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STATEMENT BY THE ADVERTISING RESEARCH FOUNDATION ON 
CONSULTATION WITH LIFE MAGAZINE

Life Magazine consulted with the Advertising Research Foundation on this study entitled: "An Experimental Study Comparing Magazine Audiences As Determined By Two Questioning Procedures."

The ARF consultation facility is designed to aid in developing more useful information for the benefit of the entire industry. To accomplish this, the Technical Committee interprets ARF Criteria, and renders advice which emphasizes the viewpoints and needs of advertisers and agencies.

The research plan was submitted to the Consultation Section of the Technical Committee before the survey was put into the field. The Committee reviewed the objectives, sample design, questionnaire, and data collection procedure, and made suggestions for improvement. After the data were collected the Committee consulted on the preparation of the report. While consultation includes a review of the research plan and the report, it provides neither supervision nor certification of the execution of the study. At the request of the research firm, ARF's FACT verification service (Field Audit and Completion Test) recontacted approximately one third of each interviewee assignment as reported in the Technical Appendix.

The report, compares two questioning procedures used in measuring magazine audiences. The Committee considers this study a constructive contribution to basic audience research.

In the opinion of the Technical Committee, the sample design, questionnaire, data collection procedure, and method of reporting the study findings in this document conform to the objectives of the study and to the standards set forth in ARF's Criteria for Marketing and Advertising Research.

Technical Committee, Consultation Section
Advertising Research Foundation, Inc.
INTRODUCTION

by ALFRED POLITZ MEDIA STUDIES

Background

Through the years in an effort to provide media planners and buyers with the most reliable information, Life Magazine has conducted a number of methodological studies to demonstrate and enhance the validity of the basic measurements employed in media research. As an example, in 1949, Life Magazine engaged our firm to design and conduct a series of studies to test the effect of innovations in the audience questioning technique. Out of that experimental research evolved a measuring device which had been considered standard procedure for determining magazine audiences. This method is now termed the "editorial interest" or the "through the book" technique. The audience questioning procedures employed leading up to the evolvement of the "editorial interest" technique are briefly discussed in the following paragraphs.

In 1938, Life Magazine sponsored the first national magazine audience study. That study was conducted by Crossley, Inc.
In that survey, for the first time, a "reader" was defined as a person exposed to editorial material in the issue under study. Life Magazine and the Crossley organization engaged the aid of other leading researchers, the Research Committee who later formed the nucleus of the Magazine Audience Group, in developing techniques to reduce the effect of confusion or mistaken responses to the readership questioning.

In early studies, the audience questioning procedure was simply to ask people to look through the issue and point out pages they remembered. A person was counted as a reader if he remembered seeing any editorial page. Dr. Darrell B. Lucas' "controlled recognition" method was used to discount mistaken readership claims. To do this, separate interviews were conducted with pre-published issues to estimate the amount of over-claimed readership, which was then applied in the Lucas formula to reduce the post-published issue audience finding to an adjusted level.

In ensuing studies, the procedure for adjusting mistaken readership claims was modified. This modification involved counting a person as a reader of the issue only if he remembered
seeing a specified number of pages in the issue. It was reasoned that people who remembered seeing fewer than the specified number of pages were over-claiming and therefore should be omitted from the audience. The number of pages required to be remembered was varied for different magazines. This was done in an effort to equalize the number of people omitted from the audience by the number of pages remembered technique and the pre-published issue method. Periodic check studies conducted with pre-published issues were done to up-date the specified number of pages an individual must remember before being counted as a reader. The specified number of pages procedure was then modified to the editorial item concept. The editorial item concept counted complete articles or stories a unit, rather than as individual pages.

In 1946, a new readership questioning approach was developed with the aim of correcting readership over-claiming at the interview source, as opposed to correction for it in the tabulating stage. The respondent was asked to go through the issue to see what editorial items looked interesting. On each editorial item in the issue he was asked whether it looked interesting, and whether this was the first time he had seen it.
At the end of the issue, the respondent was also asked a check-question on whether he had read the issue before, for substantiation of any prior claims based on individual items. To count in the issue's audience a respondent had to report at least one editorial item as seen before and also had to report having seen the issue before. Experimentation with pre-published issues showed considerably less over-claiming than had been the case with preceding methods, and it was decided to discontinue the correction factor interviews.

As mentioned above, in 1949, Life Magazine together with the Alfred Politz organization embarked on a vigorous program to further improve the accuracy of audience measurement. Politz reasoned that although the use of interest in the appearance of editorial items was an excellent way of getting previous readership, the manner in which it was applied created additional problems. That is, the respondent "catches on" to the readership purpose of the interview when he is asked to report on his previous readership of each item. This in itself destroys one objective of the "interest" questioning by putting a psychological premium on prior issue reading. Furthermore, by the responses he gives on the first few items the respondent
feels he has already committed himself to being a reader or non-reader of the issue under study and therefore feels pressure to give a consistent answer when later asked about the issue as a whole. When a respondent has already claimed seeing a particular item before, he is often unwilling to "back down" on the committal when later asked about the issue as a whole, even if his later inspection of other items lead him to doubt whether he saw this particular item or any item in the issue before.

Politz further reasoned that the way to solve these problems was to have the respondent inspect the complete editorial contents of the issue before being asked to state whether he previously looked into it and that he should not commit himself while inspecting the issue. Also, it should appear to the respondent that whether he has seen the issue before or not is just one aspect of the survey, and not its primary concern.

Another important feature of the Politz audience method is interviewer use of certain formalized comments to discourage and discount premature commitments. A complete description of the Politz ("editorial interest") method is given in the Technical Appendix to this report.
Life Magazine's first Politz Audience Study in 1950 using the standard "editorial interest" questioning method and the first probability sample in an audience research survey showed Life's audience to be several million lower than had been found in previous research. Prior to that 1950 study a small experiment among 225 individuals was conducted applying the then newly developed audience questioning procedure to a pre-published issue. In this research, only one person or less than one-half percent of the 225 respondents claimed prior readership of the pre-published issue.

