

Qualitative Media Measures: Newspaper Experiences



Bobby J. Calder and Edward C. Malthouse
Northwestern University

We seek to understand the experience of reading a newspaper. Qualitative and quantitative research methods identify 44 distinct dimensions of the newspaper reading experience. Using statistical models, these experiences are compared across a random sample of 101 daily U.S. newspapers to examine the extent that the experiences vary both across newspapers and among readers of a specific newspaper. Also, hierarchical linear models are used to study the association between readership and each of the 44 experiences. This shows which experiences have the strongest associations with readership and whether the strength of association varies across newspapers. By measuring experiences, media management can improve both content and advertising, ultimately increasing readership.

Media research typically focuses on quantitative measures of usage. In the case of print media, readership is often measured as recent reading. In the United States, for example, newspaper readers are asked whether they read a newspaper yesterday. Media *usage* is a relatively straightforward construct. Just as one can conceive of, say, orange juice usage, one can also conceive of media usage. Usage is about actual behavior. It is not about how people subjectively think and feel about that behavior. Therein lies an important distinction.

People do not just use media, they experience it. There is a subjective, qualitative side to their usage. The most obvious facet of this is involvement. Two people could each read a newspaper on three occasions for about 15 min each time. Person A might be engaged in what she is reading, and even be trying to remember the material. Yet Person B might be reading merely to pass time with no thought of wanting to remember anything. The two peoples' usage is the same, but their experiences are very different.

Our view is that usage and experience are different constructs and must be conceptualized and measured differently. Measures of experience must capture the subjective side of usage. A good measure needs to capture the

"qualitative" side of reading in the fullest sense of the word. Another way of putting this is that media products are "experience brands." This article attempts to conceptualize and measure the distinct experiences that define the brand and ultimately lead to usage (Calder & Malthouse, 2003b).

Many words can be used for this construct. *Involvement* is an obvious one. *Enjoyment* is another. In some industry circles words like *wantedness* are used. We use the term *experience* because it captures the idea of what people think and feel when they read, and this is not a unidimensional continuum (as implied by involvement). We postulate that there are many (multidimensional) experiences associated with media use.

The ultimate goal is to identify specific, measurable experiences that characterize involvement with newspapers. Our approach is to avoid defining experiences in terms of survey questions such as "Is this newspaper involving?" or "Is this newspaper one of your favorites?" We want to measure specific, multiple experiences rather than some overall composite reaction. Moreover, a specific experience should have multiple indicators (survey questions) that serve both to measure the construct and (on the assumption that the experience of any medium is inherently multidimensional) to separate it from other experience constructs. Our approach is thus to begin with many potential survey questions that may or may not indicate a variety of experience constructs. These questions

Address correspondence to Edward C. Malthouse, Northwestern University, 1870 Campus Drive, Evanston, IL 602081. E-mail: ecm@northwestern.edu

are analyzed (via exploratory factor analysis) to locate separate experience constructs. Following this, reliability is examined to refine the measurement of each construct in terms of its best survey question indicators. Experiences are then related to usage.

Literature Review

Media measurement has focused mainly on usage, usually measured with a single critical question. Brown (1999) discussed the “read yesterday” question used to measure newspaper readership. Frequency measures such as the number of times per week that people read the newspaper are commonly used in academic studies (e.g., Burgoon & Burgoon, 1980). Time spent reading a newspaper has also been used (e.g., Loges & Ball-Rokeach, 1993).

Recently, Calder and Malthouse (2003a) argued that quantitative measures such as these are inferior to multiquestion measures that treat usage as an underlying construct that must be inferred from data. We developed a latent-variable approach to measuring newspaper readership employing questions spanning frequency of reading, amount of time spent reading, and completeness of reading for weekdays and Sunday. It yields a reader behavior score (RBS) reflecting all six indicators.

