

# CONTENTS

<b>AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>SECTION I EDITORS' INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 SURVEYS IN MODERN LITIGATION INVOLVING TRADEMARKS AND DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING</b>	<b>3</b>
THE CHAPTERS	6
DEDICATION	7
<b>SECTION II PRELIMINARY MATTERS</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 THE USE OF PILOT TESTS AND PRETESTS IN CONSUMER SURVEYS</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>By Ivan Ross</i>	
INTRODUCTION	11
The Expert and the Attorney: Different Perspectives on the Value of Pilot Tests	14
An Example of the Value of Pilot Work	16
TYPICAL RESEARCH PARAMETERS STUDIED IN PILOT TESTS	17
The Questionnaire	18
Universe Specification, Sampling Issues, and Incentives	20
Mechanical, Administrative, and Logistical Considerations	21
HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT PILOT WORK WILL BE HELPFUL?	22
Piloting Usually Provides at Least Some Helpful Information	22
Circumstances in Which Pilot Work Is More Likely to Be Helpful	23
Circumstances When a Pilot Test Is Less Likely to Be Helpful	23
PILOT TEST IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS	24
Pilot Survey Sample Size	24
How Many Parameters Can Be Evaluated at the Same Time?	24
Pilot Study Timing	25
How Many Pilot Tests?	25
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS	25
<b>3 THE UNIVERSE</b>	<b>27</b>
<i>By William G. Barber</i>	
DETERMINING THE PROPER UNIVERSE	28
Forward Confusion	28
Reverse Confusion	31
Post-Sale Confusion	31

Distinctiveness/Strength of Senior User’s Mark	32
Dilution Issues	33
False Advertising	36
Special Rules	36
ERRORS IN DEFINING THE UNIVERSE	39
Overinclusiveness	39
Underinclusiveness	42
Overinclusive and Underinclusive	44
Judicial Nit-picking	44
SAMPLING AND SCREENING THE UNIVERSE	47
Sampling	47
Screening	48
CONCLUSION	49
<b>SECTION III   LEGAL QUESTIONS</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>4   LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION</b>	<b>53</b>
<i>By Jerre B. Swann</i>	
<hr/>	
EVEREADY	56
The Questionnaire and Variants	56
Categorization and Pattern Matching in an EVEREADY Format	60
The Confusion Factors Tested by EVEREADY	61
The Need for a Control Cell	62
The Scope of EVEREADY	62
SQUIRT	64
The Questionnaire and Variants	64
Categorization and the Representativeness Heuristic	66
The Confusion Factors Tested by Squirt	67
The Need for Control Cells	68
The Scope of Squirt	69
GOING BOTH WAYS	72
OTHER FORMATS	72
REJECTED APPROACHES	74
PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR REDUCED WEIGHT/PRECLUSION OF CONFUSION STUDIES	75
Lack of Relevance, Reliability, or Objectivity	75
Distortion of the Stimulus or Its Context	76
CONCLUSION	77
<b>5   SECONDARY MEANING SURVEYS</b>	<b>79</b>
<i>By Vincent N. Palladino</i>	
<hr/>	
INTRODUCTION	79
THE MEANING OF SECONDARY MEANING	81
ASSESSING ASSOCIATION DIRECTLY	83
Isolating the Trademark or Trade Dress	83
Questions	85
Level of Association	90

OTHER ATTEMPTS TO ASSESS SECONDARY MEANING DIRECTLY	91
“Who” Questions	91
“What-Word” Questions	92
“What-Name” Questions	93
Brand Awareness Questions	94
Applicability to Trade Dress	95
Reported Secondary Meaning Percentages	96
INFERRING SECONDARY MEANING FROM OTHER FINDINGS	97
Genericness	97
Likelihood of Confusion	98
A COMMENT ON COMMON SENSE	99

## **6 GENERICNESS SURVEYS IN TRADEMARK DISPUTES:**

### **UNDER THE GAVEL**

101

*By E. Deborah Jay*

---

INTRODUCTION	101
THE SURVEYS IN AMERICAN THERMOS	105
THE SURVEYS IN E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS	107
THERMOS SURVEYS AFTER AMERICAN THERMOS	109
TEFLON SURVEYS AFTER E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS	112
The Brand-Name/Common-Name Dichotomy	114
Screening Respondents	115
Question Wording	117
Frame of Reference	119
Controls	120
Rotation of Items and Response Categories	121
Survey Analysis	122
ALTERNATIVES TO THE THERMOS AND TEFLON FORMATS	124
Consumer-Recognition Surveys	125
Source-Identification and Brand-Association Surveys	126
Permission or Approval Surveys	129
Statement-of-Meaning Surveys	129
Consumer Motivation Surveys	130
OTHER SURVEY DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	131
The Role of Experts and Attorneys in Surveys	131
Universe Selection and Sample Size	131
Data Collection Methods and Visual Stimuli	136
Survey Reporting	139
COUNTERING A GENERICNESS SURVEY	139
CONCLUSION	143