About the Present Study

At the present time, several research companies offer services which provide the advertising community with estimates of magazine audiences. Each of these companies employs a different questioning procedure as the means of estimating a magazine's audience. In addition, there are other differences in survey design and methods between the services. For example, the services differ on the number and size of sample clusters; the number of magazines studied in a given interview; the amount of procedure for collecting demographic and marketing classification information; the overall length of interview; interviewer training and implementation of survey procedures.
The present study, is viewed as the first in a series of experimental studies concerned with various methodological approaches to the measurement of magazine audiences.

This study, within the survey universe, draws statistical inferences only about the measurement difference between a magazine audience as obtained by the "editorial interest" method versus a method of "unaided recall." All other survey variables which may affect audience estimates were held constant in these comparisons.

The "editorial interest" method employed display of a full* issue for recognition, prior to questioning the respondent about previous readership of the specific issue. The "unaided recall" method employed a self-administered questioning procedure which asked the respondent to report how many issues in a recent time period he looked into.

This study was made with a probability sample of approximately 1,650 adult females in six metropolitan markets, using a carefully controlled experimental design.

*As distinguished from an "editorial interest" method employing display of a "skeletonized issue" for recognition purposes.
Each interview covered readership of all 14 magazines: Better Homes & Gardens, Family Circle, Good Housekeeping, Ladies' Home Journal, Life, Look, McCall's, Newsweek, Reader's Digest, Redbook, Saturday Evening Post, Time, TV Guide and Woman's Day. For a given respondent, readership was established separately by the "editorial interest" method for seven of the magazines, whereas readership of the balance of magazines was determined by the "unaided recall" method. This design necessitated the establishment of two equal groups of seven magazines each. The group of magazines to be covered by a given questioning method was rotated from interview to interview. Within each group, the order of displaying and asking about magazines on the "editorial interest" method was also rotated from interview to interview. A further rotation, alternating the questioning method used first in the interview was also carefully utilized.

All subsamples thus established were statistically equivalent, the only difference between them was the method used to determine readership of a given magazine. The advantage of this design was that a given respondent contributed responses to both types of audience questioning procedures and that the interview length was approximately constant from interview to interview. Thus, this plan avoided the possible "conditioning" effects of interviewing the same person on the identical magazine and using two different methods for determining readership.
Field work is the survey operation which has traditionally been least susceptible to scrutiny by the data user; it is, however the focal point of all other survey operations. Good sampling designs, accurate measurement procedures, efficient data processing methods all go for naught in the absence of trustworthy field work. Consequently, both the researcher and the data user require specific assurance of the quality of field interviewing operations.

The quality of field work is mostly, but not wholly, assured through the use of a well-prepared and trained field staff. To this end, each interviewer selected to work on this study received intensified personal training on survey procedures. In addition, each interviewer received detailed written instructions on survey techniques to serve as a reminder of what was covered in the training sessions. Furthermore, each interviewer did practice interviews on the survey questionnaire which were graded by the training supervisor and returned, when necessary, with notations on how to conduct the interview properly.

Quality assurance further requires a detailed audit of work
completed to give evidence that this work was indeed conducted according to survey specification. To meet this requirement, The Advertising Research Foundation's Fact Service was employed for verifying interviews.

Statistical inferences about the differences between the two methods are drawn for estimates of total audience and various components thereof on the basis of the average magazine studied. Sampling reliability considerations limit statistical inferences drawn about class of magazine differences to total audience.

Statistical inferences, of course, are made in the context of the population studied, the field administrative procedures employed; interviewer implementation of survey procedures and the study's interview length.

The Technical Appendix at the end of this report gives a detailed description of the survey design and methods.

We wish to thank Life Magazine for the freedom they gave us in the design and execution of this study. We also are grateful
to the staff of ARF and the ARF Technical Committee for their
guidance in the design and analysis stages of this study. We
hope that the advertising community finds this study a useful
contribution to the evaluation of magazine audience procedures.

September, 1967
SURVEY FINDINGS
## Table 1

**Comparison of average issue audiences as determined by the "Editorial Interest" method and "Unaided Recall" method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience per issue as determined by:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females age 18 and over</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;editorial interest&quot; method</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;unaided recall&quot; method</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Margin by which "unaided recall" estimate exceeds "editorial interest" estimate:

- Absolute margin: 2.3
- Relative margin: 12.2%
STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 1

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue is established as:

... 18.6% by the "editorial interest" method
... 21.1% by the "unaided recall" method

The "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 2.3 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 12.2%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE ISSUE AUDIENCES AS DETERMINED BY THE "EDITORIAL INTEREST" METHOD AND "UNAIDED RECALL" METHOD

ACCORDING TO PUBLISHING FREQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazines published:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weekly/</th>
<th>Biweekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females age 18 and over</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audience per issue as determined by:

"editorial interest" method
| | 18.8 | 16.8 | 20.3 |

"unaided recall" method
| | 21.1 | 18.1 | 23.4 |

Margin by which "unaided recall" estimate exceeds "editorial interest" estimate:

| Absolute margin | 2.3 | 1.3 | 3.1 |
| Relative margin | 12.2% | 7.7% | 15.3% |
STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 2

Across all six weekly/biweekly magazines studied, the audience of an average issue is estimated as:

- 16.9% by the "editorial interest" method
- 18.1% by the "unaided recall" method

The "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 1.3 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 7%. The chances are less than 1 in 39 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.

Across all eight monthly magazines studied, the audience of an average issue is estimated as:

- 20.3% by the "editorial interest" method
- 23.4% by the "unaided recall" method

The "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 3.1 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 15.3%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variations only.

Comparing the two methods, as applied to weeklies/biweeklies versus monthlies, the relative margin which "unaided recall" estimates of audience exceed "editorial interest" estimates is almost twice as great for the monthlies (15.3%) than it is for the weeklies/biweeklies (7%). The chances are less than 1 in 17 that these differential margins are due to chance sampling variation only.