Malthouse and Calder (2002) presented a “qualitative-variable” version of this approach using latent class analysis. This version yields nine types of readers, termed reader behavior types (RBTs). One RBT is heavy readers, who read frequently, spend considerable time, and read most of the newspaper on both weekdays and Sunday. Another RBT is selective heavy readers who read frequently and spend considerable time but read less than half of the newspaper. Another is Sunday-only light readers, who rarely read on weekdays but who read a fraction of the paper on Sundays. The RBT measure is found to complement the RBS measures. Heavy readers are found at the high end of the RBS distribution and Sunday-only lights are at the low end. Other types occur in between. Thus RBTs provide additional “qualitative” information, making the RBS scores more interpretable.

Malthouse, Calder, and Eadie (2003) applied a methodology similar to the one used here to identify experiences associated with magazines. Berry, Hercock, and Beard (2003) described a study designed to understand the motivations for reading newspapers in New Zealand.

Methodology

We study a random sample of newspapers so that inference can be extended to newspapers as a medium; the first subsection describes the sample of newspapers. Qual-

itative research is used to gain insight into experiences, which is then extended through quantitative analysis.

Sampling Publications

The conclusions of this research should generalize to newspapers as a medium. Any one newspaper may no doubt involve unique experiences. However, this research postulates and attempts to show empirically that many experiences exist across newspapers.

This research is part of a longitudinal study of a random sample of 101 U.S. newspapers. The details of the first wave of the sampling plan are provided in Calder and Malthouse (2003) and summarized briefly as follows. We first drew a stratified random sample of 101 U.S. daily newspapers, stratifying on newspaper and market characteristics including circulation, competition, geographical extent of distribution, and market urbanicity. All types of newspapers are represented in our sample, ranging from small-town local papers to large papers serving urban centers and surrounding areas.

Qualitative Phase

The quantitative phase includes a survey asking respondents the extent to which they agree with questions such as, “Reading this newspaper makes me feel like I am drowning in the flood of news that comes out each day.” It is analyzed along with many other items to determine if they indicate a separate experience construct. Two key issues arise with this approach. One is how to obtain the pool of items that are thought to be potential indicators of constructs. We argue that the items should be grounded in data from readers. Accordingly, our item pool is based on in-depth qualitative interviews with readers during which they described their experiences.

We conducted more than 300 personal interviews across seven different newspaper markets. An illustrative quote from one of the interviews is as follows:

You are inundated by the news on a constant basis ... news updates on TV ... you see it in the paper ... you stand in the aisles at grocery stores and you read it and you're plagued by the news and there's just a point where I don't want to know any more.

Data from these interviews were analyzed to find patterns across individuals. Similar sentiments to the one just quoted were voiced by many others. This led to the drowning-in-the-news item cited earlier. The goal of this stage of the research was thus not quantitative generalization of frequencies, but an enhanced understanding of consumer thoughts and emotions (Calder, 2001).

Details on the format of the interviews, the discussion guides, and the complete set of items are available on our Web site.¹

Quantitative Surveys

As indicated earlier, this work is part of a longitudinal study and surveys respondents to the first study a second time. In the first study, we mailed 115,890 surveys to consumers in the 101 newspaper markets and 37,036 responded; the response rate was 37%, after dropping undeliverables. For this second wave, we drew a random sample of 15,664 readers from the 37,036 responders to the first wave and received 4,444 responses.

The survey contained the items generated in the qualitative interviews. We seek experience constructs that apply across newspapers. All items refer to a specific newspaper for the survey respondent. Because the same items are used for each newspaper, the data can be analyzed without regard to the specific publication. Our intention is for the aggregated data to describe the newspaper medium.

Quantitative Results

Quantitative analysis consists of three parts: developing experience scales with exploratory factor analysis, quantifying experience levels for newspapers as a medium and variation across individual newspapers with random-effect analysis of variance (ANOVA) models, and measuring the strength of the relation between each experience and readership.