## **7A DILUTION SURVEYS UNDER THE TRADEMARK DILUTION REVISION ACT 145**

*By Jerre B. Swann*

---

INTRODUCTION	145
RECOGNITION/AWARENESS	147
ASSOCIATION	149

IMPAIRED DISTINCTIVENESS AS A FUNCTION OF SIMILARITY, ELEVATED FAME, SUBSTANTIALLY EXCLUSIVE USE, ASSOCIATION, AND JUNIOR USER INTENT	151
CONCLUSION	154
<b>7B SURVEYS IN DILUTION CASES II</b>	<b>155</b>
<i>Shari Seidman Diamond</i>	
FAME SURVEYS	155
ASSOCIATION SURVEYS	157
AFTER FAME AND ASSOCIATION	159
CONCLUSION	161
<b>7C SWANN'S REBUTTAL TO DIAMOND</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>8 SURVEY EVIDENCE IN FALSE ADVERTISING CASES</b>	<b>167</b>
<i>By Bruce P. Keller</i>	
WHEN SURVEYS ARE USED IN FALSE ADVERTISING	167
Advertisements That Are Literally False	168
Advertisements That Are False by Necessary Implication	172
Advertisements That Are Misleading	173
CONSTRUCTION OF SURVEYS	177
Survey Standards	178
WEIGHT AND ADMISSIBILITY OF SURVEY EVIDENCE	194
CONCLUSION	197
<b>SECTION IV CONTROLS</b>	<b>199</b>
<b>9 CONTROL FOUNDATIONS: RATIONALES AND APPROACHES</b>	<b>201</b>
<i>By Shari Seidman Diamond</i>	
INTRODUCTION	201
THREATS TO INTERNAL VALIDITY AND SOURCES OF MEASUREMENT ERROR	203
Preexisting Beliefs	204
Yea-Saying	204
Guessing That Produces Random Error	205
Guessing That Produces Systematic Error	205
A CLOSER LOOK AT SURVEY DESIGN WITHOUT AND WITH CONTROLS	206
Without Controls	206
With Controls	209
CHOOSING APPROPRIATE CONTROLS	210
Selecting a Control That Shares Features with the Test Stimulus That Are Not at Issue	212
Avoiding Cues in the Control That Artificially Depress "Confusion" Responses	213

Selecting a Control That Is a Plausible Member of the Product Category	214
Avoiding a Control That Is Itself Infringing	214
THE ROLE OF MULTIPLE CONTROLS	215
CONCLUSION	216

## **10 DESIGN ISSUES FOR CONTROLS 217**

*By Mike Rappeport*

INTRODUCTION	217
THE MYTH OF REPLICATION	218
THE PROBLEM—THE INHERENT “LEADINGNESS” OF SURVEYS	219
NOISE AND OTHER SURVEY ARTIFACTS	220
PRECONCEPTIONS	221
SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER TO THIS POINT	222
GOOD DESIGN—THE CONCEPT OF CONTROLS	223
THE ENGINEERING NATURE OF SURVEY RESEARCH	224
CHOOSING A CONTROL—GENERAL PRINCIPLES	225
THE BASIC KINDS OF SURVEY CONTROL STRUCTURES	226
THE CONTROL CELL DESIGN	227
The Basic Design	227
Uses of a Control Cell Design—False Advertising	228
Other Uses of a Control Cell Design	228
Analysis of Control Cell Designs with Multiple Controls	232
THE SINGLE TEST STIMULUS ONE-ROOM ARRAY DESIGN	233
The Basic Design	233
Controls in Single Test Stimulus One-Room Array Designs	234
Use of Single Test Stimulus One-Room Array Designs	234
Additional Control Stimuli in Single Test Stimulus One-Room Array Designs	236
COMPARISON ARRAY DESIGNS	236
The Two Basic Designs	236
Deciding Between a One-Room and a Two-Room Comparison Array	237
Selecting the Controls	238
Analysis in a One-Room Array	238
Analysis in a Two-Room Array	239
CONCLUDING REMARKS	239

## **SECTION V OTHER METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES 241**

### **11 DEMAND EFFECTS IN LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION SURVEYS:**

#### **THE IMPORTANCE OF MARKETPLACE CONDITIONS 243**

*By Itamar Simonson and Ran Kivetz*

ACADEMIC RESEARCH REGARDING DEMAND EFFECTS IN SOCIAL- PSYCHOLOGICAL AND BUYER-BEHAVIOR EXPERIMENTS	244
LEADING SURVEY QUESTIONS AND DEMAND EFFECTS	246
DEMAND EFFECT BIASES IN LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION SURVEYS	248
Monadic versus Sequential Presentation	249
SIMON PROPERTY GROUP V. MYSIMON	252

