



22 REASONS TO SAY NO TO AVES: by Richard Bagnall, Chairman , AMEC

对广告等值(AVE)说不的 22 个理由:

1. The worldwide PR industry denounces AVEs as flawed

全球公关行业机构一致认定广告等值是一个有缺陷的指标

Global communication trade associations AMEC, IPR (Institute for Public Relations), PRSA (Public Relations Society of America), PRCA (Public Relations and Communications Association), the Global Alliance and ICCO (International Communications Consultancy Organisation) all agree that AVEs are not a valid metric.

包括 AMEC (国际公关传播测量与评估协会)、IPR (公共关系研究院)、PRSA

(美国公共关系学会)、全球联盟、ICCO (国际公关顾问组织) 在内的全球公关

传播领域的行业协会, 一致认定广告等值不是一个有效的评估指标。

Here are some quotes on the subject:

以下是各行业协会对这一问题的观点:

“Most reputable researchers view such arbitrary ‘weighting’ schemes aimed at enhancing the alleged value of editorial coverage as unethical, dishonest and not at all supported by the research literature.” – **The IPR.**

“绝大多数信誉良好的研究人员认为, 这种为了提高媒体报道的所谓价值所采取的不严谨的加权方式是不道德的、不诚实的, 也不被任何研究文献所支持的。”

– **IPR.**

“Anyone attempting to use them (AVEs) today is fooling themselves, fooling their clients, and failing the profession. AVEs have no place in modern, professional, PR practice.” – **CIPR.**

“任何今天还在使用它们（广告等值）的人，都是在愚弄自己、愚弄客户，也辜负了自己所从事的职业。在当今专业的公关实践中，广告等值不再拥有一席之地。” – CIPR。

“AVEs measure absolutely nothing other than the vanity of those reporting them.” – PRCA.

“广告等值所测量的只不过是那些还在使用这种指标的人的虚荣心罢了。” – PRCA。

“By working with partners around the world AMEC is committed to a long-term campaign to eradicate this meaningless metric and educate professionals on better and available alternatives.” – AMEC.

“通过与全球伙伴的通力合作，AMEC 将长期致力于摒弃这一无意义的指标，并向从业人员宣传、普及更好的替代指标。” – AMEC。

2. The Barcelona Principles

《巴塞罗那协议》

The global communications measurement industry came together in Barcelona in 2010 to establish seven broad principles to achieve best practice for meaningful measurement and evaluation programmes. The Barcelona Principles have achieved worldwide recognition within the PR and communications profession with perhaps the most famous principle being Number 5 which states plainly and simply: **“AVEs are not the value of communication”**

2010 年，全球传播测量行业的专家学者们在巴塞罗那聚集一堂，针对如何实施有效的测量与评估项目，共同制定出了七条通用原则。《巴塞罗那协议》目前已经在全世界的公关传播领域获得了广泛认可，其中最广为人知的要数第五条原则，它简明扼要又直截了当地指出：**“广告等值绝非传播的价值”**。

3. Advertising and PR are different things

广告和公关是两码事

And should therefore be treated as such. Advertising is an “interruptive” marketing discipline. PR is an “engaging” one. Audiences seek out editorial. Advertising on the other hand must interrupt us and grab our attention. Editorial has more credibility than advertising, coming as it does from a third-party viewpoint. Advertising messaging can be specific and controlled, editorial cannot. Advertising and PR may often complement each other, but they work in different ways, are designed for different reasons and should be measured in distinct ways.

因此也应该被区别对待。广告是一种“干扰式”营销，而公关则是“参与式”的推广。受众会主动去阅读评论性文章，而广告则必须对我们进行干扰以引起我们的注意力。由于评论性文章属于来自第三方的观点，因此其可信度要高于广告。广告所传递的信息可以是具体的、可控的，而评论性文章则不然。广告和公关通常是互补的，但是它们发挥作用的方式不同、设计目的也不同，因此对其效果的评估方法也应该不同。

4. You can't advertise everywhere

广告不能无处不在

Advertising is simply not available in all the places that it's possible to secure earned media coverage. For example, the BBC accepts no advertising in the U.K. – either broadcast or online. Many blogs don't carry advertising either. Should a piece of coverage be secured in media that does not carry advertising, how on earth can a meaningful 'advertising value' be attributed against it?

未必任何能够刊载媒体报道的地方都可以刊登广告。例如：BBC 在英国不接受任何广告，无论是在其电视台还是网站。许多博客也不刊载广告。如果是在不刊载广告的媒体上发表的一篇报道，如何能够用一个有意义的“广告价值”来评估它呢？

5. Don't confuse 'cost' with 'value'

不应混淆“成本”与“价值”

Advertising Value Equivalents are misnamed and confuse 'cost' with 'value'. Part of the appeal of AVEs is that they are mistakenly used as a metric to show the value of a PR campaign. We all know however that cost and value are very different things. Cost and value often bear no relation to each other. Have you ever placed an advert somewhere which cost money but received no response? Where was the value in that?