Measuring Consumer Experiences and Readership

The survey included 275 items, constructed from the qualitative research, measuring the experience of reading a specific newspaper. We used exploratory factor analysis and coefficient alpha to develop 44 experience scales. We first factor analyzed all 275 items using the principal components method of estimation and a varimax rotation. There were 68 eigenvalues greater than 1, and a scree plot suggested that 35 to 70 factors would be reasonable. Some factors had many items. The first had 46 items loading most heavily on it with 20 of the loadings greater than 0.5 and the remaining items with loadings greater than 0.3. We factor analyzed these 46 items separately and found 6 eigenvalues greater than 1. Our general approach for developing factors from this large set of items was:

1. Factor analyze all items.
2. Run separate factor analyses on each factor from Step 1.

3. If factor analysis from Step 2 indicates a unidimensional scale based on inspection of a scree plot, purify the scale by dropping items with loadings less than 0.5 and items that cause coefficient alpha to increase.
4. If the factor analysis in Step 2 was not unidimensional, continue factoring the factors until scales are unidimensional.

The analysis resulted in 44 experience scores. See our Web site for a list of items included in each scale, factor loadings, and coefficient alphas. Estimates of experiences are the simple averages of the items. Note that by using the simple averages of the items as factor scores, it is possible for experiences to be correlated, as one would expect. A few of the experience scales have moderately low values of alpha, indicating poor reliability. In most cases, the low values of alpha are due to having too few indicators of the underlying construct on the survey. As future research, we recommend developing additional items.

We measure newspaper readership using RBS (Calder & Malthouse, 2003). RBS includes six manifestations of readership including the time, frequency, and completion for weekday and Sunday papers. The previous study showed that these six items form a highly reliable scale ($\alpha = .92$). For the data set analyzed here, $\alpha = .77$, and improves to .78 if the Sunday frequency item is dropped. To be consistent with previous publications using RBS, we include all six items.

Average Experience Levels

Because we have a random sample of daily U.S. newspapers, our conclusions generalize to newspapers as a medium (at least in the United States). Newspapers, as a medium, might provide some experiences better than other media. Strongly felt experiences by readers might characterize the medium and potentially differentiate it from other media. Likewise, some individual newspapers undoubtedly deliver higher experience levels on, for example, Experience Score 42 (Political bias), than others. This analysis quantifies these notions.

We study average experience levels and variation across newspapers with the following random-effects ANOVA model:

$$x_{ij} = \mu + m_i + e_{ij}$$

where x_{ij} is the experience score for one of the factors for reader j of newspaper i ; μ is the overall mean across newspapers; m_i is the random effect, having mean 0 and standard deviation σ_m , on the mean for newspaper i ; and e_{ij} is

the error term having mean 0 and variance σ^2 . Random variables m_i and e_{ij} are assumed to be normally distributed and independent of one another.

Table 1 gives estimates of overall means (μ) and variation across newspaper (σ_m). Recall that experiences are measured on 5-point scales, where 5 indicates a high level of the experience. The experience with the highest average across newspapers is Experience 6 (Regular part of my day), with $\mu = 3.57$, indicating that readers, on average, rate newspapers between 3 (*neither agree nor disagree*) and 4 (*agree*) on being brief and easy to read. Being a regular part of the reader's day, in part, characterizes newspapers as a medium. Experience 35 (Unwilling to share) has the low-

est average of $\mu = 2.13$, indicating that across newspapers, readers nearly *disagree* (scale point 2) with statements regarding their unwillingness to share the newspapers with others in the household.

Table 1 also provides p values (sixth column) testing the null hypothesis that there is no variation in the means across newspapers ($H_0: \sigma_m^2 = 0$), implying that readers of all newspapers have the same experience. For example, if the variance of Experience 42 were 0, we would conclude that all newspapers are perceived as equally politically biased. For all but 1 of the 44 experience factors, we reject the null hypothesis at the .01 level that there is no variation in mean experience level across newspapers, and con-

Table 1. Mean of Experience Levels Across Newspapers Estimated With a Random-Effects ANOVA Model