* * *

"Unaided recall" estimates of average issue audience exceed "editorial interest" estimates for three of the six weekly/biweekly magazines and for all eight of the monthly magazines. For monthly magazines, the relative margin by which the "unaided recall" estimate exceeded the "editorial interest" estimate ranged from approximately 2% to 40%.
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE ISSUE AUDIENCES AS DETERMINED
BY THE "EDITORIAL INTEREST" METHOD AND "UNAIDED RECALL" METHOD

ACCORDING TO AGE GROUP OF INDIVIDUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group is:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>18-49 years</th>
<th>50 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females age 18 and over</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audience per issue as determined by:

- "editorial interest" method
  - 18.8
- "unaided recall" method
  - 21.1

Margin by which "unaided recall" estimate exceeds "editorial interest" estimate:

- Absolute margin ...
  - 2.3
  - 2.1
  - 2.9
- Relative margin ...
  - 12.2%
  - 10.3%
  - 17.8%
STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 3

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among females age 18 to 49 is estimated as:

... 20.3% by the "editorial interest" method
... 22.4% by the "unaided recall" method

Among females age 18 to 49, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 2.1 percentage points and by a relative margin of 10.3%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among females age 50 and over is estimated as:

... 16.8% by the "editorial interest" method
... 19.2% by the "unaided recall" method

Among females age 50 and over, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 2.9 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 17.8%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females age 18 and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$8,000 and over</th>
<th>Under $8,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audience per issue as determined by:

- "editorial interest" method: 18.8% 23.2% 15.9%
- "unaided recall" method: 21.1% 26.0% 17.9%

Margin by which "unaided recall" estimate exceeds "editorial interest" estimate:

- Absolute margin: 2.3 2.8 2.0
- Relative margin: 12.2% 12.1% 12.6%
STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 4

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among adult females living in households with an annual household income of $8,000 and over per year is estimated as:

... 23.2% by the "editorial interest" method
... 26.0% by the "unaided recall" method

Among adult females living in households with an annual household income of $8,000 and over the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 2.8 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 12.1%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among adult females living in households with an annual household income of less than $8,000 is estimated as:

... 15.9% by the "editorial interest" method
... 17.7% by the "unaided recall" method

Among adult females living in households with an annual household income of less than $8,000, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 1.8 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 12.6%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE ISSUE AUDIENCES AS DETERMINED
BY THE "EDITORIAL INTEREST" METHOD AND "UNAIDED RECALL" METHOD

ACCORDING TO EDUCATION OF INDIVIDUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Finished high school or beyond</th>
<th>Did not finish high school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females age 18 and over</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience per issue as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin by which &quot;unaided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recall&quot; estimate exceeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute margin</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative margin</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALFRED POLITZ MEDIA STUDIES
STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 5

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among adult females who have finished high school or beyond is estimated as:

... 22.1% by the "editorial interest" method
... 25.0% by the "unaided recall" method

Among adult females who have finished high school or beyond, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 3.7 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 16.7%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among adult females who did not finish high school is estimated as:

... 12.5% by the "editorial interest" method
... 12.6% by the "unaided recall" method

Among adult females who did not finish high school, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 0.1 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 0.8%. The chances are less than 1 in 1.3 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.
STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 6

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among employed adult females is estimated as:

... 20.8% by the "editorial interest" method
... 22.4% by the "unaided recall" method

Among employed adult females, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 1.6 percentage points, and by a relative margin of 7.7%. The chances are less than 1 in 37 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.

Across all 14 magazines studied, the audience of an average issue among adult females not employed is estimated as:

... 17.6% by the "editorial interest" method
... 20.5% by the "unaided recall" method

Among adult females not employed, the "unaided recall" estimate of audience exceeds the "editorial interest" estimate of audience by an absolute margin of 2.9 percentage points and by a relative margin of 16.9%. The chances are less than 1 in 1,000 that the margin of difference is due to chance sampling variation only.
TECHNICAL APPENDIX
TECHNICAL APPENDIX

I. SAMPLE DESIGN

The population for this study was defined as all females age 18 and over living in private households in the standard metropolitan areas of Baltimore, Maryland; Boston, Massachusetts; Columbus, Ohio; Denver, Colorado; San Francisco, California; and Tampa, Florida. A sample of 1,651 females was drawn from this universe by a multi-stage probability sample of the area type. In a multi-stage sample, each person in the universe under study has a measurable or known probability (greater than zero) of inclusion in the sample which is associated with the probabilities of selection of the sampling unit in which she is located at each stage of sampling. Given the selection probabilities for each sample member, the sample is automatically projectable, within calculable margins of sampling reliability to the entire universe under study.

The sample was selected in three stages, with stratification and clustering to increase efficiency. The stages of selection were:
Stage I - Selection of Locations

The entire land area of each metropolitan area is divisible into locations. There were two bases for this division. First, it was necessary that locations be easily identifiable in the field operation. Second, it was desired to achieve uniformity in the number of housing units per location. Different treatment was used to achieve these conditions, depending upon whether the locations were in cities, towns, urban fringe areas or in open country.

In cities, towns and urban fringe areas, locations were defined on street maps as blocks or groups of blocks. Locations in cities and towns were set up to contain an estimated minimum of 50 housing units. Locations in urban fringe areas were set up to contain an estimated minimum of 25 housing units. In rural open country, locations were defined on recent public highway or public transportation maps in terms of identifiable boundaries such as roads, railroad tracks, rivers and other landmarks. These locations were set up to contain an estimated minimum of 25 housing units.
In this study, it was decided to select approximately an equal number of locations in each of the metropolitan areas in the universe. Within a metropolitan area, locations were grouped into strata according to whichever of the following factors applied in that unit: cities with over 500,000 population; cities with 50,000–499,999 population; cities with under 50,000 population; urban fringe areas, rural towns, and rural open country. The number of locations selected from each resulting stratum was proportional to the estimated population of that stratum.

Sampling locations were selected with probability proportional to their estimated population from an array of all stratum locations in geographic order. Where no population estimates were available, either from prior independent enumerations or from counts of structures on aerial photographs, locations were selected with equal probability.

