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## Respondent Characteristics
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## Mailings to Existing/Prospective Customers

The vast majority of respondents (75\%) utilize email for campaigns to both prospective and existing customers. 20\% use this vehicle for existing customers only.

Total $=1,503$ Respondents


## Promotions/Sales Alerts versus Newsletters

In mailings to existing customers, $59 \%$ say they send both sales alerts or promotions and newsletters, while $27 \%$ send newsletters only.


## Total Respondents - Mailings Sent to Existing Customers

## Systems Used for Existing Customer Mailings

In mailings to existing customers, respondents most often log into and use an ESP, a web-based email service provider (43\%). Smaller proportions have either developed their own inhouse software (16\%), have purchased licensed software and brought it in-house (14\%) or use a full-service provider (11\%).

Total Respondents - System Used for Existing Customer Mailings

Total $=1,447$ Respondents

## Systems Used for Existing Customer Mailings by Revenue Size

Organizations with revenues under $\$ 100$ million are significantly more likely to use an ESP than those with higher revenues. In contrast, larger organizations are significantly more likely to use a full-service provider.
$\square$ We have developed our own in-house software
$\square$ We have purchased licensed software and brought it in-house
$\square$ We use an ESP that we log into to use their facility
$\square$ We use a full-service provider
$\square$ Don't know/ Not sure of our system

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Total Respondents - System Used for Existing Customer Mailings

## Systems Used for Existing Customer Mailings by Percentage Spent on Email

Respondents who utilize more than $75 \%$ of their online budget for Email Marketing are significantly more likely to use an ESP facility than those who spend a smaller proportion

## $\square$ We have developed our ouninhouse

 software$\square$ We have purchased licensed software and brought it inhouse
$\square$ We use an ESP and log into their facility
$\square$ We use a full-service provider
$\square$ Dorit know Nbt sure of our system

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


System Used for Existing Customer Mailings by Percentage of Budget Spent on Email

## Email Marketing Budget

$\square$



## Spending on Email Marketing

On average, respondents say they spend $35.7 \%$ of their online budget on email marketing, with $44 \%$ spending less than $25 \%$ but more than 0 .


[^0]
## Spending on Email Marketing by Revenue Size

Respondents with higher revenues tend to spend a smaller proportion of their online budget on email marketing. Specifically, 63\% of those with revenues greater than or equal to $\$ 100$ million spend less than $25 \%$ of their resources on email marketing, compared with between $40-44 \%$ of those with lower revenues. In contrast, these smaller companies are more likely to devote anywhere from 50-100\% of their budgets to email marketing.

```
\None
\square<25%
\square 25-49%
\square50-74%
\square75-99%
\square 100%
```

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Percentage of Online Budget Spent on Email Marketing by Revenue Size

## Average Spending on Email Marketing By Revenue Size

The average budget percentage devoted to email marketing is also significantly higher among those respondents with revenues of under $\$ 100$ Million, compared with larger organizations.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


## Average Online Budget Percentage Spent On Email Marketing by Revenue Size

## Spending on Email Marketing by Budget Change

The percentage of online budget spent on Email Marketing does not vary significantly by any overall budget change that has occurred over the past two years, although it appears that the average proportion is slightly higher among those respondents who have experienced neither budget increase nor decline.


Average Online Budget Percentage Spent On Email Marketing by Budget Change Over Past 2 Years

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: A/B/C, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c$

## Spending on Email Marketing by Industry

Respondents who classify themselves as being in either Publishing/Media, Professional Services/Consulting, or Small Business General spend at least $40 \%$ of their online budget on email marketing, a higher proportion than those in other industries.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D / E / F / G / H / I, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size
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## Staffing for Email Marketing

Respondents are about equally likely to say that they staff their email marketing efforts with 1,2 or more individuals employed part-time (43\%) as they are to dedicate 1-3 full-timers (43\%).


Total Respondents - Composition of Staffing for Email Marketing

Total = 1,124 Respondents

## Staffing for Email Marketing by Revenue Size

Respondents from organizations with revenues of less than $\$ 1$ Million are most likely to have 1 part-time individual dedicated to coordinating, managing and overseeing their email marketing efforts. Larger companies are significantly more likely to staff with either full-time employees, or additional part-time staff.

| $\square$ No one |
| :--- |
| $\square$ |
| $\square$ |
| $\square$ |
| part-time |
| $\square$ |
| $\square$ |
| or more parl-time |
| $\square 2-3$ full-time |
| $\square 4-5$ full-time |
| $\square$ 6-7 full-time |
| $\square$ 8-10 full-time |
| $\square$ More than 10 full-time |
| $\square$ Don't Know |

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Composition of Staffing For Email Marketing by Revenue Size

## Budget Split Between Mailing to Existing and Prospective Customers

Among those who conduct campaigns to both prospective and existing customers, a slightly greater proportion of the budget is dedicated to existing customers (51.7\% versus 48.7\%).

Total =877 Respondents


Total Respondents - Percentage of Budget Split Between Existing and Prospective Customer Mailings

## Budget Split Between Mailing to Existing and Prospective Customers

On average, respondents from organizations with $\$ 100$ Million or more in revenues devote a significantly greater percentage of their email budget to existing customers than other respondents.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of
confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Percentage of Budget Split Between Existing and Prospective Customer Mailings - by Revenue Size


Existing

## Cost Per Thousand Names - Prospective versus Existing

Respondents who mail to prospective customers incur a cost of $\$ 244.69$ per thousand names. Those who mail to existing customers incur a cost of \$183.66 per thousand names.


Total Respondents - Cost Per Thousand Names

## Usage of Lead Generation

$\square$


## Quality of Leads

At the top two box level ("Excellent" and "Very Good"), respondents give top ratings to webinars (39\%), offer on website (38\%) and subscription box on your website (37\%) for quality of leads generated for organizational email marketing campaigns. These tactics are followed closely by search engine optimization (35\%) and tradeshows (31\%).

| $\square$ Excellent |
| :--- |
| $\square$ Very Good |
| $\square$ Good |
| $\square$ Fair |
| $\square$ Poor |
| $\square$ Don't know about quality of leads |

Total Respondents - varies by tactic


Total Respondents - Quality of Leads by Tactic

## Co-Registration - Site Monitoring

Respondents who use coregistration are most likely to check or monitor the sites used for their opt-in policies (56\%), followed by their privacy policies (44\%), and the synergy of the site with their brand (43\%). A much smaller proportion monitors these sites for the number of current offers (28\%).


