Conceptualizing and Measuring Magazine Reader Experiences

Edward C. Malthouse
Integrated Marketing Communications
Northwestern University

Bobby J. Calder
Kellogg Graduate School of Management
Northwestern University

Wayne P. Eadie
Senior Vice President, Research
Magazine Publishers of America

December 19, 2003

Abstract

A variety of approaches have been developed, and used as an advertising currency, to measure magazine readership in terms of the behavior of readers. The number of issues read in a period is one such measure. In contrast the research reported here compliments previous approaches by focusing on the conceptualization and measurement of the subjective, qualitative experiences that people have when they read magazines. The result is a set of experiences that are common across widely-read magazines and scales for their measurement.

1 Introduction

The goal of this research is to provide quantitative measures of readership that reflect the qualitative experience of reading magazines. Many readership measures have been proposed and used. Most were motivated by concerns about readership as an indicator of potential exposure to advertising. Measures such as "the number of issues read in the last four issues" presently have the most currency.

In terms of readership, these are best viewed as "usage" measures. The "number of issues read" usage measure is of interest primarily because it is also considered a good indicator of potential exposure to advertising. In general, usage measures of readership reflect behavior-how people consume a magazine. Implications for advertising aside, they are no different than measures of usage for other products, e.g., number of ounces of butter per month consumed. (For further discussion of readership usage measurement issues along these lines, see Calder and Malthouse, 2003 and Malthouse and Calder, 2002.)

Usage measures of readership can be distinguished from the more subjective or qualitative side of reading. It is one thing to read two issues of a magazine versus three issues. It is quite another to be engrossed in reading a magazine or to want to tell other people about what you have read. The latter entails not just overt behaviors, but the cognitive, emotional, and social correlates of reading. Many words could be used for this aspect of reading. In the magazine industry words such as "involvement with magazines" or "magazine wantedness" or simply "qualitative measures" have been used. We use the term "experience" because it captures the concept that this is what people think and feel when they read and because it is not a unidimensional continuum (as implied by involvement or wantedness). We postulate that there are many (multidimensional) experiences associated with reading magazines.

Experiences are conceptual, theoretical constructs. By this we do not mean that they are not real. A construct for our purposes is simply a variable that is not directly observable because it is either too complex or too subjective to be captured by a single survey question. Thus, in our view, magazine experiences are best viewed as constructs because they are

complex, subjective reactions that cannot be *defined* by any one specific survey question. As constructs they must be inferred from multiple indicators such as batteries of survey questions and, again, cannot to be defined as specific survey questions, e.g., "Is this magazine a favorite?"

As a construct an experience has multiple indicators (survey questions) that serve to both measure the construct and separate it from other experience constructs. Thus, our approach is to begin with many potential survey questions that may or may not indicate a variety of experience constructs. These questions are then 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.

An example of a potential survey question indicator of an experience construct is the following survey question item: "I like to have the magazine around so that others might read it." There is no a priori assumption about what construct this item indicates. People are asked to agree or disagree with this item with regard to a particular magazine, then this data is analyzed along with the data from a large number of other items to determine if it, along with some other items, indicates a separate experience construct. The analysis also reveals whether it should be used as an indicator of that construct in future magazine studies.

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? To us it seems best to "ground" the selection of items in data from readers about their reading experiences. Accordingly, our approach is to base the item pool on qualitative interviews with consumers. To this end, in-depth qualitative interviews were used to allow readers to describe their experiences with particular magazines. Readers were encouraged to verbalize any thought or feeling that expressed their experience. This data was analyzed to find patterns that were repeated across individuals. The goal of this research is not quantitative generalization of frequencies but an enhanced understanding of consumer thoughts and emotions (see Calder, 2001).