Altogether, a total of 180 locations (30 per metropolitan area) was so selected. Each location had a known chance of inclusion in the sample.
Stage II - Selection of Segments

Each location is divisible into segments, or groups of consecutive housing units. Within each selected location, two groups of individual segments were established by random procedures and within each group one segment was selected with equal probability from among all segments in the group.

Each location was first described to its assigned interviewer on a special, large-scale, detail map. This map showed the area immediately surrounding the location, and its boundaries and interior. A particular starting point, at an intersection or corner within the location, was selected in our home office and indicated on the map. From this starting point, a travel-route was marked out, proceeding systematically around and through the location.

Before doing any interviewing, the interviewer first proceeded through the entire location along the assigned route. The address of every seventh housing unit was recorded alternately to Group I or Group II on a special grouping sheet, thus dividing the entire location into two major groups each consisting of subgroups of.
approximately 7 housing units. As explained below, it was not necessary that exactly 7 housing units be counted in each subgroup. Nor did it matter at this stage that a particular housing unit was missed or counted twice. Consequently, the interviewer did not have to take the time, at this stage, to search for obscure housing units (for example, in basements or at the rear of stores) or to knock on each door to ascertain this information.

By the principle of the "half-open interval", segments (subgroups) were then defined as including the starting housing unit of each subgroup and all other housing units along the travel-route up to, but not including, the housing unit which defined the start of the next consecutive subgroup. If the last subgroup in the location contained 3 or fewer housing units, it was combined with the previous segment. If it contained 4 or more housing units, it was established as a separate segment.

When all segments had been defined and identified on the listing sheet, a random set of signs specified two segments for interview. This procedure gave every segment in each major group an equal probability of selection. The interviewer then started at the
housing unit which defined the beginning of the first specified segment and visited every housing unit for interview until the segment was completed. The same procedure was repeated for the second segment.

In this interviewing stage it was far easier to discover previously unnoticed housing units, and to be sure of canvassing every distinct housing unit, because the interviewer talked to respondents at each address, as he moved from address to address, and accumulated information about housing units within the segment.

Each segment had a known chance of inclusion in the sample. This segmenting procedure provided an unbiased estimate of the current population size of each location, for comparison with 1960 population data on which location selection is based. By taking account of these estimates in tabulating, the sample becomes self-correcting for recent population shifts.

**Stage III - Selection of Individuals Within Households**

Within each household (occupied housing unit) one female was
selected with known probability from among all females age 18 and over who live in the household. This individual was selected by a system independent of the interviewer as follows. The interviewer first determined how many females age 18 and over lived in the household. These individuals were listed in a prescribed order on the face sheet of the questionnaire. A random set of signs then automatically specified the particular individual to be interviewed. No substitutes were permitted.

Some selected individuals were found to be not at home at the time of individual selection. Other individuals either refused or were unable to grant the interview at the time of selection. The initial survey design specified that up to three attempts were to be made to successfully interview each selected individual, however, to increase the completion rate it became necessary to alter this specification by having the interviewer recontact a designated respondent up to six times.
The product of the probabilities of selection at each of the foregoing stages is the respondent's final probability of selection.
II. QUESTIONING PROCEDURE

"Editorial Interest" Method - Definition & Questioning Procedure

This survey's definition and measurement of issue audience employing the "editorial interest" method followed our standard practice for previous magazine audience studies. The audience of an issue is defined as people exposed to any of that issue's editorial contents. No specified amount of reading is required to qualify as an audience member, other than the minimum of having looked into the issue at all and thus having seen or read at least one item.

This issue audience definition provides a uniform measurement basis for all magazines, regardless of the number and kinds of editorial items they contain. Any issue audience definition which required more than minimum exposure to the issue's contents would tend to favor some but penalize others among the different types of magazines. For example, a definition predicated on seeing or reading at least a fixed number of editorial items would tend to penalize magazines with fewer but longer items per issue, or with fewer pictorial items but
more reading matter. Moreover, such a definition would exclude a legitimate, even if small, portion of each issue's performance in reaching people.

The minimum requirement of having looked into the issue at all does not imply that all or most readers see only one or a few editorial items. (Such reasoning would be equivalent to concluding that all or most eligible voters are 21 years old.)

The definition of issue audience as those people who saw or read any of the issue's editorial contents draws the simplest and least arbitrary boundary between exposure and non-exposure to the issue.

Given this audience definition, the survey must classify each person in the sample as a member or non-member of the audience of each magazine issue being studied. The questioning procedure employed derives from two primary considerations:

1. That people often cannot accurately report whether they have looked into a particular issue unless they inspect its editorial contents in their original order and context.
2. That it is dangerous to ask or even permit people to report whether they have looked into the issue prior to full inspection of its contents. If during the inspection of the issue's contents, a person is asked whether she has seen each item before, she may erroneously claim she has seen an item because she confuses the item with a similar one seen elsewhere. She therefore commits herself to appear as a reader of the issue when in reality she may not be. The danger is that later the person may be unwilling to contradict this earlier readership claim, even though further inspection of the issue convinces her she has not looked into the issue before. Vice-versa, a person may be doubtful of the familiarity of specific items observed in isolation. She thereby may be inclined to deny readership of the issue in order to avoid seemingly contradictory statements.

Therefore, this audience procedure requires the respondent to examine the complete editorial contents of the issue, page by page, before soliciting or accepting any commitment to prior
reading or non-reading of the issue. Details of this procedure follow below.

The first magazine question screened out respondents who had not looked into any issue of the particular magazine for a long period of time: "We're interested in knowing the kinds of magazines you may have looked into during the past six or seven months, either at home or anywhere outside your home. As I show you the title of each magazine, would you please tell me which statement on this card is true about it?" The interviewer displayed a sequence of 7 magazine cards, each containing a reproduction of that magazine's logotype. As the interviewer showed each card, the respondent reported either "surely looked into", "probably looked into", "probably not looked into" or "surely not looked into" for that magazine during the "past six or seven months." Respondents who were certain that they had not looked into any copy of a particular magazine in the past six or seven months were classified as not having looked into the specific recent issues of the magazine being studied, and were asked no further questions about that magazine.
The remaining respondents were asked to examine the editorial contents of two specific issues of the magazine carried by the interviewer. (See Chapter IV for a discussion of issue dates and ages.) The respondent was questioned separately but identically about each issue and each magazine. The magazine order was rotated from interview to interview. The following request gets the respondent to examine the issue without suggesting or revealing the actual purpose of determining whether she had looked into that issue before. "While I leaf quickly through this issue of [magazine name], please stop me if we come to an item that looks especially interesting." This request puts the respondent in the self-desirable position of passing judgment on the editorial items as they are displayed by the interviewer. The respondent is given to believe that the main objective is to gather opinions of editorial contents, and that her answers are valuable even if she has not looked into the issue before.