广告等值(Advertising Value Equivalents)这个说法有歧义,且混淆了“成本”和“价值”。广告等值之所以被业界使用,部分原因是它们被错误地用来体现公关活动的价值。然而,我们大家都明白成本和价值是两个截然不同的概念,它们之间通常没有关联。你是否曾经在价格昂贵但是却几乎收不到反馈的媒体上做广告?这样做有任何价值吗?

6. AVEs don't consider other important advertising criteria that affect its price

广告等值没有考虑其它影响其价格的重要标准

Adverts carry a premium price for being in premium locations. These might include right hands pages, inside covers, front pages, back pages etc. What about the difference between black and white? How many AVE systems identify these criteria and value them accordingly? And even if they do, at what price (see below)?

刊登在右手页、内封面、头版、封底等黄金版位的广告,其广告费用通常会包含溢价。黑白广告和彩色广告价格又该如何区别?有多少广告等值的计算方法会将这些不同的因素均考虑其中?即便考虑了,又如何定价(参见下文)?

7. What price anyway?

用什么价格呢?

Very few adverts are bought at rate card prices. Think of the last advert you bought. Did you pay full rate card price? Media buying agencies certainly do not. Discounts and agency commissions are factored in at different rates for different agencies and clients. In the same way that when you take a flight it's highly unlikely that you paid the same price for your seat as your neighbour, it's very unlikely that two similar ads

in the same media cost the same. Yet despite this, AVEs tend to be calculated based upon published rate card prices, instantly over inflating the figures.

很少有广告是按照刊例价来成交的。想一想你上一次进行的广告投放，是按照刊例价支付的吗？媒介采购代理肯定不会这样做的。不同的代理商和不同的广告客户享有不同的折扣、返点。就如同你搭飞机旅行时，你和你邻座的乘客所支付的机票价格很有可能是不一样的，相似的两个广告所支付的成本也很有可能是不同的。尽管如此，广告等值的计算通常都是按照公开发布的刊例价来计算的，直接导致金额被夸大。

8. How much of each piece of content should be included to measure the AVE?

每篇新闻中有多少内容应该用于计算广告等值？

When attributing an AVE, how much of an article, post or broadcast clip should be included? Just the specific part with a brand name mention? The paragraph around it? The whole page? Or the whole article or programme? These challenges exist with broadcast as much as they do with the written word. An already spurious and subjective number gets ever more subjective when 'size' is considered.

在计算广告等值时，每篇文章、每个帖子、每条视频中，有多少内容应该被计算其中？只是提到品牌的那几句话？提及品牌的整个段落？整页？还是整篇文章、整个节目都算？无论是广播电视、还是文字稿都存在这样的问题。当面积、长度这类因素需要考虑其中时，这个本来就主观性很强的、主观得出的数字就会变的更加主观了。

9. AVEs take no account of the quality of the coverage

广告等值没有考虑报道质量的因素

In the same manner that AVEs don't relate to the size of the piece, they don't take account of the quality of the coverage either. AVEs are purely a quantitative metric. They provide no insight into the quality of content, the messages, inferences and issues that matter. AVEs simply ignore this, all coverage is counted equally, whatever the calibre of its content.

同广告等值没有考虑文章大小的因素一样，它也没有考虑报道的内容质量。广告等值只是一个纯粹的量化指标，无法就内容质量、传递信息、推断结论、话题热点提供有价值的洞察。广告等值直接忽略这些内容水准方面的因素，所有的报道都被同等对待。

10. Adverts are always positive. Earned media coverage may not be

广告总是积极正面的，但是免费/赢得的媒体报道未必

Ads can't be negative. Earned media can. How is this accounted for in AVEs? Some systems apply a negative value to the AVE, some do not. Both approaches are flawed. Reputation takes years to build but can be destroyed overnight through one event. Negative coverage can have rapid and disastrous consequences for a brand, way out of proportion to the effect that positive coverage generates.

广告不可能是负面的，而免费/赢得媒体却有可能是负面的。这种情况要怎么计算广告等值呢？有的计算方法会给这种报道一个负的广告等值，有的则不然。

两种处理方式都有缺陷。良好的声誉需要经过多年的努力，但是毁掉它可能只是一夜之间的事情。负面报道能够迅速给品牌带来灾难性的后果，这同正面报道为品牌带来的积极宣传效果完全不成比例。

11. AVEs take no account of target audiences

广告等值不考虑目标受众

AVEs take no account of target audiences. Instead they purely reward mass media outlets as these are the ones that will have the higher advertising rates. If you are trying to reach a niche target audience through low readership publications, your AVE is going to be very small, even if you have run a highly successful campaign. As a result...