The second issue that arises is how to represent different magazines. Our approach was to use magazines with the largest audiences. By definition, these magazines cover the reading experiences of a very large number of people and span the MRI (Mediamark Research, Inc.) categories. Specifically, we screened for readers of the top 100 MRI magazines. These magazines represent 96.2% of net readers of all MRI-measured titles. (See Appendix 3 below for the categories of magazines.) Two titles were excluded; one no longer published and another that did not contain advertising as content. Two business magazines were added to better represent that category. We then conducted individual interviews about one magazine a person read. The items developed from this qualitative research were thus derived from the thoughts and emotions of readers as expressed in interviews about one specific magazine, with multiple interviews conducted for a set of widely read magazines. The quantitative analysis followed a similar logic with a survey conducted with readers about a specific magazine that they read, with multiple survey respondents for each of the 100 magazines.

2 Variation across Magazines

A key feature of this research is that we wanted to reach conclusions about the experiences involved in reading magazines. Any one magazine may no doubt involve some experiences that are unique to it. But this research postulates and attempts to show that there are some experiences that exist across magazines. Whether such experiences exist is an empirical question to be answered by the research.

If there are common experiences across magazines, it is to be expected that some magazines will be higher or lower in terms of the level of any one experience. This should not be confused with the issue of whether there are unique experiences. We are looking for experiences that are sufficiently generalizable enough across magazines that it is potentially worthwhile to measure the level or degree of that experience for any magazine. The payoff is that the measurement of these common experiences provides a way to profile magazines in a comparable way and, even more importantly, to find a way to represent the experiences associated with the medium as a whole (which could be used in the future to compare magazines with other media, such as television).

In terms of research methodology (described in detail below), we take a three-step approach to the identification of common experiences. First, we begin with an item pool of survey question indicators that is based on thoughts and feelings expressed in qualitative interviews about many widely-read magazines. (Note that the rationale for using widely-read magazines is not only to span the reading experiences of a large number of people but also to look for common experiences in a set of commonly read magazines. We would expect a magazine about ferrets, for instance, or some other rare interest, to be associated with more idiosyncratic experiences.)

Second, we conduct an analysis of the survey items collapsing over magazines. The items all refer to a specific magazine for the survey respondent, but since the same items are used for each magazine, the data can be analyzed without regard to the specific publication. This is what is meant by collapsing over magazines. In effect, this assumes that the aggregated data is at the industry level and refers to magazines as a medium. We are seeking experience constructs that apply across magazines. An item such as "I like to have the magazine around so that others might look at it" is taken as a reaction a reader could have to a greater or lesser extent for any of the 100 magazines. It is a reaction to magazines.

So, in steps one and two we begin by assuming that the data refers to magazines as a medium and seek to determine experiences that are common to the medium. In a third step, however, we *test* the assumption that the experiences indicated by the data are in fact generalizable across magazines. We do this by examining the relationship between each of the experiences and the usage (readership) of each individual title. If an experience correlates significantly with usage (which is the overt behavior of readers) across the 100 magazines, this is clear evidence that the particular experience is an experience common across magazines. (If the experience is uncorrelated with readership and the variance of the correlations for individual magazines is positive, then the experience is idiosyncratic. If the experience is uncorrelated with readership and the variance for individual magazines is low, then the experience is uninteresting.) The level or degree of that experience can then be examined for magazines in general (as a medium) or for a specific magazine (and compared to other magazines).

3 Methodology

3.1 Qualitative Phase

Qualitative research was used, as noted above, to generate the initial set of experience items. One hundred one-hour interviews were conducted with readers. Each interview focused on only one of the 100 magazines. Interviews were conducted for 68 of the magazines.

The interviews followed a qualitative format but were structured around the following. Participants were first asked about what they liked or disliked about the magazine. They were then told: "I want to focus now on what reading (magazine) is like for you. What the experience of reading it is like. Do you understand what I mean? (If no, this was explained further.) I'll ask you about this in a number of different ways. Try to tell me what reading (magazine) is really like for you personally."

Participants were then asked about situations (times and places etc). They were probed about reading as an end in itself or as a means to an end or goal. They were asked about talking to others about what they read, how reading made them feel, what kind of mood it put them in and any behaviors that resulted from reading. They were also asked about their awareness and interest in advertising in the magazine. A final set of probes took the form of complete-the-sentence projective questions. Examples of these are: When I am not reading (magazine) I am most likely to think of it when _____. If I were to pick up (magazine) just before going to bed, I _____. A name that would better describe (magazine) would be _____. The pictures in (magazine) make me _____. I trust (magazine) not to _____. Another set of probes asked them to use a word (e.g., experience, want, anticipate, helps, worry) in a sentence about the magazine.