During the display of the issue's contents, the interviewer uses one or the other of two formalized comments to discourage or discount premature commitments. If a respondent states in passing that she has seen some item or the issue before, the interviewer
comments: "We're just as interested in your opinions whether you've seen this before or not." One or two uses of these comments are usually sufficient to get the respondent to report only her present interest in items, and to keep her from committing herself in advance, on possibly insufficient evidence, to having looked into or not looked into the issue before. In this way, substantially all editorial material is displayed to the respondent. The only omitted material is some of the continuation pages of long items and some items of less than a page length.

After the respondent has inspected the issue, if she had made any previous claim of having seen an item or the issue before, a third standard comment is used to caution her against confusing items in the issue she has just examined with similar items seen elsewhere: "As you know, similar items can appear in different magazine issues, or in newspapers or on television. Just to keep the record straight, let me ask you ..." Then the key question is asked of all respondents who examined the issue: "Now that we've been through the whole issue, are you sure whether or not
you happened to look into this particular issue before?" Only respondents who answer in the certain affirmative are counted as readers of the issue.

The number of editorial items which a person must examine in the interview before she can be sure whether or not she had looked into the issue before, is unknown and varies from person to person. That is why the standard "editorial interest" audience technique shows substantially all the editorial material before asking the respondent whether she had looked into the issue before, and prevents her from making premature commitments based on only one or a few of the issue's editorial items. The questioning on what items "look interesting" provides a reason for complete display of the issue, and avoids focusing attention on the real objective until the respondent has full evidence for her decision. Finally, the emphasis on editorial opinions, the comments on the importance of these opinions regardless of whether the issue was seen before, and the wording of the final question all contribute to removing the understandable tendency of some respondents to report what they consider "usual" or "desirable" behavior rather than actual behavior with respect to the
particular issue studied.

"Unaided Recall" Method - Definition & Questioning Procedure

Each respondent was questioned by the method described below about her reading of the seven magazines not covered by the "editorial interest" questioning. This portion of the interview was self-administered by the respondent. The interviewer first made this comment, "Now we have a few questions about magazines that we'd like to have you fill out yourself" and then handed the respondent the questionnaire to fill out. In cases where the respondent had any difficulty in filling out the page, the interviewer was instructed to assist the respondent.

Magazines which published weekly were asked about first, followed by the biweekly magazine and finally monthly magazines. When TV Guide was asked about, it immediately followed the weekly magazines.

Following are the "unaided recall" questions in the exact sequence as they appeared on the questionnaire.
There is a magazine called TV Guide priced at 15¢ and sold by subscription or at
newstands and supermarkets. Please do not confuse this with TV program book-
lets that are distributed in a number of newspapers and list all TV programs
that are on the air. Assuming only about the magazine called TV Guide, we would
like to know how many different issues of TV Guide, if any, you personally have
read or looked into in the last 4 weeks. Then, if you have read TV Guide in the
last 4 weeks, please check the box at the right that indicates whether the last
issue you read was in your own home or elsewhere outside your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did read now</th>
<th>In the last 4 weeks, I read:</th>
<th>The last issue I read was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read now and then</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 home</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not read last</td>
<td>TV Guide</td>
<td>magazine in weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not read last</td>
<td>Look Magazine</td>
<td>In the last 8 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Look Magazine is published every two weeks. Please check the box that describes
how many different issues of Look Magazine, if any, you have read or looked into
in the last 8 weeks. Then, if you have read Look Magazine in the last 8 weeks,
please check the box that indicates whether the last issue you read was in your
own home or elsewhere outside your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did read now</th>
<th>In the last 8 weeks, I read:</th>
<th>The last issue I read was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read now and then</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 home</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not read last</td>
<td>Look</td>
<td>magazine in weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nobody Can Help Nobody Exactly
Below is a list of magazines that are put out once a month. Next to each magazine, please check the box that describes how many different issues of the magazine, if any, you personally have read or looked into in the last 4 months.

Then, for each magazine that you have read in the last 4 months, please check the box at the right that indicates whether the last issue you read was in your own home or elsewhere outside your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Read now</th>
<th>Did not</th>
<th>Not read in the last magazine 4 months</th>
<th>In the last 4 months, I read:</th>
<th>The last time I read was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEEG</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Cir.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWH</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re.Dig.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The fourteen magazines studied were divided into two groups of seven magazines each as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publishing Frequency</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV Guide</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>Look</td>
<td>Saturday Evening Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Better Homes &amp; Gardens</td>
<td>Good Housekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Circle</td>
<td>McCall's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladies' Home Journal</td>
<td>Redbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader's Digest</td>
<td>Woman's Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goal in the division of the magazines was to create two comparable groups of magazines in terms of publishing frequency (4 monthly in each group) and editorial approach. A further consideration was to establish groups yielding approximately equal number of issues that would have to be displayed for recognition to the average respondent in the "editorial interest" questioning. The number of survey issues actually
displayed for an extended to the average respondent was 5.4
for Group A magazines and 5.1 for Group B magazines.

All 14 magazines were studied in a given interview. In each
interview, readership was established separately by the
"editorial interest" method for the magazines in a given
group, while readership of the magazines in the other group
was determined by the "unaided recall" method. (For example,
if Group A magazines were studied by the "editorial interest"
method then Group B magazines were covered by the "unaided
recall" method.) The group of magazines to be covered by a
given questioning method was rotated from interview to inter-
view. Within each group, the order of displaying issues and
asking about magazines on the "editorial interest" method
was also rotated from interview to interview. A further
rotation, alternating the readership method asked about first,
was also done from interview to interview.