Experience	Label	μ	SE(μ)	σ_m	p	σ
13	Makes me smarter	3.47	0.013	.109	.000	.471
31	Drowning in news	2.26	0.009	.054	.005	.471
43	Ad credibility	3.21	0.010	.070	.001	.502
9	Too much	2.42	0.011	.082	.000	.504
40	Lacks distinction	2.51	0.012	.087	.000	.510
37	Uninformative ads	3.16	0.009	.039	.088	.519
5	Something to talk about	3.47	0.013	.103	.000	.522
21	Lack of local focus	2.57	0.011	.081	.000	.528
11	High quality, unique content	3.11	0.016	.142	.000	.541
14	Wasting my time	2.46	0.013	.106	.000	.543
38	Makes me want to read	3.07	0.011	.066	.003	.547
12	All sides of the story	2.99	0.014	.110	.000	.548
4	Touches and inspires me	3.07	0.014	.111	.000	.552
2	My personal timeout	3.01	0.013	.103	.000	.553
18	Makes me more interesting	2.61	0.012	.087	.000	.553
36	Taking a stand	3.40	0.015	.122	.000	.562
17	Annoyed and unimpressed by ads	2.76	0.011	.071	.002	.569
16	Ad usefulness	3.16	0.013	.093	.000	.577
20	People I know	3.42	0.027	.251	.000	.582
22	Skim and scan	3.07	0.011	.072	.002	.583
34	Unappealing stories	2.77	0.013	.097	.000	.588
1	Looks out for my interests	3.15	0.015	.118	.000	.590
25	Turned on by surprise and humor	3.00	0.012	.079	.001	.598
19	Makes me anxious	2.99	0.013	.089	.000	.599
27	Gender bias	2.56	0.012	.075	.002	.603
8	Grabs me visually	3.17	0.015	.114	.000	.608
15	Shows me diversity	3.49	0.020	.180	.000	.626
7	Clip and save	2.70	0.014	.104	.000	.647
33	News junkie	2.71	0.015	.112	.000	.650
24	Commands my attention	2.72	0.014	.102	.000	.658
23	Poor service	2.45	0.015	.108	.000	.663
29	Awkward to handle	2.32	0.015	.108	.000	.665
42	Political bias	2.93	0.018	.145	.000	.699
32	My dining companion	3.00	0.029	.265	.000	.717
6	Regular part of my day	3.57	0.014	.085	.004	.720
44	Pick up or take with me	2.68	0.017	.129	.000	.720
10	I connect with writers	3.03	0.018	.145	.000	.721
41	Guide me	2.76	0.015	.095	.001	.734
35	Unwilling to share	2.13	0.015	.100	.002	.765
3	Reading on the Web	2.21	0.017	.122	.000	.772
30	Value for my money	2.50	0.016	.104	.001	.790
39	Pass it around	3.29	0.017	.120	.000	.794
26	Like to critique	3.04	0.016	.107	.001	.807
28	Media multitasking	3.00	0.023	.182	.000	.967

clude newspapers differ in the level or degree for each experience.

Even though these standard deviations are highly significant, many are rather small in absolute magnitude due to the large sample size. Values of σ_m (fifth column) indicate how much experiences vary across newspapers. For example, the standard deviation of Experience Score 6 (Regular part of my day) is $\sigma_m = 0.085$; under the assumption that the means across newspapers are at least reasonably normally distributed, approximately 68% of newspapers will have means within ± 0.085 scale points, 95% within ± 0.17 , and so on. Experience 20 (People I know) has one of the largest standard deviations ($\sigma_m = 0.265$). This scale measures how often people see stories about people they know in the paper. This makes sense because one would expect some newspapers to have more of a local flavor than others. Newspapers differentiate themselves from other newspapers on the amount of local coverage.

It is of interest to examine the variation in experience in a different way. Values of σ (column 7) indicate the extent to which readers of a newspaper agree on the experience. Experiences such as 28 (Media multitasking) with $\sigma = 0.97$, 26 (Like to critique) with $\sigma = 0.81$, and 39 (Pass it around) with $\sigma = 0.79$ have particularly large values, indicating large within-newspaper variation. Some readers simultaneously consume other media, critique the writing, and give the paper to others, but many do not have these experiences. Experiences with the most agreement are 13 (Makes me smarter) and 31 (Drowning in the news), both with $\sigma \approx 0.47$. Experiences 43 (Ad credibility) and 9 (Too much) also have small error variance. Within a newspaper, readers agree more on the extent to which the paper makes them smarter and that they are drowning in news.