The complete set of items generated is given in Appendix 2. These are shown in the form used in the quantitative survey. (Two different orders were used in the survey.)

3.2 Survey Phase

Sampling. The same sample of 100 magazines used in the qualitative phase, as described above, was also used in the survey phase. These magazines were used to provide a strong test of whether the magazine experiences were common across magazines.

We sampled readers of these magazines using a two-wave procedure. The first wave was a mail survey to identify readers of each of the 100 magazines. The second wave involved mailing selected responders a longer survey containing the survey question items developed in the qualitative research.

Wave 1. We mailed 22,810 surveys to a random sample of NFO household panel members. This included an over-sampling of teenagers, Generation X, African Americans, and Hispanics. A total of 11,494 usable questionnaires were returned, giving a 50.4% response rate. The survey asked up to three members of the household to complete the survey. The three members were indicated on the survey and selected from a sampling frame provided by NFO. From the 11,494 returned surveys by households, a total of 19,004 individuals completed the question. Individuals were asked whether or not they read each of the 100 magazines. For each of the magazines they read, they were asked how much time they spent reading it, how often they read it, and how completely they read the issues. The 19,004 individual respondents yielded a total of 80,536 magazine experiences.

Wave 2. The goal of this wave was to survey a random sample *of readers* of each of the 100 magazines. We define a reader as someone who reads or looks into the magazine at least once in a typical month. To avoid difficult problems with doing statistical inference during our analysis, we decided to interview at most one person from each of the households that returned a survey. Each person was asked about one of the magazines they read. We computed weights for each magazine experience and used a random sampling procedure with these weights to select roughly the same number of people for each of the 100 magazines. (The details for these weights are available from the authors.) This guarantees a random sample of magazine-person experiences. In total, 4,347 of the 6,085 surveys mailed were returned giving a 71% response rate to this wave of the survey. Overall the response rate was .50 4 .71 = 36%. Respondents were weighted to the U.S. Census and included demos such as age, gender, and race.

3.3 Measuring Readership and Consumer Experiences

Reader Usage Measure (RUM). As described above, the logic of our approach called for relating experiences to usage behavior in order to determine if the experiences are common across magazines. Accordingly, the first section of the survey included questions (Q2–Q10) measuring many different aspects of how the respondent read the specific magazine. These included the number of issues out of every four published that the respondent read or looked into (Q2); time spent looking into an issue (Q3); number of days read or looked at an issue (Q4); number of times per month that the respondent read or looked into any issues of the magazine (Q5); total time per month reading any issue of the magazine (Q6); fraction of pages, articles, and advertisements looked at in a typical month (Q7); days of the week when respondent reads magazine (Q8); times of the day read (Q9); and where the respondent reads (Q10). Question 8 was recoded as a count of the number of days in a typical week that the respondent reads, question 9 was recoded as the number of times during a day, and question 10 was recoded as the number of places. We factor analyzed the nine questions using the principal components method of estimation and a varimax rotation. Three eigenvalues were greater than 1. Questions 2–7 had loadings of .5 or more on the first factor. Two items, Q8 (number of days in week read) and Q9 (number of times during the day), had loadings greater than .5 on the second factor. The item Q10, number of places read, was the only item that had a loading of at least .5 on the third factor. We purified the first factor using coefficient alpha, which increases when Q2 and Q7 are dropped from the scale. Our final readership usage scale has an alpha of .82 and consists of the four items Q3–Q6. We confirmed this scale further by running a factor analysis on these four items alone and found that one eigenvalue was greater than one and all factor loadings were .81 or more.

It is of interest to note that completeness did not enter into this scale. We have found for newspapers that completeness did enter into a similar scale (Malt-

house and Calder, 2002). This makes sense in that people may not think of going through magazines in the same way that they think of reading through the newspaper.