All subsamples thus established are statistically equivalent,
the only difference between them was the method used to de-
termine readership of a given magazine. A schematic outline
of the established samples is given below "in tabular form".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Audience Method</th>
<th>Magazines Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>1. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td>1. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 4</td>
<td>1. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 5</td>
<td>1. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (7-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 6</td>
<td>1. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (7-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 7</td>
<td>1. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (14-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 8</td>
<td>1. &quot;unaided recall&quot;</td>
<td>Group A (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;editorial interest&quot;</td>
<td>Group B (14-6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each sample, the order of displaying and asking about magazines on the "editorial interest" method was either arranged alphabetically or in reverse alphabetical order.

Within each sample, the order of asking about magazines on
the "unaided recall" method was always weeklies arranged alphabetically (except TV Guide), TV Guide (when it was studied), the biweekly magazine and monthlies arranged alphabetically. The reason for not rotating the order of asking about magazines on the "unaided recall" method was to simulate as far as possible the procedure used by the services applying the technique.

To minimize sampling error, Samples 1 through 4 were established within a given interviewing location, whereas Samples 5 through 8 were established in a different interviewing location.

The difference in audience level between the two methods of estimating readership is denoted by obtaining the difference between the methods for Samples 1, 2, 5 and 6 in combination, and averaging it with the difference between methods for Samples 3, 4, 7 and 8 in combination.
The plan described above for measuring the differences between audience estimates obtained by the "editorial interest" procedure versus the "unaided recall" method represents a change-over design arranged in the form of a "Latin Square". Actually samples 1 and 3; 2 and 4; 5 and 7; 6 and 8; each are a separate "Latin Square," with each square comparing the two methods of estimating audience.

The major feature of this plan is that differences in audience estimates between the two methods are denoted by the differences in audience estimates from equivalent samples of different people, rather than differences in readership by the same person on the identical magazine using the two different methods for determining readership. Thus, a principal advantage of this plan was that it avoided "conditioning" biases of interviewing the same people on the identical magazine using the two different methods for determining readership.

Neither interviewers nor respondents were aware of the survey purpose and plan. Each interviewer conducted interviews with all eight subsamples.
Compared with a plan (either in a given interview or a "before and after" design) in which each respondent's readership of a given magazine is determined by each method, this study's estimate of differences by methods for a given magazine are subject to relatively larger sampling error. However, when the findings for all magazines are combined, the respondents in each pair of samples ("Latin Square") are represented in both questioning methods. All respondents are represented seven times in the "editorial interest" audience estimate and seven times in the "unaided recall" estimate. This rotation greatly increases the reliability of survey estimates referring to the differences between methods for the average magazine.
IV. FIELD DESIGN AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

Field Schedule

Field work was done over an eight week period, from May 1st to June 25th inclusive. As noted earlier, in the "editorial interest" part of the interview two issues of each magazine covered were studied. These survey issues were systematically changed during field work according to a specified schedule. The following table gives the cover dates and average age of the issues studied on the "editorial interest" technique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Cover Dates</th>
<th>Average Age in Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>March 31, April 7, April 14,</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 21, April 28, May 5,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 12, May 19, May 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>April 3, April 10, April 17,</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 24, May 1, May 8, May 15,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 22, May 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>March 31, April 7, April 14,</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 21, April 28, May 5,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 12, May 19, May 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Guide</td>
<td>April 15, April 22, April 29,</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 6, May 13, May 20, May 27,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 3, June 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>Cover Dates</td>
<td>Average Age in Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>April 4, April 18, May 2, May 16, May 30</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Evening Post</td>
<td>March 25, April 8, April 22, May 6, May 20, June 3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Homes &amp; Gardens</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Circle</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Housekeeping</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies' Home Journal</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall's</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbook</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader's Digest</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman's Day</td>
<td>February, March, April, May</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Average Age" refers to the interval between issue appearance and the interview. Since a common field schedule had to be used for all magazines, regardless of their particular on-sale dates, slight variation was unavoidable in the average age of the magazines, but this variation has negligible effect on the audience standing.
Experience of Field Staff

The best questioning and sampling designs on paper are actually no better than their field execution. The quality of field work depends above all on the ability of the interviewers, as proved by past performance, and after that on their training for the particular assignment. As with other employees, demonstrated past performance by an interviewer is the crucial indicator of present ability.

The field staff for this research comprised 43 people. Approximately ten per cent were men and ninety per cent were female; forty per cent had college education and sixty per cent had high school education but no college; fifteen per cent were under 35 years of age, sixty per cent were age 35-49, and twenty-five per cent were 50 years or older. 35 of the 43 interviewers on this study are members of our national staff of regularly employed interviewers, each with a continuous good record of performance on previous studies by our company.
Training of Field Staff

Notwithstanding their previous experience and performance, a special personal training program was undertaken for the research. This intensified personal training was given to all interviewers on this study by an executive of our home office Field Department who travelled to each survey area. The training sessions consisted of lectures and demonstrations.

Beyond this, every interviewer was given detailed written instructions on all necessary procedures together with an assignment of practice interviews. (The practice questionnaire was identical to that used in the final study; needless to say, none of the completed practice interviews are included in this survey's tabulation.) The completed practice interviews were individually analyzed by the training supervisor. Each interviewer received an individual review of his own practice work. There were scattered errors of omission, but on the whole, the practice work was excellent.
Finally, every interviewer was tested on his understanding of sample segmenting procedures (described in Chapter II). This test was administered in written form using a "case study" approach. Correction and reminder notes were sent where necessary.

Naturally, all interviewers were fully compensated for their training time and expenses to encourage careful study of all survey procedures. Also, in the main study, interviewers were compensated for their interviewing time and expenses and not on the basis of number of interviews turned in. This compensation plan encourages and rewards the interviewer for conscientious work.