Relation Between Newspaper Readership and Experience Scores

We hypothesized that experiences drive usage. This section quantifies the concomitant variation between experiences and readership to provide support for this hypothesis. If an experience correlates significantly with usage (the overt behavior of readers) across the newspapers, this is clear evidence that the experience is common across newspapers. Further, experiences that are uncorrelated with readership for some newspapers but correlated for others are said to be *idiosyncratic*. Idiosyncratic experiences are thus indicated when the variance of the correlation between the experience and usage across newspapers is positive. When experience is uncorrelated with readership for all newspapers and the variance not different from 0, then the experience is uninteresting. The level or degree of experience can thus be examined for newspa-

pers in general (as a medium) or for a specific newspaper and compared to others.

More generally, the extent to which experiences relate to media usage provides evidence about the relative importance of different experiences. At least in terms of current media practices, more important experiences should be the ones most associated with usage.

We relate each experience to readership for each of the 101 newspapers analyzed simultaneously with hierarchical linear models (HLM; Kreft & DeLeeuw, 1998) of the form:

$$y_{ij} = (\alpha + a_i) + (\beta + b_i)x_{ij} + e_{ij},$$

where y_{ij} is the RBS of person j of newspaper i , x_{ij} is the measure of an experience, α is the overall intercept, a_i is the random effect on the intercept for newspaper i having mean 0 and variance σ_a^2 , β is the overall slope, b_i is the random effect on the slope with mean 0 and variance σ_b^2 , and e_{ij} is the error term having mean 0 and variance σ^2 . Random variables a_i , b_i , and e_{ij} are assumed to be normally distributed and independent of one another. All models are estimated in SAS proc mixed, Release 8.2.

Table 2 gives estimates from 44 models, sorted in descending order of the overall slopes estimates. Experience 5 (Something to talk about) has the largest positive slope. Across newspapers, its average slope is $\beta = 0.88$. Every unit increase in this scale is associated with an RBS increase of 0.88 scale points, on average. Some slopes are negative. The slope for Experience 5 (Wasting my time) is $\beta = -0.92$, indicating the more people agree with this statement, the less they read the newspaper. Some experiences have slopes that are approximately 0. The p values in the next column evaluate the null hypothesis $H_0: \beta = 0$, that the experience has no linear effect on readership, versus a two-sided alternative. For example, we cannot reject this null hypothesis for Experience 28 (Media multitasking). At least with these data, we cannot conclude these experiences are associated with RBS.

Values of σ_b tell how much slopes vary across newspapers; $\sigma_b = 0$ indicates the slopes have no variance, implying all newspapers have the same slope. For Experience 2 (My personal timeout), SAS is unable to detect variance across newspapers ($\sigma_b = 0$), indicating the slopes for Experience 2 do not vary across newspapers. Providing readers with a timeout has the same effect on readership for all newspapers. This is the case with most newspaper experiences. In some cases SAS is able to estimate positive variation across newspapers, but the variance is not significantly different from 0. For example, Experience 5 (Something to talk about) has a standard deviation in slopes across newspapers of $\sigma_b = 0.014$, but the p value testing the null hypothesis that this standard deviation is 0 is .469.