KARGO GLOBAL V. ADVANCE MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS SEQUENTIAL PRESENTATION SURVEY	255
LEELANAU WINE CELLARS V. BLACK & RED, INC.	257
CONCLUSION	259
<b>12 ARE CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS LEADING QUESTIONS?</b>	<b>261</b>
<i>By Jacob Jacoby</i>	
INTRODUCTION	261
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	262
CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS	262
JUDICIAL VIEWS OF CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS	263
Reliability	263
Objectivity	264
Leadingness	265
THE VIEWS OF AUTHORITIES, LEGAL AND OTHERWISE	266
Authorities Generally Recognized in Law	266
The Case Law	267
Other Authorities	268
The Psychology Underlying Open-Ended and Closed-Ended Questions	269
WHAT MAKES A CLOSED-ENDED QUESTION A LEADING QUESTION?	272
FACTORS THAT CONVERT CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS INTO LEADING QUESTIONS	273
Failure to Provide Explicit Instructions Not to Guess	273
Failure to Provide a “Don’t Know” (or Equivalent) Response Option	274
Asking Simple Yes/No Questions	274
Failure to Be Fair and Balanced	274
REVISITING THE EARLIER CITED COURT CRITICISMS OF CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS	281
Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Nintendo Co.	281
Beneficial Corp. v. Beneficial Capital Corp.	282
Scott Fetzer Co. v. House of Vacuums Inc.	282
Marshall Field & Co. v. Mrs. Fields Cookies	283
Gillette v. Norelco	283
CONCLUSION	283
<b>EDITORS’ NOTE ON CHAPTER 12</b>	<b>285</b>
<b>13 INTERNET SURVEYS FOR EVALUATING TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING</b>	<b>287</b>
<i>By Roger Tourangeau and Shari Seidman Diamond</i>	
INTRODUCTION	287
SURVEY RESEARCH FOR EVALUATING TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING	288
POTENTIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE INTERNET FOR TRADEMARK AND DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING SURVEYS	289

NONOBSERVATION AND MEASUREMENT ERRORS IN INTERNET SURVEYS	290
Nonobservation Errors	292
Observation Error	300
CONCLUSION	305
<b>EDITORS' NOTE ON CHAPTER 13</b>	<b>307</b>
<b>SECTION VI   RESPONSES TO SURVEY EVIDENCE</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>14   SURVEY PERCENTAGES IN LANHAM ACT MATTERS</b>	<b>311</b>
<i>By Gerald L. Ford</i>	
<hr/>	
INTRODUCTION	311
LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION SURVEYS	313
SECONDARY MEANING SURVEYS	315
GENERICNESS SURVEYS	317
FALSE ADVERTISING SURVEYS	319
FAME SURVEYS	322
LIKELIHOOD OF DILUTION SURVEYS	324
Dilution Surveys—January 16, 1996, through March 4, 2003	324
Dilution Surveys—March 5, 2003, through October 6, 2006	324
Dilution Surveys—October 7, 2006, through December 31, 2010	325
CONCLUSION	326
<b>EDITORS' NOTE ON CHAPTER 14</b>	<b>327</b>
<b>15   THE DAUBERT REVOLUTION AND LANHAM ACT SURVEYS</b>	<b>329</b>
<i>By G. Kip Edwards</i>	
<hr/>	
INTRODUCTION	329
THE SUPREME COURT AND EXPERT EVIDENCE	331
The Daubert Decision	331
The Kumho Decision	333
The Amendments to Rule 702	335
Procedural Aspects of Daubert	335
DAUBERT CHALLENGES TO LANHAM ACT SURVEY EVIDENCE	338
Survey Universe	340
Sample Size and Related Issues	343
Definitions	345
Presenting the Stimulus and Replicating Market Conditions	346
Problems with the Survey Questions	348
The Need for Controls	355
EXPERTS TESTIMONY UNSUPPORTED BY SURVEY EVIDENCE	357
CONCLUSION	361

**16 SURVEY CRITIQUES****363***By Jerre B. Swann*

INTRODUCTION	363
HOW A CRITIQUE SHOULD NOT BE DONE	363
IPSE DIXIT CRITIQUES PURELY AS TO TECHNICAL MATTERS SHOULD BEAR LITTLE (IF AT ALL) ON THE WEIGHT GIVEN A SURVEY	367
CRITIQUES AS TO SUBSTANTIVE FLAWS SHOULD TURN ON THE IMPACT OF THE FLAW ON RELEVANCE OR RELIABILITY, NOT ON THE LABEL ATTACHED TO THE FLAW	371
The Truly Irrelevant	371
The Substantially Irrelevant	372
The Partially Relevant	372
The Substantially Relevant	372
TRUE CANDIDATES FOR FATAL FLAW TREATMENT, WITHOUT EXTENSIVE ANALYSIS OR SUPPORTING DATA	373
A Survey Without a Control Cell or with a Fundamentally Inadequate Control Stimulus	373
A Complete Divergence “from the Conditions That Potential Purchasers Encounter in the Parties’ Marketplace” Is Irrelevant	374
CONCLUSION	375

**INDEX****377**

<http://www.pbookshop.com>