Total Respondents - Sites Used for Co-Registration: Checking/Monitoring

## Co-Registration - Use of Autoresponder

Half of those respondents who indicate that they use coregistration use an autoresponder mechanism for names gathered through this tactic, such as welcome messages, while $30 \%$ do not.


Total Respondents - Use of Autoresponder for Names Gathered Through Co-Registration

## Co-Registration - Database

$33 \%$ of respondents using coregistration separate the names they gather in a different database, while $33 \%$ maintain them in the same database.


Total Respondents - Database Placement of Names Gathered Through Co-Registration

## Co-Registration - Treatment

$79 \%$ of respondents who maintain co-registered names separately from other names treat them differently, most often in terms of segmentation (61\%) or tracking (43\%).

## Total Respondents - Percentage Treating Co-Registered Names Differently



$$
\text { Total = } 163 \text { Respondents }
$$

## Co-Registration - Measurement

$63 \%$ of respondents who maintain co-registered names separately also measure them separately, particularly in terms of clickthrough rate (71\%).

## Total Respondents - Percentage Measuring Co-Registered Names Separately



$$
\text { Total = } 163 \text { Respondents }
$$

## Email Appends - Database

$26 \%$ of those respondents who use email appends maintain them in a list separate from other names.


Total Respondents - Database Placement of Names Gathered Through Email Appends

## Email Appends - Treatment

$72 \%$ of respondents who maintain email append names separately treat these names separately, most often in terms of segmentation (56\%), followed by email content (46\%) and tracking (45\%).

## Total Respondents - Percentage Treating Email Names Differently



Total $=172$ Respondents

## Email Appends - Measurement

$56 \%$ of respondents who segregate email append names measure them separately, most often by clickthrough rate (66\%).

## Total Respondents - Percentage Measuring Email Append Names Separately



Total $=172$ Respondents

## Affiliate Marketing - Database

$27 \%$ of respondents who use affiliate marketing separate names captured through this method in a database separate from others.


Total Respondents - Database Placement of Names Gathered Through Affiliate Marketing

## Affiliate Marketing - Database

Respondents from smaller organizations (<\$10 Million in revenues) are significantly more likely than others to keep names gathered by affiliate marketing in the same database as other names they've captured.
$\square$ Add to regular database
$\square$ Maintain in separate database
$\square$ Don't know/ Not sure

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Database Placement of Names Gathered Through Affiliate Marketing - by Revenue Size

## Affiliate Marketing - Treatment

$79 \%$ of respondents who separate names gathered through affiliate marketing treat them differently, with roughly the same proportions doing so by email frequency (47\%), segmentation (46\%), tracking (45\%), or email content (44\%).

Total Respondents - Percentage Treating Affiliate Marketing Names Differently


$$
\text { Total = } 154 \text { Respondents }
$$

## Affiliate Marketing - Measurement

$65 \%$ of respondents who maintain affiliate marketing names separately assign measurements separately from other names, most often in terms of clickthrough rate (58\%) or open rate (56\%).

## Total Respondents - Percentage Measuring Email Affiliate Marketing Names Separately



Total $=154$ Respondents

## Monitoring Deliverability/Relationship

$\square$




## Establishment of "Feedback Loop"

$22 \%$ of respondents have established a "feedback loop", in which they are notified of spam complaints. The email clients with which this loop has been established most frequently are AOL (48\%) and Hotmail (47\%), followed by MSN (39\%).

## Total Respondents - Percentage Establishing a Feedback Loop



Total $=\mathbf{1 , 1 7 9}$ Respondents

## Establishment of "Feedback Loop" By Revenue Size

Respondents from the largest organizations (\$100 Million or more in revenues) are significantly more likely than others to have established this feedback loop.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of
confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Percentage Establishing a Feedback Loop - By Revenue Size

## Establishment of Feedback Loop By Industry

Respondents in
E-Commerce/Retail are significantly more likely than those in other industries to have established a "feedback loop."

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of
confidence: $A / B / C / D / E / F / G / H / I$, $90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size


Establishing a Feedback Loop - By Industry

## Monitoring of "False-Positives"

$23 \%$ of respondents currently have a mechanism in place to monitor "falsepositives", or valid messages that are mistakenly rejected as spam. $50 \%$ of those who monitor use an outside source, while $30 \%$ use their own ISP.

Total Respondents - Percentage Monitoring "False-Positives"


Total $=\mathbf{1 , 1 7 9}$ Respondents

## Monitoring of "False-Positives" - Passalong Rate

Respondents who monitor "false positives" indicate having a significantly higher passalong rate than those who do not.


Passalong Rate by "False-Positives" Monitoring

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: A/B/C, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c$

## Authentication

$31 \%$ of respondents use at least one method for authentication, $54 \%$ of which use SPF (Sender Policy Framework). Respondents are less likely to use DKIM (35\%) or SIDF (33\%).

Total Respondents - Usage of Authentication


Total $=\mathbf{1 , 1 7 9}$ Respondents

## Authentication - Revenue Size

Respondents from the largest organizations are significantly more likely to use at least one method for authentication (41\%) than those from the smallest (29\%).

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Percentage Using at Least One Authentication Method by Revenue Size

## Authentication - Industry

Respondents in
Advertising/Marketing are most likely to use at least one method for authentication, with $44 \%$ of those in that industry group indicating they do so.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size


## Sender Reputation

$24 \%$ of respondents use a method to monitor their sender's reputation, with Return Path (30\%) used most often.