Table 2. Slope Estimates Using HLM

<i>Experience</i>	<i>Label</i>	β	<i>p</i>	σ_b	<i>p</i>	σ
5	Something to talk about	0.88	.000	.014	.469	1.13
13	Makes me smarter	0.81	.000	.000		1.16
1	Looks out for my interests	0.80	.000	.000		1.13
6	Regular part of my day	0.77	.000	.000		1.09
20	People I know	0.72	.000	.000		1.14
4	Touches and inspires me	0.54	.000	.049	.245	1.19
2	My personal timeout	0.50	.000	.000		1.18
11	High quality, unique content	0.45	.000	.000		1.20
18	Makes me more interesting	0.44	.000	.083	.053	1.19
36	Taking a stand	0.42	.000	.000		1.20
7	Clip and save	0.39	.000	.092	.010	1.19
10	I connect with writers	0.39	.000	.041	.263	1.18
8	Grabs me visually	0.36	.000	.018	.459	1.20
24	Commands my attention	0.34	.000	.078	.049	1.20
25	Turned on by surprise and humor	0.32	.000	.035	.359	1.21
15	Shows me diversity	0.32	.000	.034	.313	1.21
12	All sides of the story	0.31	.000	.000		1.21
32	My dining companion	0.28	.000	.000		1.21
43	Ad credibility	0.27	.000	.000		1.22
39	Pass it around	0.17	.000	.000		1.21
16	Ad usefulness	0.16	.000	.067	.059	1.22
30	Value for my money	0.15	.000	.090	.012	1.21
19	Makes me anxious	0.09	.004	.020	.450	1.22
35	Unwilling to share	0.06	.045	.111	.004	1.22
26	Like to critique	0.05	.060	.093	.005	1.22
42	Political bias	0.04	.148	.062	.128	1.21
28	Media multitasking	0.04	.050	.000		1.22
33	News junkie	0.01	.690	.107	.002	1.22
44	Pick up or take with me	0.00	.947	.106	.003	1.22
37	Uninformative ads	-0.03	.468	.000		1.22
41	Guide me	-0.05	.088	.054	.188	1.22
3	Reading on the Web	-0.15	.000	.081	.046	1.21
34	Unappealing stories	-0.20	.000	.107	.001	1.21
17	Annoyed and unimpressed by ads	-0.22	.000	.090	.036	1.21
38	Makes me want to read	-0.23	.000	.032	.394	1.21
27	Gender bias	-0.23	.000	.118	.001	1.21
23	Poor service	-0.27	.000	.122	.000	1.21
21	Lack of local focus	-0.27	.000	.100	.019	1.21
29	Awkward to handle	-0.34	.000	.081	.050	1.19
40	Lacks distinction	-0.43	.000	.106	.012	1.20
9	Too much	-0.54	.000	.101	.025	1.19
22	Skim and scan	-0.56	.000	.070	.101	1.18
31	Drowning in news	-0.70	.000	.143	.000	1.17
14	Wasting my time	-0.92	.000	.117	.001	1.11

However, there is significant, or nearly significant, variation in slopes across newspapers for some experiences. Experience 31 (Drowning in the news) has $\sigma_b = 0.143$, which is highly significant ($p = .000$). This indicates that for some newspapers, feeling drowned by the news is less correlated with readership than for others. Based on the assumption that the slopes have a normal distribution across newspapers, 99.7% of newspapers should have drowning-in-the-news slopes between $-0.70 \pm 3 \times 0.143$, all of which are negative. Therefore, drowning in the news has a negative association with readership for all newspapers, but it is more negative for some. Experience 33 (News

junkie) has highly significant variance in slopes, yet the grand slope β is not significantly different from 0, indicating this factor is idiosyncratic. For some newspapers, being a news junkie is associated with readership but not for others. Neither the slope nor the variance of Experience 37 (Uninformative ads) is significant, making this factor uninteresting.

In view of the across-newspaper relations between the experiences and usage behavior obtained here, the data are sufficient to establish that almost all of the newspaper experiences relate to RBS. There are four uninteresting experiences and four idiosyncratic ones. The other experi-

ences relate to usage behavior across newspapers in a manner that implies that they are potentially useful metrics for any newspaper and certainly for newspapers as a medium.

Conclusions

This research confirms that reading newspapers is a rich, multidimensional experience. The qualitative phase and factor analysis of the quantitative data identify experiences that are common across a random sample of 101 U.S. daily newspapers. Our analysis indicates that these experiences apply to newspapers as a medium and to individual newspapers. By regressing usage on experiences with HLMs, we show that across newspapers, greater usage is associated with higher experience levels for most experiences. To reiterate, the results indicate a robust relation such that it is worthwhile to consider these experiences in connection with newspapers as a medium or with any individual newspaper.