广告等值不考虑目标受众这个因素，只是对于那些有着更高广告价格的大众媒体上的报道，给出更高的广告价值。如果你想通过发行量较低的媒体面向小众市场进行宣传，即便你的活动非常成功，你所获得的广告等值也会很低。由此...

12. Measuring AVE drives the wrong activity

测量广告等值会导致鼓励错误的活动

We all know that ‘you become what you measure’. According to the [Harvard Business Review](#): “Human beings adjust behaviour based on the metrics they’re held against. Anything you measure will impel a person to optimize his score on that metric. What you measure is what you’ll get. Period.”

When measuring communication with AVEs, literally every piece of content counts, no matter how inappropriately placed or irrelevant the media in which it appears. Use of AVE as a metric encourages behaviours that won’t benefit your organization, such as the “carpet-bombing” or “spray and pray” of press releases in the hope that large volumes of coverage will result, irrespective of where. It makes it tempting to use a scatter-gun approach to PR rather than a targeted, well-planned and efficient strategy.

我们都知道，“你会成为考核标准所要求的那样的人”。据《[哈佛商业评论](#)》：

“人类会根据用于考核他们的指标来调整他们的行为。无论你考核的是哪个方面，都会驱使被考核者去优化那个方面的指标。你所考核的内容决定了你能得到的结果。”

当我们用广告等值来测量传播效果，每一篇文章的贡献都被计算其中，无论这篇文章是否出现在合适的媒体、合适的版位上。将广告等值作为考核指标会鼓励一些无法令机构受益的行为的出现，例如：在发新闻稿时采取“地毯式轰炸”、

“大面积撒网”的策略，期望以量取胜，而不考虑媒体的相关度。从而导致在进行公关活动时摒弃了目标精准、计划周密、注重效率的原则。

13. AVEs are a vanity metric

广告等值是一个没有价值的指标

Most communication campaigns will in all likelihood generate a high AVE, certainly a ‘financial’ number that is in excess of the cost/budget of the campaign itself. This large number however is nothing more than a vanity metric which sounds good but is in itself meaningless.

绝大多数的公关传播活动都极有可能产生很高的广告等值，一定会是一个超过活动本身开销/预算的“财务”数字。然而，这个价值数字只是一个看着好看的数字而已，其本身并没有任何实际意义。

14. Advertising is not measured in ‘PR value equivalents’

广告效果并没有用“公关等值”来衡量

So, why should PR and communications professionals demean themselves by measuring in ‘advertising value equivalents?’

那么，为什么公关和传播领域的从业人员要用“广告等值”衡量自身活动的价值来自降身份呢？

15. Multipliers and ‘PR Values’

倍数与“公关价值”

Some claim that a multiplier should be applied to AVEs to “weigh them up” further than a straight advertising value. This is done allegedly to factor in the additional impact of third-party endorsement provided by the journalist or influencer. However, there is no credible, peer-reviewed research that proves that any multiplier (or divider for that matter) should be used, or even whether one is relevant and appropriate at all. Where multipliers have been used, different organisations have used different multipliers, thus further confusing the market. A ‘weighted’ AVE claiming to represent “PR value” is nonsense.

有些观点认为在计算广告等值时应该乘以一定的倍数，以确保其价值高于直接计算的广告价值，据称，这么做的目的是要将记者或者意见领袖所带来的额外的第三方背书效应考虑进去。然而，并没有可信的、经过同行评审的研究结论能够证明我们应该使用任何倍数（或者是分数），甚至这种做法是否相关、适合也并无结论。即便是使用了倍数的情形中，不同的机构所使用的倍数也是不同的，从而导致这一领域更加混乱。用“加权”广告等值来代表“公关价值”也同样是无稽之谈。

16. There is no agreed methodology to measure AVE

计算广告等值没有统一的方法

AVEs are not measured in a standard way. Each provider will have their own methodology and are likely to be using different advertising rates too. As well as not being meaningful, the metric is simply not transferable between suppliers either.

广告等值的计算并没有一个标准的方法。每家机构都有自己的计算方法，也很可能使用了不同的广告价格。因此，广告等值不但没有意义，作为一个指标也无法在不同的机构之间参考、通用。

17. Good measurement and evaluation should inform the planning process

好的测量与评估方法应该对制定计划的过程提供指导

AVEs provide no meaningful information that can be used to refine a communication plan. They are literally a ‘backward-looking’ number to be used in a vain attempt at justifying performance. Best practice evaluation should always produce insights and intelligence that can inform strategy. AVEs have no strategic value at all.