Total Respondents - Monitoring of Sender Reputation


Total $=1,179$ Respondents

## Sender Reputation - by Revenue Size

$37 \%$ of respondents from organizations with revenues of at least $\$ 100$ Million monitor their sender reputation, a significantly larger proportion than those from smaller organizations.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Monitor Sender Reputation - by Revenue Size

## Sender Reputation - Average Clickthrough Rate

Respondents who monitor their sender reputation report higher average clickthrough rates than those who do not.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B, $90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b$


A Monitor Sender Reputation ( $N=162$ )
20.49

B. Don't Monitor Sender Reputation ( $\mathrm{N}=459$ )

## Average Clickthrough Rate by Sender Reputation

## Sender Reputation - Average Unique Clickthrough Rate

Similarly, respondents who use at least one service to monitor their sender reputation also experience significantly higher average unique clickthrough rates than those who do not.


Average Unique Clickthrough Rate by Sender Reputation

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: A/B, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b$

## Privacy Policy Link

The majority of respondents (69\%) include a privacy link on their emails.

Don't know/ Not sure,


Total Respondents - Percentage Including Privacy Policy Link

## Privacy Policy Link By Industry

Respondents in Non-
Profit/Associations and Manufacturing are significantly less likely than those in other industries to have a privacy policy link on their email messages.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D / E / F / G / H / I, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size


Percentage Including Privacy Policy Link - by Industry

## Determination of Opt-Out Reason

$62 \%$ of respondents say their organization does not make an effort to determine the reason for opt-out.


Total $=1,296$ Respondents

## Determination of Opt-Out Reason - by Revenue Size

Respondents with revenues of under $\$ 10$ Million are significantly more likely to say that they attempt to determine the reason for opt-out, when compared with respondents at organizations with higher revenues.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Making Effort to Determine Opt-Out Reason - By Revenue Size

## Determination of Opt-Out Reason and Average Unique Clickthrough Rates

Respondents who attempt to find out the reason for opt-out report a significantly higher average unique clickthrough than those who do not make this inquiry.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C, 90\% level of confidence: a/b/c
*CAUTION: Small sample size


## Average Unique Clickthrough Rate by Determination of Opt-Out Reason

## Determination of Opt-Out Reason and Passalong Rate

On average, respondents who attempt to determine reason for unsubscribing also report higher passalong rates.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: A/B, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b$
*Small sample size does not support statistical testing


Average Passalong Rate by Determination of Opt-Out Reason

## Permission Type

$32 \%$ of respondents claim to use a mixture of opt-in methods depending upon the type of signup. $15 \%$ use implied consent, $14 \%$ each use either expressed consent or confirmed consent, and $11 \%$ use double opt-in.


Total Respondents - Percentage Using Permission Types

Respondents from the larger companies ( $\$ 10$ million or more in revenues) are significantly more likely to vary the type of permission they use, depending upon sign-up type than smaller organizations. While companies with the lowest revenues use a mix more frequently than any individual method, they are significantly more likely than other organizations to use double opt-in.

```
\square Implied consent (permission pre-checked
    on any forms)
\square Expressed consent (permission is not
    pre-checked on any forms)
\square Confirmed consent (we send a
    confirmation email upon sign up)
\square Double opt-in (recipient must click on
    confirmation email to be added to the list)
| mix of the above depending on the type
    of sign up
\square Don't know/Not sure
```

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$

## Permission Type



Percentage Using Permission Types - by Revenue Size

## Prevention of Email Blocking

Just 26\% of respondents report that their organization has attempted to send email in short spurts to prevent blocking. 55\% have not attempted to use this strategy, and 19\% are unsure.


No, $55 \%$

Total Respondents - Attempt to Send Email In Short Spurts to Prevent Blocking

## List Management






## Annual Net Growth Rate in List Size

Over the past three years, the typical annual net growth rate in terms of list size has been $64.1 \%$, although $55 \%$ of respondents report a growth rate of $25 \%$ or less.

Total Respondents - Growth Rate in List Size


## Annual Net Growth Rate in List Size - Revenue Size

Respondents with revenues between $\$ 10$ million and $\$ 99.9$ million claim to have observed a much higher annual growth rate in terms of list size than respondents with either lower or higher revenues.

Statistical testing not available due to unequal variances


Average Annual Growth Rate in List Size - by Revenue Size

## Deletion of Persistent Non-Opens

26\% of respondents delete persistent non-opens, usually within 6 months or less (56\%).

Total Respondents - Deletion of Persistent Non-Opens


Total $=1,228$ Respondents

## Deletion of Persistent Non-Opens - by Industry

Respondents in the Publishing/Media industry are most likely to delete persistent non-opens, significantly so when compared with many other respondents.


Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D / E / F / G / H / I, 90 \%$ level of confidence: a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i *CAUTION: Small sample size

## Deletion of Persistent Non-Buyers

Respondents display greater reluctance to delete persistent non-buyers, with just 7\% saying they do so. In addition, they retain persistent non-buyers for a longer period of time, with $37 \%$ waiting at least a year before these subscribers are removed.

## Total Respondents - Deletion of Persistent Non-Buyers



Total $=\mathbf{1 , 2 2 8}$ Respondents

## Information Collected

Nearly all respondents collect email address ( $97 \%$ ) and name (94\%) when individuals register to receive email from the organization. Phone number and company name ( $57 \%$ each) are the next most frequently collected items, followed by street address (49\%) and title (45\%). Delivery and content preferences are collected relatively less frequently.


Total Respondents - Percentage Collecting Information Items

Total $=1,228$ Respondents

## Number of Pages Involved in Registration

The vast majority (86\%) of respondents include one page in their registration process.


Total $=1,228$ Respondents

## Number of Fields in Registration Form

Respondents are most likely to include 2-10 fields in the registration form (83\%).


Total Respondents - Percentage Reporting Number of Fields in Their Registration Forms

Total $=1,228$ Respondents

## Number of Fields in Registration Form by Revenue Size

Respondents from organizations with less than $\$ 1$ Million in revenues typically use fewer fields in the registration form (48\% having 2-5) when compared with other companies ( $46 \%-55 \%$ having 6-10 fields).

Number of Fields in Registration Forms - by Revenue Size


Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$

## Number of Fields in Registration Form and Open Rates

The average open rate appears to increase with number of fields on registration form, k but falls off when the number of fields exceeds 10.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D, 90\% level of confidence: a/b/c/d
*CAUTION: Small sample size


Average Open Rate and Number of Fields in Registration Forms

## Preference Center

$34 \%$ of respondents include a preference center link in their emails through which individuals can update their preferences.

