dominate the assessments of usefulness made by the executives and senior marketing managers in our survey. The headline result is that Net Profit was adjudged the most important metric with 91% of the entire sample reporting this metric was “very useful”.

The dominance of Net Profit was particularly pronounced as this metric was judged to be very useful by a greater percentage of respondents across all categories in our data. It finished number one for respondents who worked for companies in the B2B sector as well as for respondents who worked for companies in the B2C sector. Respondents were on average equally convinced of the value of Net Profit regardless of the purchase relationship (contractual, frequent or infrequent purchase) or what the company was selling (products or services).

Net Profit was followed by Margin % to which 78% of the sample thought was very useful. Margin % was very closely followed by Return on Investment at 77%. The full details of the top ten metrics viewed as very useful are in Table 6.

Tab. 6

Two traditional marketing metrics, customer satisfaction and loyalty, managed to break into the top ten, but it remains clear from our sample that the executives and senior managers look to use measures that would be familiar to colleagues in finance and accounting. This suggests two considerations for the future.

One is that the current push towards making marketing relevant to finance, such as the recent MSI/Emory University conference (Hanssens/Rust/Srivastava 2009) is likely to be welcomed by the managers in our sample. They want to know how marketing impacts the bottom line. Simply put, they want metrics that matter (Lehmann 2004). The financial metrics clearly matter to many parts of the organization and seem to fulfill this need.

A second, and perhaps less appealing idea, is that marketers still have much work to do in persuading senior managers and executives that what marketers do both matters and is properly measurable. Our senior managers had a marketing focus, and yet seemed not to highly rate some measures that are often lauded as key marketing metrics. Take Willingness to Search – the likelihood that customers will not settle for a second choice product if their first choice is unavailable. Despite being known as the “acid test of loyalty” only a paltry 20% of our sample suggested that Willingness to Search was a very useful metric. Indeed, Willingness to Search was only ranked the 85th of our 110 metrics amongst those who work for end-consumer facing companies. (Of course, it is quite possible that the managers we surveyed felt that Willingness to Search as a concept was very useful but that the metrics around Willingness to Search are currently not very useful.) This might be because such metrics often rely heavily on consumer’s knowledge of their own future behavior. The senior managers may also doubt the ability and willingness of consumers to accurately report the consumers own Willingness to Search. Senior managers may regard the effects of marketing as very important but feel that they cannot adequately measure it. While this appears somewhat more reassuring from the perspective of marketers it is a far from satisfactory position to adopt long term. Marketers are unlikely to be able to maintain influence in organizations based upon a belief that what they do is important, but sadly cannot be meaningfully measured.

Overall, we found that despite more than a decade of marketing research focused on tying marketing activities to firm value that senior managers, on average, remain to be convinced that non-financial marketing metrics are anything close to being as useful as the more financially based metrics.

That said it is important to note that not all financial metrics were as widely recognized as useful. Net Present Value fared relatively poorly, with only 46% of the respondents regarding it as a very useful metric. It is, of course, possible that respondents recognized the problems inherent in projections of the future (Ambler/ Roberts 2006). It is harder to explain the lack of recognition of the value of contribution analysis. Only 40% thought Contribution per Unit very useful while a full 15% of those who responded to the question saw no value in Contribution Per Unit, including a surprising 12% of those whose companies produced products. The numbers were a little better for Contribution Margin % but still only 46% subscribed to the idea that Contribution Margin % is a very useful metric. The value of contribution analysis rests on the ability to differentiate between fixed and variable costs in order to calculate the value of incremental sales, break-even quantities, advisability of pricing adjustments and a host of other marketing decisions. It is surprising (to the authors anyway) that many managers do not share the same enthusiasm as academics. Overall we can conclude that while managers seem to subscribe to the value of the financial metrics, there remains room for managers and academics to come

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>% Sample Saying Very Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Net Profit</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Return on Investment</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Target Revenues</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sales Total</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Target Volumes</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Return on Sales</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Annual Growth %</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Top Ten Metrics
to a greater consensus over which ways of monitoring profits are the most valuable.

4. New Metrics Are Taking Time to Be Adopted While Market Share Remains Very Popular

Our survey also allowed us to consider the diffusion of relatively new metrics. The overall message is that despite new metrics having been lauded by their proponents, they have yet to take a broad hold amongst senior managers. This is particularly significant because we assumed that many of the marketing metrics that we assessed would serve the needs of senior management.

For instance, Economic Profit (EVA) is most usefully assessed at a high level of aggregation. The advantage of Economic Profit over such measures as ROI is that it allows an idea of scale of success. Growth in absolute profit, so long as the company’s return on capital exceeds the Weighted Cost of Capital, will result in increased Economic Profit (even if ROI declines). Economic Profit, for example, helps us understand and measure Wal-Mart’s enormous success in a way that monitoring the company’s ROI does not. It is perhaps surprising that only 41% of our sample of senior managers rated Economic Profit as very useful. It is possible that a very useful generic concept, Economic Profit, has been confused with the branded version (EVA).

Metrics that are more focused on issues central to the role of marketing such as customer profitability seem to fare little better. Consider the example of Customer Lifetime Value. This metric was regarded as very useful by only 39% of those who responded, a similar percentage rated it as somewhat useful. This left a full 16% of those who responded judging Customer Lifetime Value to be not at all useful. Given that CLV seems to have a number of great strengths, it would seem that these need to be communicated to senior managers. Of course, some of the managers surveyed work in transaction-focused businesses where the emphasis (correctly, in many cases) is on selling to large groups of anonymous buyers. Or, basic concepts such as trial, repeat rates, share of requirements, and unit margins may be being used to approximate the same concepts.