广告等值不能为改进传播计划提供有价值的信息。它实际上是一个“回顾过去”表现的数字，徒劳无功地用来证明活动的效果。最佳的评估方法应该总是能够为制定战略提供情报和洞察，而广告等值则完全没有战略价值。

18. AVEs don't work in digital and social media

对于数字化媒体和社交媒体，广告等值并不适用

Advertising works in a different way online from how it does in the printed press. It is based on paid for exposures rather than guaranteed runs in publications. Accordingly, attributing any kind of meaningful AVE to an online piece of mainstream content is impossible. Additionally, it's not possible to assign a value to individual tweets, blog content, Facebook and LinkedIn updates etc. AVEs are even more flawed on social media than they are in mainstream media!

网络媒体的广告同纸质媒体上的广告有着不同的运作方式。网络媒体的广告费用是基于广告的曝光情况，而非在出版物上的固定排期。因此就不可能给主流媒体的一篇网络稿件赋予一个有意义的广告等值。同样地，对于一条推特、一

篇博客、以及一条脸书或领英上的更新也不可能赋予一个价值。比起应用于主流媒体，广告等值如果应用到社交媒体内容上更是漏洞百出。

19. AVEs are just an output metric

广告等值只是一个结果指标

AVEs are measured using ‘content analysis’ and therefore are an ‘output’ metric only. Best practice in communications measurement agrees that effective evaluation moves beyond outputs alone and should also include outtakes, outcomes and business impact too. (See AMEC’s [Integrated Evaluation Framework](#) micro-site for more information on this.) AVEs take no account of these important parts of the evaluation process.

广告等值是通过“内容分析”来测算的，因此它只是一个衡量“结果”的指标。

传播测量领域的最佳实践认为有效的评估应该不仅限于对结果的测量，还应该

包括效果、成果以及对业务所产生的影响。（更多细节请参考 AMEC 的[综合评估框架](#)）。广告等值没有涵盖上述这些重要的评估环节。

20. AVEs don’t reflect objectives

广告等值无法体现目标

Good PR campaigns will support an organisation’s objectives and will be planned against pre-defined communications objectives as well. AVEs take no account of the success of delivery against objectives as part of their methodology.

好的公关活动会为机构的目标提供支持，也会根据既定的传播目标进行策划。

在广告等值的计算方法中，没有考虑既定目标是否成功实现的因素。

21. PR is not just media relations

公关不仅限于媒体关系

PR has always been about far more than just gaining editorial coverage and media relations. AVEs, at their best, attempt only to measure the result of your media relations activities. How can they be the true value of your PR efforts? The changes of the last ten or so years have meant that this is an even more important point. Communicators today are expected to embrace all aspects of the PESO model – Paid, Earned, Shared and Owned. To measure effectiveness meaningfully, AVEs would need to be appropriate and relevant across each of these steps. But they’re not.

When, for example, a communications professional is incorporating paid media into their campaign, how can it make any sense to then measure 'Paid' with an AVE? And how many of us accept other organisations advertising on our own 'Owned' media too?!

公关活动不应只局限于获得媒体报道、建立媒体关系。广告等值充其量只是尝试着去衡量你的媒体关系活动的结果。它怎么能够体现出你的公关活动的真正价值呢？过去 10 多年所发生的改变表明这一点正变得越来越重要。当今的传播活动需要全面涵盖 PESO（付费媒体、免费/赢得媒体、分享媒体、自有媒体）的方方面面。如果想要有效地衡量公关活动的效果，广告等值需要针对每一类媒体的内容专门适用的计算方法。但是，广告等值并没有。例如：如果一项公关活动邀请了付费媒体来参与，用广告等值来评估付费媒体内容能有什么意义呢？我们当中又有多少人接受其它机构在我们自己的“自有”媒体上做广告呢？

22. The index itself is in decline

这一指标本身也在下滑

Finally, who on Earth would want to assign a metric of success against an index that is in steep decline? Advertising rates are linked to the readership of the publication and the response rates that they generate. As the media choice proliferates for consumers, audiences fragment and readerships across the board continue their decline, advertising rates are declining as well. Think about the implications of this. Imagine an identical campaign generating the same volume of content in the same media for two consecutive years. The AVE reported in the second year would be less than in the first year even though the output was exactly the same! Who would possibly want to report on their success using a methodology that penalised them the longer they used it?!

最后，谁会希望用一个在直线下滑的指标来衡量自己活动成功与否呢？广告价格与媒体的发行量、阅读量以及它们所带来的回复率相关。随着消费者有了越来越多的媒体选择、媒体受众的分化程度越来越高，从总体上说，各个媒体的读者人数持续呈下降趋势，由此导致广告价格也不断降低。想一想这对我们意

意味着什么？假设一个相同的活动连续两年在同一个媒体上产生了同样数量的报道，那么第二年所产生的广告等值就要低于第一年，尽管活动所产出的结果是一模一样的。谁会愿意用一个用的越久反而效果越差的方法来评估自己的活动是否成功呢？