Field Controls
Locations were assigned by week to control the distribution of interviews over the eight interviewing weeks. Interviewers were instructed to visit their locations early enough in the assigned weeks so that they could revisit each sample segment within the same week to complete the location.
Initial weekday interviewing contacts at each location were made during late afternoon and evening hours. Initial weekend interviewing contacts were permitted during the afternoon or evening. Subsequent calls on locations were permitted during any time of the day.

Interviewers were required to visit initial refusal or not-at-home respondents up to six times in an effort to successfully interview them.

Overall control of the field operations rested with executives of the home office Field Department. Controls were established in each area. Each home office area supervisor was responsible for distributing assignments and materials to each interviewer in his area, for seeing that every interviewer in his area completed his assignments on schedule, and to make periodic checks of each interviewer's work.

A diary sheet for each interviewer identified the locations assigned to him, and when each was to be done. Completed
segments were returned promptly, and their completion was noted on the interviewer's diary sheet. In this way, an up-to-date record of each interviewer's progress was available on a daily basis throughout the field period. Whenever an interviewer failed to return a segment's work on time, he was immediately contacted. In case of illness or some other emergency, the work was re-assigned to another interviewer in the same area.

Field Verification

In this study, The Advertising Research Foundation's Fact Service was utilized for verifying each interviewer's work. Approximately one-third of each interviewer's work was verified by long-distance telephone or by mail if the respondent's household did not have a telephone. All verification was done by agents of The Advertising Research Foundation.

A special form, the Verification Certificate, was designed by the staff of The Advertising Research Foundation specifically
for this study. (A copy of this form appears on Page 35 of this report.) Each interviewer was required to complete a separate Verification Certificate for each interview he conducted. All Verification Certificates were turned over to The Advertising Research Foundation who in turn selected a systematic sample of forms for purposes of verification.

In addition to verifying whether the respondent was indeed interviewed, a further set of questions was formulated by our firm together with the staff of The Advertising Research Foundation to determine whether the interview was conducted according to prescribed survey specifications. These questions were as follows:

..."At some point in the interview, did the interviewer hand you a list of questions about magazines and ask you to check off those you had looked into?"

..."Were you shown a set of cards with names of magazines?"
..."Were you shown any copies of magazines and asked to point out articles that may have looked interesting to you?"

..."Now would you tell me how many females who are at least 18 years old live in your household? Be sure to include yourself."

On the basis of the verification procedures employed, there was not a single instance in which any reasonable doubt remained as to the authenticity and propriety of an interviewer's work. Some inconsistencies in reported answers were occasionally found, but no systematic pattern was uncovered within the work of any one interviewer or indeed within any individual questionnaire. Occasionally inconsistencies and omissions are to be expected even with the best equipped field staff; wherever necessary, routine editing was done to answers reported in the verification check or to what seemed most reasonable on the basis of other pieces of information reported within the questionnaire.
**ARF FACT SERVICE**

**VERIFICATION CERTIFICATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Number</th>
<th>Interviewer's Number</th>
<th>Respondent's Telephone Area Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>CHECK-IN NUMBER</th>
<th>SERIAL NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10-16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Of Interview**

Day Mo. Yr.  

**Language**

**Validation Date**  

**Respondent’s Name, Address, Zip Code**

Yes: No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>39-1 2</th>
<th>40-1 2</th>
<th>41-1 2</th>
<th>42-1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIFY If Interviewed OTHER THAN AT Respondent’s Address**

Yes No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>43-1</th>
<th>43-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Started**  

44 1 2  

**Length of Interview**  

45 1 2  

**Day of Week Of Interview**  

46 1 2

**INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWER**

1. You interview Number  
2. Respondent’s Telephone Number  
3. Language If Other Than English  
4. Time Interview Started  
5. Length Of Interview In Minutes  
6. Statement to Be initialed By Interviewer  

**STATEMENT TO BE INITIALED BY INTERVIEWER**

I hereby certify that this certificate may be used by the Advertising Research Foundation to verify my work. The answers I have recorded are complete and accurate to the best of my ability.

**INTERVIEWER'S INITIALS**  

**INTERVIEWER - DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47-1 2</td>
<td>3-1 2</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-1 2</td>
<td>34-1 2</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-1 2</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56-1 2</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>(61-62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63-64-65-66-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-1 2</td>
<td>58-1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS 67-**
Field Completion

The sample segments contained a total of 2,554 housing units. Of these, 161 or 7.1% were vacant and 220 or 8.6% were households in which no adult female resided. These two groups are not part of the survey universe. In 208 of the 2,153 occupied housing units or households the selected respondent, after up to six attempts were made to successfully interview her, refused to grant an interview. In 294 of the 2,153 households in the survey universe either no household member was home or the selected respondent was not home after up to six attempts were made to successfully conduct an interview. One adult female was successfully interviewed in 1,651 households, for a completion rate of 76.7%.
V. ESTIMATING PROCEDURE AND SAMPLING RELIABILITY

Estimating Procedure

The first step in the estimating procedure was to give each interview a tabulating weight inversely proportional to that respondent's overall probability of selection across all sampling stages.

To reduce chance sampling variation, ratio-estimates were then made within the four sets of squares (See Chapter III - EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN) (1) by age within metropolitan area to independent population estimates from Bureau of Census data, (2) income and education estimates based on the survey findings for all sample members.

According to the initial survey specification (See Chapter I - SAMPLE DESIGN) the sum of interviews in each metropolitan area received approximately equal weight in the final tabulating stage regardless of its actual proportion of the total population across the six metropolitan areas.
This procedure was followed in an effort to reduce chance sampling variation.

Computation of Average Issue Audience

In the tabulating stage, each respondent was assigned a measure of probability with regard to her reading behavior of each magazine studied. For each magazine studied by the "editorial interest" questioning method, this probability was either 2/2, 1/2 or 0, depending upon whether the respondent had read 2, 1 or 0 of the two specific issues of the magazine covered in the interview. For each magazine studied by the "unaided recall" questioning method, this probability was either 4/4, 3/4, 2/4, 1/4 or 0, depending upon whether the respondent had read 4, 3, 2, 1 or 0 issues of the magazine during the stated time period.