In recent years there has been some controversy around the value of the Net Promoter Score (Keiningham 2007; Reichheld 2003). Net Promoter Score is the percentage of customers willing to recommend to others less the percentage unwilling to recommend the product or service. The benefits, or otherwise, of the Net Promoter Score seem to have been lost on our sample. Of those who responded only 19% thought Net Promoter was very useful, a further 26% recognized it as somewhat useful. A full 23% regarded it as not at all useful. Perhaps the most illuminating statistic is that a full quarter of those who responded did not know the metric. This lack of knowledge is probably understated as 56 of the 194 managers surveyed failed to answer this specific question, compared to an average of 52 across all questions.

One possibility is that those who work specifically in marketing may have a better understanding of these metrics than those who work primarily in other functions. As such each respondent was classified as being “Marketing” or “Not-Marketing”. This left 102 respondents classified as marketers. Of the 84 who answered the question about Customer Lifetime Value only 36% regarded it as very useful. Interestingly of the 56 non-marketers who answered the question 45% regarded Customer Lifetime Value as very useful.

Net Promoter Score had a different fate with 22% of marketers regarding it as very useful which beat the proportion saying it was not at all useful (20%). Only 14% of the non-marketing managers rated Net Promoter Score as very useful. This was less than the 29% who regarded it as not at all useful. Neither of these differences between marketers and non-marketers proved to be statistically significant.

Market share has long been a popular metric, and our findings help support the findings of Barwise and Farley (2004) who noted that market share is a widely used metric across “the top 5 global markets, (US, Japan, Germany, UK, and France)”. In line with these authors, we find that Market Share remains a popular measure amongst senior managers. Market Share’s value to senior managers comes despite the potential problems that have been highlighted from focusing on this metric in a number of areas of marketing. Indeed, the value of Market Share has been criticized on both empirical (Szymanski/Bharadwaj/Nuradaranjan 1993) and theoretical/experimental (Armstrong/Collopy 1996) grounds. Such criticisms have led to a generally more nuanced role of market share within the academic community. For instance, although high market share, by itself, does not increase profitability, it can enable high market share firms to take certain profitable actions that may not be feasible or profitable for low share firms (Ailawadi/Farris/Parry 1999; Hildebrand/Temme 2004). Our survey shows that Market Share retains a central role in the thinking of managers with a full 67% of senior managers finding market share expressed in dollar terms very useful (61% when expressed in unit terms). We also tested whether the reported growth rate of the company had an effect on the relative esteem in which market share was held, but found no significant effects. It seems that opinions on the importance of market share are widely held across our respondents.

5. What Are Complementary Metrics?

Metrics often seem to come in sets. Those who consider one metric very useful are likely to consider a related metric useful. To take an example of those who consider Customer Lifetime Value to be a very useful metric 80% also regard Retention Rate as very useful. This can be compared to only 45% of the entire sample who regarded Retention Rate as very useful metric.
A metric such as Return on Investment appeals strongly to those who value Economic Profit as 95% of those who found Economic Profit very useful also found ROI very useful. This compares to only 77% of the general sample who found ROI very useful.

In the general sample only 46% found Contribution Margin % very useful. Of those who found Margin % very useful the appeal of Contribution Margin % rose to 54%. Perhaps unsurprisingly many of those who found Contribution Margin % very useful (88%) also found Margin % very useful, (compared to 78% in the general sample).

Of those senior managers who found Willingness to recommend a very useful metric only 28% also found Net Promoter very useful. However, this exceeds the 19% who found Net Promoter very useful in the entire sample but it is perhaps surprisingly that a great percentage of those who value Willingness to recommend don’t also value Net Promoter. It is possible that considerable teaching opportunities remain for the supporters of the Net Promoter Score.

6. Discussion

The list of metrics that managers value contains a number of surprising results and some quite predictable outcomes. As a convenience sample we are limited in our interpretation of the results and as such our results remain tentative. Further research with a random or stratified sample on what metrics are valued by senior managers would be an important endeavor and would help inform the work of marketers at all levels of the organization. This research might also investigate which metrics are growing and declining as concerns the role they play in marketing decisions and which have been recently adopted. Further, marketing metrics are not only industry and firm specific in their usefulness; they often are situational- or context-specific. For example, introducing a new product shifts emphasis to trial and repeat and the entry of a low-price competitor might stimulate management to measure willingness to pay and price elasticity. These situational factors also need to be investigated.

In this research we have shown that managers pay close attention to financial metrics. This is not surprising. One might have anticipated that more of the marketing measures would have been valued, however, as precursors or early indicators of financial measures. The lack of widespread adoption of some of the more recently developed metrics such as Net Promoter and Customer Lifetime Value may be a function of a slow adoption process. It will be interesting to see whether the trend is towards greater adoption of these metrics over time. Probably the most surprising outcome in our research is the less than enthusiastic reception that contribution analysis has received amongst our managers. Given the power of contribution analysis, it may be appropriate for those involved in educating managers to increase efforts to explain the importance of such analysis (or, to ensure that managers fully understand the term “contribution per unit” as distinct from “profit”).

Our snapshot survey of the way metrics are viewed has some important findings but we are forced to conclude that marketing lacks a silver metric (Ambler/Roberts 2006; Peppers/Rogers 2006) that is alone widely recognized by senior managers. Whether this is an appropriate state of affairs we leave it to other scholars to consider. Here we aim to state that the study of those metrics that will best help marketers optimize performance has much work still to be done.
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