Don't know/ Not
sure, 13\%


Total Respondents - Percentage Including Preference Center Link in Email

Total $=1,235$ Respondents

## Preference Center by Revenue Size

Respondents from the largest organizations are significantly more likely to have a preference center than others.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


## Percentage Including Preference Center Link in Email

 by Revenue Size
## Preference Center and Passalong Rate

Respondents who include a preference center link in their emails claim to achieve a significantly higher passalong rate than those who do not include this type of link.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: A/B, $90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b$
*Small sample size insufficient to support statistical testing


Passalong Rate by Percentage Including Preference Center Link in Email

## Choices Offered In Preference Center

$85 \%$ of respondents include the ability for individuals to change their email address in the preference center. The next most frequently offered choice is to update address information (59\%), followed by update content preferences (51\%). Just $16 \%$ say they offer respondents the ability to modify their frequency of email message receipt.


Total Respondents - Percentage Offering Preference Center Choices

## Campaign Management

$\square$




## Offers/Aspects Of Email Content

64\% of respondents include an unsubscription/opt-out link in their email messages. 28\% typically offer free download report/white paper, $24 \%$ include a percentage off discount, and $22 \%$ include brands that have high awareness. Just under 1 in 10 routinely offer free shipping.


Total Respondents - Offers/Aspects of Email Content

## Number of Clicks to Unsubscribe

Just over half (52\%) of respondents say users only need to complete one click to unsubscribe, while 44\% require two clicks.


Total Respondents - Number of Clicks to Unsubscribe

$$
\text { Total = } 861 \text { Respondents }
$$

## Timing of Email Messages - Day of the Week

Most often, respondents do not pick any individual week day to send out email campaigns with $44 \%$ saying they don't focus on any one day. The most popular individual day chosen is Tuesday (26\%).


## Total Respondents - Preferred Day of the Week for Email Campaigns

Total $=1,338$ Respondents

## Timing of Email Messages - Day of the Week By Revenue Size

The largest organizations in terms of revenue tend to vary their email campaigns by day of week more often than their smaller cohorts.

Respondents with revenues between $\$ 1$ - $\$ 9.9$ Million are most likely to prefer Tuesday for email blasts.

```
\square \text { Sunday}
\square \mp@code { M o n d a y }
\squareTuesday
\square \mp@code { W e d n e s d a y }
\square \text { Thursday}
\squareFriday
\squareSaturday
\square \text { We don't focus on any single day}
```

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Preferred Day of the Week for Email Campaigns - By Revenue Size

## Timing of Email Messages - Time of Day

While $27 \%$ of respondents don't consider the time of day for their email campaigns, 35\% prefer 7:00 AM -11:59 AM and 22\% typically send between 12 noon and 4:59 PM. 7\% of respondents say they vary the timing depending upon the time zone of their recipients.


Total Respondents - Preferred Time of Day for Email Campaigns

## Timing of Email Messages - Time of Day By Revenue Size

Overall, the proportion of respondents launching campaigns is highest between 7:00 AM - 11:59 AM. However, respondents at either end of the revenue spectrum are more likely to disregard the time of day than those in the middle. Instead, these respondents with revenues between $\$ 1$ Million and $\$ 99.9$ Million are more likely to blast their campaigns in the early-mid afternoon hours.

```
7:00AM-11:59AM
```

$\square 12$ Noon-4:59 PM
■ 5:00PM-9:59 PM

■ 10:00PM-6:59AM
$\square$ We vary depending on the time zone of our recipients
$\square$ We don't really consider the time of day when sending out email campaigns

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Preferred Time of Day for Email Campaigns by Revenue Size

## Frequency of Email Campaigns - Sales Alerts/Promotions

$57 \%$ send out promotions or sales alerts monthly or less frequently, and $23 \%$ send these messages 2-3 times per month.


Total Respondents - Frequency of Sales Alert/Promotional
Message Email Campaigns

$$
\text { Total = } 994 \text { Respondents }
$$

## Frequency of Email Campaigns - Sales Alerts/Promotions Revenue Size

The largest organizations are more likely than others to send out daily sales alerts or promotions, although just 6\% of these respondents indicate doing so.

```
\square Daily
```

$\square$ 2-6 times per weekOnce per week2-3 times per month
$\square$ Once per monthLess than once per month

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Frequency of Sales Alert/Promotional Message Email Campaigns

## Frequency of Email Campaigns - Newsletters

$71 \%$ send out newsletter campaigns once a month or less frequently.


Total Respondents - Frequency of Newsletter Email Campaigns

Total $=1,125$ Respondents

## Frequency of Email Campaigns - Newsletters By Revenue Size

Usually, respondents say they send out a monthly newsletter. Respondents with revenue in the \$10-\$99.9 Million range, though, are just as likely to email a newsletter on a less frequent basis as they are to send it once a month.

## $\square$ Daily

$\square$ 2-6 times per week
$\square$ Once per week
$\square$ 2-3 times per month
$\square$ Once per month
$\square$ Less than once per month

[^2]

Frequency of Newsletter Email Campaigns - by Revenue Size

## Use of Segmentation

$53 \%$ of respondents use some sort of list segmentation and segmented content creation. Buying history (39\%) and lead source (38\%) are the most frequently used criteria on which to segment, followed by seasonality (24\%), and lifecycle (21\%). Respondents are far less likely to perform clickstream-based segmenting (9\%).

Total Respondents - Percentage Using Segmentation and Criteria


Total $=1,338$ Respondents

## Use of Segmentation by Revenue Size

Respondents with revenues of less than $\$ 1$ Million are significantly less likely than others to use segmentation.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Percentage Using Segmentation - by Revenue Size

## Sending "Triggered" Email

$53 \%$ of respondents report sending email based on a "triggered" event. The most common trigger is a welcome message sent to new subscribers (64\%). $36 \%$ send an email for order confirmation and $30 \%$ send an email for a new account created. The triggers used least frequently are shopping cart abandonment, product recall, and time lapsed since last order, with $6 \%$ reporting email send based on each.