These probabilities determine the chances that an individual is a member of the average issue audience. For example, when a magazine was asked about by the "unaided recall" method, an individual who read 4 issues was included in the average
issue audience with unit (1.00) probability, whereas individuals who read 3, 2 or 1 issue respectively had a 0.75, 0.50 or 0.25 chance of being in the average issue audience. In other words, the average issue audience is comprised of all individuals who read 4 issues; 3/4 of the individuals who read 3 issues; 1/2 or the individuals who read 2 issues and 1/4 of the individuals who read 1 issue.

Sample Composition

The following table shows the composition of the total sample before and after the ratio estimates described above were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult females</th>
<th>Before ratio-estimates</th>
<th>After ratio-estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-49</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished high school or beyond</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 and over</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $8,000</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampling Reliability

The trustworthiness of sample survey data depends on a number of inter-related factors, including sampling and questioning designs and their field execution. The preceding chapters of this report have described these designs and their implementation, to help users of the findings judge the quality of this research. We now consider the reliability of the survey findings in quantitative terms.

The findings of any sample survey are subject to margins of chance sampling variation due to the use of a sample instead of a complete count of the survey population (in this case, all adult females in the six metropolitan areas listed in Chapter I - SAMPLE DESIGN). The use of a probability sampling design makes it possible to compute margins for such variation, and in this case, the use of an experimental design makes it practical to do so by analysis of variance methods. Within each subsample, differences between the findings as determined by the two questioning procedures were tabulated separately for each respondent. These tabulations yielded frequency
distributions of differences between the two methods. The mean and the standard error of the mean of each distribution were then calculated according to standard statistical procedures. These statistics were then averaged across the subsamples in order to provide their respective estimates for the sample as a whole. These procedures were also followed when estimating the sampling error on survey differences with population subgroups.
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**MEDIA INTEREST AND ACTIVITY STUDY**

Location #  
(2-8) Family Name  

---

Group selected from column  (9) Complete Address:  
This is the household visited in this group. (10-11)  
Street or RFD Address  
Town or City  State  

Present time is  

Interviewer  
Telephone No.  

---

**RESULT OF CALLS ON HOUSEHOLD**  
(Before Respondent Selection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Call on Household</th>
<th>2nd Call on Household</th>
<th>3rd Call on Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one home (CALL BACK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone home and available (ASK Q.A)</td>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily unavailable (CALL BACK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal (CALL BACK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**IF RESULT OF FINAL CALL ON HOUSEHOLD IS EITHER "NO ONE HOME", "TEMPORARILY UNAVAILABLE" OR "REFUSAL": END INTERVIEW, BUT ALSO TEAR OFF AND SEND IN THIS PAGE.**

A. We are making a survey about television programs people enjoy and about magazines. First of all, could I ask you -- how many females live in this household, not counting females under 18 years old? **RECORD BELOW.**

Total females age 18 and over __ 13 __

B. Now, may I jot down the names of the females 18 years old or older who live in this household? **LIST ALL FEMALES AGE 18 AND OVER WHO LIVE IN HOUSEHOLD, FROM OLDEST TO YOUNGEST.**

Identification of each female age 18 or over who lives in household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

C. Now may I please speak with:

(FILL IN RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION)
**RESULTS OF CALLS ON RESPONDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Call on Household</th>
<th>2nd Call on Household</th>
<th>3rd Call on Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for interview (ASK Q.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at home (CALL BACK)</td>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily unavailable (CALL BACK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal (CALL BACK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We would like to know what you think of various kinds of television programs. Please look at this card and tell me -- which of these kinds of television programs do you consider most interesting? SHOW CARD #1.

   a. Westerns .......... 16-1
   b. Quiz, panel shows.. 2
   c. Mystery, detectives 3
   d. Full-length movies 4
   e. Variety shows ..... 5
   f. Medical programs 6
   g. Comedy ............ 7
   h. Dramatic plays 8
   i. Sports ............ 9
   j. Family situation plays 10

   1.  
   2.  
   3.  
   4.  
   5.  
   6.  

   None of these; don't watch television ....
7a. Life Magazine and Newsweek are put out once a week. Next to each magazine please check the box that describes how many different issues of the magazine, if any, you personally have read or looked into in the last 4 weeks. This includes all issues of the magazine that you have looked into in the last 4 weeks, even if they came out some time ago and you just got around to reading them in the past 4 weeks.

**IF YOU DO NOT READ THE MAGAZINE, CHECK THE FIRST BOX.**

**IF YOU READ THE MAGAZINE NOW AND THEN, BUT HAVE NOT READ ANY ISSUE IN THE LAST 4 WEEKS, CHECK THE NEXT BOX.**

**IF YOU HAVE READ THE MAGAZINE IN THE LAST 4 WEEKS, CHECK THE BOX THAT TELLS HOW MANY ISSUES YOU HAVE READ OR LOOKED INTO IN THE LAST 4 WEEKS.**

7b. Then, for each magazine that you have ... in the last 4 weeks, thinking about the last issue of that magazine that you ... please check the box at the right that indicates whether you read that last issue in your own home or elsewhere outside your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Read now and then</th>
<th>In the last 4 weeks, I read:</th>
<th>The last time I read was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life ...</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>In Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The Saturday Evening Post is put out once in two weeks. Please check the box that describes how many different issues of The Saturday Evening Post, if any, you have read or looked into in the last 8 weeks. Then, if you have read The Saturday Evening Post in the last 8 weeks, please check the box that indicates whether the last issue you read was in your own home or elsewhere outside your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Read now and then</th>
<th>In the last 8 weeks, I read:</th>
<th>The last issue I read was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>In Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9a. Below is a list of magazines that are put out once a month. Next to each magazine, please check the box that describes how many different issues of the magazine, if any, you personally have read or looked into in the last 4 months.

9b. Then, for each magazine that you have read in the last 4 months, please check the box at the right that indicates whether the last issue you read was in your own home or elsewhere outside your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Read now and then</th>
<th>In the last 4 months, I read:</th>
<th>The last time I read was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Housekeeping...</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>In Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall's... 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbook... 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman's Day 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THERE IS NO QUESTION 10 ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE VERSION.**