Once the existence of common experiences is established, it is of most interest to note that newspapers as a medium are certainly higher on some experiences than others and individual newspapers vary in their level or degree of an experience. Tables 1 and 2 show the overall pattern of how the industry and individual newspapers stand on the experiences identified in this research. Newspapers as a medium are high on experiences such as: Regular part of my day, Shows me diversity, and Something to talk about. Our conclusion from these results is that these experiences represent the strengths of the medium. There may be strategic reasons for any individual newspaper to discount one or more of them, but otherwise individual newspapers ignore them at their peril. They represent a new, more complete way of looking at the value that newspapers provide.

Beyond this, the broader implications of this research are, in our view, fivefold. First, newspaper readership cannot be entirely understood or evaluated only in terms of usage behavior (and given our previously reported results, especially not in terms of single, narrow measures of usage such as whether a person read yesterday). There is a subjective, qualitative side of readership, as measured by the experiences proposed here, that must be considered as well. Second, newspaper reading experiences are highly multidimensional. We have identified at least 44 newspaper experiences that appear to be sufficiently separate enough constructs to warrant consideration in further research and practice.

The third implication is that for each of the experiences identified, this research provides survey measures that could be incorporated into industry-level research and into benchmarking research by individual newspapers. This would have the incidental benefit of refining

the present experience measures and adding new ones. Fourth, these results also bear on the issue of media-neutral media planning. To the extent that newspaper experiences are found to be different from the experience of other media, this could provide a way of evaluating each medium more fully on its own merits. Finally, a better understanding of experiences may also be beneficial in designing and evaluating newspaper advertising as creative. There is a need to view the media environment not just in terms of exposure but of context as well.

Bobby J. Calder

(calder@northwestern.edu)

is the Charles H. Kellstadt Distinguished Professor of Marketing, Psychology, and Journalism, Director of Research at the Media Management Center, and Director of the Center for Cultural Marketing, all at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL. Calder's research focuses on marketing research, marketing planning, and consumer behavior.

Edward C. Malthouse

(ecm@northwestern.edu)

is Associate Professor in the Integrated Marketing Communications Department at the Medill School of Journalism and the Senior Research Statistician of Medill and the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL. His research focuses on media and database marketing.

Endnotes

1. <http://www.medill.nwu.edu/faculty/malthouse/ftp/npexp.html>

References

- Berry, S., Hercocock, C., & Beard, L. (2003). "If they need it they'll read it"—Understanding readers' needs. In *Proceedings of the Worldwide Readership Symposium* (pp. 253–267).
- Brown, M. (1999). *Effective print media measurement*. CITY, England: Ipsos-RSLLimited.
- Burgoon, J., & Burgoon, M. (1980). Predictors of newspaper readership. *Journalism Quarterly*, 57, 489–596.
- Calder, B. J. (2001). Understanding consumers. In D. Iacobucci (Ed.), *Kellogg on marketing* (pp. 151–164). New York: Wiley.
- Calder, B. J., & Malthouse, E. C. (2003a). The behavioral score approach to dependent variables. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13, 387–394.
- Calder, B. J., & Malthouse, E. C. (2003b). What is integrated marketing. In D. Iacobucci & B. J. Calder (Eds.), *Kellogg on integrated marketing* (pp. 6–15). New York: Wiley.

- Kreft, I., & DeLeeuw, J. (1998). *Introducing multilevel modeling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Loges, W., & Ball-Rokeach, S. (1993). Dependency relations and newspaper readership, *Journalism Quarterly*, 70, 602-614.
- Malthouse, E. C., & Calder, B. J. (2002). Patterns of readership: A qualitative variable approach. *International Journal on Media Management*, 4(4), 248-260.
- Malthouse, E. C., Calder, B. J., & Eadie, W. (2003). Conceptualizing and measuring magazine reader experiences. In *Proceedings of the Worldwide Readership Symposium* (pp. 285-306).
- Schoenbach, K., Lauf, E., McLeod, J., & Scheufele, D. (1999). Sociodemographic determinants of newspaper reading in the USA and Germany, 1974-96. *European Journal of Communication*, 14, 225-239.