Total Respondents - Percentage Using Triggers and Trigger Types


Total $=1,338$ Respondents

## Sending "Triggered" Email by Revenue Size

The largest companies (\$100 Million or more in revenue) are significantly more likely than smaller organizations to use "triggering" for email.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Percentage Using Triggers by Revenue Size

## Sending "Triggered" Email by Industry

Respondents in
Publishing/Media, E-
Commerce/Retail, and
Computer/Internet industries are significantly more likely to send "triggered" email than those in other industries.


Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size

## Sending "Triggered" Email and Open Rates

Respondents who do not send "triggered" email report significantly higher open rates than those who do use this tactic.


Open Rate by Use of Triggers

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B, $90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b$

## Sending "Triggered" Email and Percent of Online Sales Attributed to Email

Respondents who use "triggered" email indicate a significantly higher proportion of online sales that can be attributed to email, when compared with those who don't use such a system.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: A/B, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b$


Percent of Online Sales Attributed to Email by Use of Triggers

## HTML/Text Usage for Triggered Welcome/New Account

56\% of respondents send triggered welcome/new account email in either HTML format or text, with the option of viewing in the other. $24 \%$ send these messages in text format only, and $13 \%$ limit format of these messages to HTML.


Total Respondents - Welcome/New Account Text/HTML Usage

## HTML/Text Usage for Triggered Welcome/New Account By Revenue Size

Regardless of revenue size, respondents are most likely to send out triggered welcome/new account messages in HTML or text with the option to view in the other, although the tendency to do so increases significantly with higher revenues. Further, organizations with under \$1 Million in revenues are significantly more likely than their large cohorts to send these messages in text only.


Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Welcome/New Account Text/HTML Usage by Revenue Size

## Options Included in Triggered Welcome/New Account Messages

$60 \%$ of respondents who use triggered welcome/new account messages include their contact mailing address in these messages. Smaller proportions ask the subscriber to add the respondent to their email address book (47\%) or include product images or links (38\%).
Respondents are far less likely to add an offer discount, reward or incentive in these messages (21\%).


Total Respondents - Percentage Including in Triggered Welcome/New Account Messages...
Total $=507$ Respondents

## Physical Retail Locations/Inclusion of Store Locator Link

$28 \%$ of respondents have physical retail locations, $48 \%$ of which contain a store locator link in their welcome messages.

## Percentage Have Physical Retail Locations

## Have Store Locator Link in Welcome Messages



$$
\text { Total = } 507 \text { Respondents }
$$

Time Elapsed Between First Subscriber/Customer Contact and Initial Email
Communication
$38 \%$ of respondents claim to send out their initial email communication within 24 hours of the initial contact by the subscriber or customer, and 15\% respond within the first 48 hours. $11 \%$ say the time elapses can exceed one week, and $26 \%$ do not have any specific timetable.

Total $=1,338$ Respondents


Total Respondents - Time Elapsed Between First Subscriber/Customer Contact and Initial Email Communication

## Forwarding/Printing Options

53\% include forwarding/printing options in their email messages, of which 89\% contain the option to forward to a friend, and $43 \%$ include a print-option link to a printer-friendly version.

## Total Respondents - Printing and Forwarding Options


Total = 1,338 Respondents

## Creative Content and Development

$\square$




## Creative Content and Strategic Development - In-House versus Outsourcing

Respondents are most likely to handle all creative and strategic development in-house (72\%) for their email campaigns.

Total $=1,340$ Respondents


Total Respondents - Percentage In-House versus Outsourcing

## Creative Content and Strategic Development: In-House versus Outsourcing By Revenue Size

The tendency to use a mix of outsourcing and in-house creative increases with revenue size, while smaller organizations are significantly more likely to handle this work entirely inhouse.
$\square$ We handle creative and strategic development entirely in-house
$\square$ We use a mix of in-house and outsourcing for creative and strategy development
$\square$ All of our creative and strategic development is outsourced

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Usage of In-House versus Outsourcing by Revenue Size

## Inclusion of Personalization Elements

$69 \%$ of respondents say they include personalization elements in their email campaigns. Most frequently they include the recipient name ( $81 \%$ ) and least frequently, customized advertising (16\%).

## Total Respondents - Inclusion of Personalization Elements



Total $=1,340$ Respondents

## Inclusion of Personalization Elements by Revenue Size

Respondents with highest revenue are significantly more likely to use personalization than other respondents.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Include Personalization Elements by Revenue Size

## Inclusion of Personalization Elements by Industry

Respondents in the
Computer/Internet industries are most likely to use some
personalized elements, followed by those in
Advertising/Marketing.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D / E / F / G / H / I, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size


Include Personalization Elements by Industry

## Inclusion of Text/Images

$47 \%$ of respondents typically use an equal division of text and images in their email messages, although a proportion nearly as large (45\%) uses mostly text.


Total Respondents - Inclusion of Text/Images

Total $=1,340$ Respondents

## Inclusion of Text/Images By Revenue Size

Respondents who work for organizations generating more than $\$ 1$ Million in annual revenues are significantly more likely than these smaller companies to use a mixture of text and images. In contrast, organizations in this lowest revenue category are significantly more likely to use mostly text.

```
\square \text { Mostly text}
\square \text { Mostly images}
\square \mp@code { A l ~ t e x t }
\(\square\) About an equal division between text and images
```

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Inclusion of Text/Images - By Revenue Size

## Inclusion of Organization Name in "From" Line

The vast majority of respondents (84\%) include the organization name in the "from" line.


Total Respondents - Include Name of Organization in "From" Line

## Number of Characters in Subject Line

Overall, respondents have an average of 39.3 characters in their email message subject lines, with 47\% having between 25-49. Just 5\% have 100 or more.


Total Respondents - Number of Characters in Subject Line

## Inclusion of Navigation Bars

$48 \%$ of respondents include navigation bars in their email messages. $44 \%$ of these respondents say the bars appear across the top, and $32 \%$ say they appear on the left.


Total $=1,340$ Respondents

## Inclusion of Navigation Bars by Revenue Size

The tendency to include navigation bars increases with revenue size.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$

Inclusion of Navigation Bars - By Revenue Size

## Position of Navigation Bars By Revenue Size

Respondents at the low and high end of the revenue spectrum tend to have navigation bars placed most often at the left side.

Variation in navigation bars appears to increase with revenue size, but drops off among the highest revenue group (\$100 Million or more).

[^3]

## Position of Navigation Bars - by Revenue Size

## Location of First Call to Action

$63 \%$ of respondents say the first call to action appears above the fold.


Total Respondents - Location of First Call to Action

## Format of Email Messages

The format used most frequently is newsletter format (40\%), but $32 \%$ vary the format of their messages. Just $8 \%$ typically use a postcard format.


Total Respondents - Format of Email Messages

## Format of Email Message By Revenue Size

Organizations with revenue greater than $\$ 1$ Million are significantly more likely to vary the format they use in email messages, while these small organizations tend to rely exclusively on newsletter format.

$\square$ Letter format
$\square$ Post card format
$\square$ We vary the format
$\square$ Don't know/ Not sure

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Format of Email Message - By Revenue Size

## Format of Email Message and Open Rate

Respondents who use a newsletter format report the highest open rate, a statistically significant difference when compared with either those who postcard format or those who vary their format.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$
*Small sample size does not support statistical testing


Open Rate by Format of Email Message

## Usage of Organization Logo

Respondents overwhelmingly say that their organization's logo appears in their email messages (89\%).


Total Respondents - Usage of Organization Logo

Total $=1,340$ Respondents

## Usage of Organization Logo By Revenue Size

The largest organizations (\$100 Million or more in revenues) are significantly more likely than others to feature their logos in email campaigns.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Usage of Organization Logo - By Revenue Size

## Placement of Logo Relative to Fold

Of those respondents who include a logo, $87 \%$ say it appears above the fold.

Total $=\mathbf{1 , 1 8 6}$ Respondents


## Placement of Logo Relative to Top of Page

Of those who place the logo above the fold, $53 \%$ say it appears at the top left, while 23\% each say it appears at the top right or the center.


Total Respondents - Placement of Logo Relative to Top of Page

## Placement of Logo Relative to Top of Page By Revenue Size

While organizations tend to position their logo at the top left regardless of revenue size, those with revenues of over $\$ 10$ Million do so more often, while smaller companies are more likely to use the top center area.

```
\square ~ T o p ~ l e f t
\square \mp@code { T o p ~ c e n t e r }
\square \text { Top right}
\square ~ D o n ' t ~ k n o w / ~ N o t ~ s u r e
```

[^4]

Placement of Logo Relative to Top of Page - By Revenue Size

## Email Message Layout

Most often, respondents indicate that their email messages are laid out in a single-column (40\%), followed by 2 columns, varied in size (26\%) and varied cell blocks (25\%). It is far less common to use two columns, equal in size (9\%).


Total Respondents - Email Message Layout
Total = 1,340 Respondents

## Email Message Layout by Revenue Size

Single-column layout is predominant regardless of revenue size, although organizations with less than $\$ 1$ Million in revenues are most likely to use this format.

```
\square \text { - Single column}
\square2 columns varied in size
\squareTwo columns equal size
\squareVaried cell blocks
```

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Email Message Layout - by Revenue Size

## Elements That Appear in the Preview Pane

Respondents include a variety of elements in the preview pane, most often their logo (55\%). More than one-quarter also display personalization (31\%), the option to click to view in either full/HTML version (27\%), and a top line area that advertises an offer (26\%). It is much less common to show a subscription box (4\%) or toll-free number of contact information (12\%) in the preview pane area.


Total Respondents - Elements That Appear in the Preview Pane

## Design to Handle Image Blocking

$43 \%$ say they design the contents
of their email to handle image
blocking. $28 \%$ do not and an
equally-sized proportion say they
don't know.

Total $=1,340$ Respondents


Total Respondents - Design to Handle Image Blocking

## Design to Handle Image Blocking and Bounce Rates

Respondents who have not designed their emails to handle image blocking appear to experience a higher bounce rate than those who do.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c$


## Bounce Rate by Use of Design for Handling of Image Blocking

## Design to Handle Image Blocking and Unsubscription Rates

Respondents who have yet to incorporate handling of image blocking also seem to have higher unsubscription rates than those who utilize this strategy.

[^5]

Unsubscription Rates by Design for Handling of Image Blocking

## Number of Links Included

40\% of respondents include 3-5 links in their email messages, and an additional $22 \%$ include 2.

Total $=1,340$ Respondents


Total Respondents - Number of Links Included

## Conduct Testing and Specific Elements Tested

Approximately half of respondents say they conduct some type of testing of at least one element for its impact on results, most often the subject line ( $71 \%$ ), followed by call to action placement ( $45 \%$ ) and the offer ( $43 \%$ ). Respondents who test are less likely to measure the impact of whether or not to include an image (19\%), landing page image (20\%), landing page formatting (21\%) or type of image (22\%).


Total $=1,340$ Respondents

## Conduct Testing by Revenue Size

The tendency to test elements for their impact on results increases with revenue size.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Conduct Testing - by Revenue Size

## Conduct Testing by Industry

Respondents in Publishing/Media, E-Commerce/Retail,
Advertising/Marketing, and Computer/Internet are significantly more likely than those in NonProfit/Associations, Manufacturing and Professional
Services/Consulting to test message elements for their impact on results.

Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size


Conduct Testing - By Industry

Respondents who test are split between the type used. 29\% use single A/B test, while 19\% use multiple versions. $27 \%$ vary the type of testing used.

## Type of Testing Used



Total Respondents - Type of Testing Used

## Use of MIME (Multi-purpose Internet Mail Extensions)

Just over half (51\%) send out their messages in MIME, in which both text and HTML versions are sent out in the same deployment. 20\% do not use MIME and $28 \%$ are unsure.


Total Respondents - Usage of MIME

Total $=1,340$ Respondents

## Results Measurement






## Measurement of Metrics

$86 \%$ of respondents measure at least one metric listed.

Total = 1,244 Respondents

Do not measure any
of the named metrics, 14\%
 one named metric, 86\%

## Total Respondents - Percentage Measuring At Least One Metric

## Measurement of Metrics - By Revenue Size

Respondents with revenues of under \$1 Million tend to be less likely than others to measure at least one metric.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$


Measuring At Least One Metric - by Revenue Size

## Measurement of Metrics By Industry

Respondents in Publishing/Media and E-Commerce/Retail are the most likely to measure at least one metric, and do so at significantly higher rates than those in Manufacturing and Professional Services/Consulting.

Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D / E / F / G / H / I, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d / e / f / g / h / i$
*CAUTION: Small sample size


Measuring At Least One Metric - by Industry

## Specific Metrics Measured

Most often, respondents measure the average open rate, with $67 \%$ of respondents doing so, followed by the average clickthrough rate ( $63 \%$ ) and the average bounce rate (62\%). Half or more also measure the average unsubscribe rate (56\%), the average unique clickthrough rate (55\%), and delivery rates (50\%).

Respondents are least likely to measure average order size (14\%), revenue per email delivered (18\%) or time elapsed between delivery and open (18\%).

Total $=1,071$ Respondents


Total Respondents - Percentage Measuring Each Metric

## Specific Metrics Measured by Revenue Size

The metrics most frequently tracked, regardless of revenue size are average open rate, average bounce rate, and average clickthrough rate.

Overall, the tendency to measure each metric increases with revenue size, particularly for some of the less frequently measured statistics.

[^6]|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { A. } \\ <\$ 1 \mathrm{M} \\ (\mathrm{~N}=333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B. } \\ 1 \mathrm{M}-\$ 9.9 \mathrm{M} \\ (\mathrm{~N}=282) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10 M-\$ 99.9 M \\ (N=185) \end{gathered}$ | D. \$100 M or more ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| average open rate | 60\% | 67\% | 72\% | 74\% |
| average bounce rate | 59\% | 62\% | 68\% | 59\% |
| average clickthrough rate | 55\% | 65\% | 66\% | 69\% |
| average unsubscribe rate | 51\% | 62\% | 60\% | 53\% |
| average unique clickthrough rate | 47\% | 49\% | 57\% | 57\% |
| delivery rates | 43\% | 48\% | 56\% | 55\% |
| average optout rate per campaign | 36\% | 45\% | 48\% | 40\% |
| conversion rate | 29\% | 40\% | 39\% | 41\% |
| \% of online salesattributable to email marketing | 26\% | 29\% | 25\% | 34\% |
| spam rate | 25\% | 30\% | 28\% | 25\% |
| orders per month | 24\% | 26\% | 22\% | 18\% |
| average passalong rate | 22\% | 23\% | 25\% | 17\% |
| amount spent | 20\% | 23\% | 31\% | $34 \%$ |
| time elapsed between delivery and open | 20\% | 17\% | 17\% | 23\% |
| change in revenue from email marketing programs | 19\% | 30\% | 29\% | 22\% |
| revenue per email delivered | 15\% | 20\% | 23\% | 25\% |
| average order size | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 22\% |

## Specific Metrics Measured by Industry

Average open rate, average bounce rate, and average clickthrough rate also appear to be the key measures tracked regardless of industry.

|  | A. Tech- nology $(\mathrm{N}=118)$ | B. <br> Publishing/ Media ( $\mathrm{N}=92$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { C. } \\ \text { E-commerce/ } \\ \text { Retail } \\ (N=70) \end{gathered}$ | D. Non-Profit/ Association ( $\mathrm{N}=60$ ) | E. Advertising/ Marketing ( $\mathrm{N}=120$ ) | F. Manufacturing ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { G. } \\ \text { Prof. Serv./ } \\ \text { Consulting } \\ (N=90) \end{gathered}$ | H. Sm. Business General $(N=35)^{*}$ | 1. Computer/ I nternet ( $\mathrm{N}=49$ ) * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| average open rate | 75\% | 71\% | 76\% | 63\% | 65\% | 75\% | 73\% | 46\% | 69\% |
| average clickthrough rate | 66\% | 73\% | 70\% | 65\% | 62\% | 72\% | 62\% | 49\% | 61\% |
| average bounce rate | 65\% | 64\% | 54\% | 70\% | 63\% | 67\% | 66\% | 57\% | 76\% |
| average unsubscribe rate | 58\% | 61\% | 49\% | 57\% | 59\% | 52\% | 62\% | 54\% | 73\% |
| average unique clickthrough rate | 57\% | 53\% | 59\% | 48\% | 58\% | 57\% | 58\% | 34\% | 59\% |
| delivery rates | 53\% | 61\% | 61\% | 45\% | 53\% | 54\% | 49\% | 37\% | 55\% |
| average optout rate per campaign | 44\% | 47\% | 41\% | 42\% | 43\% | 48\% | 43\% | 37\% | 45\% |
| conversion rate | 43\% | 37\% | 54\% | 20\% | $34 \%$ | 30\% | 26\% | 31\% | 49\% |
| \% of online sales attributable to email marketing | 25\% | 29\% | 53\% | 12\% | 25\% | 12\% | 21\% | 26\% | 37\% |
| spam rate | 24\% | 28\% | 33\% | 22\% | 29\% | 36\% | 21\% | 23\% | 39\% |
| change in revenue from email marketing programs | 22\% | 27\% | 49\% | 15\% | 23\% | 17\% | 14\% | 23\% | 27\% |
| amount spent | 22\% | 22\% | 56\% | 10\% | 22\% | 20\% | 13\% | 23\% | 22\% |
| average passalong rate | 20\% | 17\% | 23\% | 20\% | 29\% | 23\% | 24\% | 23\% | 20\% |
| orders per month | 18\% | 26\% | 49\% | 13\% | 14\% | 17\% | 10\% | 37\% | 35\% |
| revenue per email delivered | 14\% | 22\% | 43\% | 10\% | 15\% | 13\% | 8\% | 14\% | 31\% |
| average order size | 14\% | 18\% | 40\% | 5\% | 13\% | 7\% | 7\% | 17\% | 27\% |
| time elapsed between delivery and open | 14\% | 20\% | 7\% | 10\% | 24\% | 23\% | 24\% | 17\% | 29\% |

Statistical testing not available

## Email Metrics

Because self reports of email results tend to be biased, we consulted with several email vendors and are instead presenting objective results from the email campaigns they manage.

Here we present general results from two email vendors who have accounts with a broad range of customers across a variety of industries.

Editor's Note: All outcome metrics (e.g., open rates, clickthrough rates, etc.) should be taken cautiously. The reasons for differences in metrics between email companies are numerous and most likely due to differences in the tactics used by their clients as well as the size of clients.

|  | MyEmma | Constant <br> Contact |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| unique open rate | $20.31 \%$ | $16.39 \%$ |
| unique clickthrough rate | $3.45 \%$ | $2.30 \%$ |
| spam rate | $.08 \%$ |  |
| unsubscribe rate | $.28 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |

We thank MyEmma (www.myemma.com) and Constant Contact (www.constantcontact.com) for providing us with this data.

Here we present industry specific results. These data are provided by Bronto (www.bronto.com)

Editor's Note: As can be seen, email metrics vary across industries. But even within an industry (or a specific company), these metrics will vary widely depending on all the other factors in this report. For example, companies who do more testing will likely have much higher open rates than those who do not.

## Email Metrics

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delivered | Opened | Clickthrough |
| Travel/ Hospitality | $99.0 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ |
| Publishing/ Media | $98.1 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| Entertainment | $98.1 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Education | $97.7 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
| Non-Profit/ Association | $97.7 \%$ | $34.2 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| Healthcare/ Insurance | $97.5 \%$ | $39.3 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| Advertising/ Marketing | $97.3 \%$ | $20.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Financial Services | $97.1 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| E-Commerce/ Retail | $96.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| Government | $96.3 \%$ | $37.5 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ |
| Services/ Consulting | $96.1 \%$ | $21.1 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |
| Manufacturing/ Distribution | $96.1 \%$ | $46.3 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| Unknown | $96.0 \%$ | $49.9 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
| Legal Services | $95.5 \%$ | $61.8 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| Real Estate | $95.2 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Priorities for Future Campaign Measurement

In terms of future campaign measurement, respondents are most likely to say that the average open rate is both among their top 5 priorities (58\%) and is also their top priority (21\%). In terms of top five future priorities, average clickthrough rate (49\%), conversion rate (42\%), average unique clickthrough rate (39\%) and change in revenue from email marketing programs (36\%) are named more frequently than other metrics.

Respondents are least likely to prioritize time elapsed between delivery and open (9\%), average order size (14\%) and spam rate (14\%) for future measurement preferences.

```
\square \mp@code { O n e ~ o f ~ t o p ~ 5 ~ p r i o r i t i e s }
\square ~ T o p ~ p r i o r i t y
```

Total $=1,224$ Respondents


Total Respondents - Priorities for Future Campaign Measurement

## Demographics

$\square$



## 2007 Fiscal Year Revenues

$31 \%$ of respondents say their fiscal year revenues were under \$1 Million, and an additional $17 \%$ say they ranged between \$1-\$4.9 Million. 7\% had revenues ranging between $\$ 5$ Million and $\$ 10$ Million, and 23\% claim a higher revenue level.


Total Respondents - 2007 Fiscal Year Revenues

## Target Audience

$49 \%$ of respondents indicate that their target audience is best defined primarily as Business to Business, while 33\% are Business to Consumer. The remaining $17 \%$ are a combination of the two targets.

Roughly split
between Business to
Business and
Business to
Consumer, 17\% Primarily Business to

Primarily Business to
Business, 49\%

Total Respondents - Target Audience

## Industry

The industries most frequently represented by respondents are Advertising/Marketing (11\%) and Technology (11\%), followed by Professional Services/Consulting (9\%).


## List Size

Respondents most often claim to have a list size of between 1,000 - 4,999 recipients (23\%). 30\% have a smaller list size and 40\% claim to have a list that is larger.


Total Respondents - List Size

## Channels Used

Respondents use direct mail more than any of the other channels listed (69\%), followed by Public Relations (56\%) and Tradeshows (54\%). They are least likely to use Outdoor Media (15\%), Yellow Pages (18\%) and Broadcast Advertising (18\%).


Total Respondents - Channels Used

## Overall Marketing Budget






## Change in Overall Marketing Budget

Just over half of all respondents (54\%) say their overall marketing budgets have increased by 5\% or more over the last two years. $35 \%$ have observed flat budgets during the same period, and $11 \%$ have seen a decrease of $5 \%$ or more.


Total Respondents - Marketing Budget Change
Over The Past Two Years

## Percent of Budget Spent on Traditional versus Online

On average, respondents claim to split their budgets between traditional marketing and online marketing at a roughly 60-40 ratio.


Total Respondents - Marketing Budget Percentage Spent on
Traditional versus Online Methods

Total = 1,147 Respondents

## Budget Change Percent of Budget Spent on Traditional versus Online



## Methodology and Further Help

$\square$


## Methodology

To understand how marketers are using email as part of their overall marketing effort, MarketingProfs conducted a survey of marketers who are members of MarketingProfs and used email as part of their marketing strategy. The survey instrument was sent to a random sample of MarketingProfs members, over a period of 2 months (April-June 2008). Since the membership of MarketingProfs is diverse in size, industry and other demographics, the results are sufficiently generalizable and no systematic biases are evident.

## Need More Stats?

While we tried to provide you with a wide range of statistics that could help you in planning for your 2009 email marketing budget, we know the data we obtained can be sliced and diced in many different ways. You may find you need a table that slices the data differently than we presented. If that is case, please send us email at reports@marketingprofs.com with your specific request and we will do our best to send you the table that will help you most.

You can also use that address to provide any other feedback that would help us as we plan for gathering data for our next email marketing benchmark report.

Finally, if we provide any enhancements to this report, we will contact you to let you know where you can download the most updated report for 2008.


[^0]:    Total $=1,042$ Respondents

[^1]:    Average Online Budget Percentage Spent On Email Marketing by Industry

[^2]:    Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$

[^3]:    Data statistically tested at the $95 \%$ level of confidence: A/B/C/D, 90\% level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$

[^4]:    Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C / D, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c / d$

[^5]:    Data statistically tested at the 95\% level of confidence: $A / B / C, 90 \%$ level of confidence: $a / b / c$

[^6]:    Statistical testing not available