Having concluded that the four items Q3-Q6 formed a unidimensional readership usage scale, we had to decide on exactly how to average the four items. We recommend having readership scaled so that the minimum value is 1, indicating a nonreader, and the maximum value is 7. To achieve this, we convert each of the four items to have minimum value 1 and maximum value 7. For example, Q3, total time looking at an issue, was measured on a 1–14 scale on the survey; we converted this to a 1–7 scale with the following transformation $1 + 6(x - 1)/13$, where x is a response. After converting the four items to have 1-7 scales, we computed the simple average as our measurement of readership. We prefer this approach over using factor scores because the simple average will always have minimum value 1, indicating a nonreader. Scores from factor analysis will have mean 0 and standard deviation 1. Since the mean and standard deviation depend on the particular sample drawn and the magazines included in the survey, the readership score for a nonreader would not be fixed and the unit of measurement (standard deviation) would be sample dependent. Our scores are highly correlated with factor scores, so the method of averaging should not affect conclusions when relating readership to other variables. The correlation between our readership score and the factor scores from a principal components analysis is .99962 and the correlation with factor scores from a maximum likelihood analysis is .99729. Based on this analysis, subsequent analyses use this scale as a reliable measure of usage readership, which we term the Reader Usage Measure (RUM).

Experience Scores. The majority of the survey contained a total of 220 items measuring the experience of reading a specific magazine. These are the items from the qualitative research (see Appendix 2). We used exploratory factor analysis and coefficient alpha to form 39 experience scores. We first factor analyzed all 220 items using the principal components method of estimation and a varimax rotation. There were 41 eigenvalues greater than one, although many eigenvalues were close to one and a scree plot suggested that 30–45 factors would be reasonable. Some of the factors had many items. For example the first factor had 43 items that loaded most heavily on it with 27 of the loadings greater than .5 and the remaining items with loadings greater than .4. We factor analyzed these 43 items separately and found 10 eigenvalues greater than 1. Our general approach for developing factors from this large set of items was as follows:

1. Factor analyze all items
2. Run separate factor analyses on each factor from Step 1
3. If the factor analysis from Step 2 indicates the scale is unidimensional based on inspection of a scree plot, purify the scale by (1) dropping items with loadings less than .5 and (2) dropping any items that cause coefficient alpha to increase
4. If the factor analysis in Step 2 was not unidimensional, we continued to factor the factors until we found unidimensional scales

The analysis resulted in 39 experience scores (factors). See Appendix 1 for a list of the items included in each scale, the factor loadings from a separate factor analysis of the items, and coefficient alpha. The final scores (scale values) are the simple averages of the items.

A few of the Experience Score scales have moderately low values of alpha, indicating low reliability. In most cases, the low values of alpha are due to having too few indicators of the underlying construct on the survey. In future research, we recommend developing additional items for these scales and thereby improving their reliability.

4 Results

Having derived measures of magazine experiences and usage behavior, we can now examine two central issues. One is the level or degree of each experience for magazines as a medium and for different magazines. The key results here are shown in Table 1. It presents the grand mean - averaged across magazines - for each experience and the variation across magazines (measured by the standard deviation), showing how different magazines are in the level or degree of

that experience. The magnitude of these differences is explored in the section below with an analysis of variance. Following this in the next section, we report the test of whether the experiences are indeed common across magazines by examining the relationship between reading behavior and specific experiences.

4.1 Comparing Experiences Across Magazines

This section explores the extent to which the level or degree of an experience varies across magazines. For example, one might expect some magazines to be experienced by readers as being higher on Experience Score 16 (It helps me look good; it's sensual, even sexy). We study such variation across magazines 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 magazine i, μ is the overall mean across magazines, m_i is the random effect on the mean for magazine i having means 0 and standard deviation σ_m, 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.

Estimates of the overall means (μ) and the variation across magazine (σ_m) are shown in Table 1. Recall that experiences are measured on scales ranging from 1 to 5, where 5 indicates a high level of the experience. The experience with the highest average across magazines is Experience Score 27 (It's brief and easy for me to read), with μ =3.5 indicating that readers, on average, rate magazines between "Neither agree nor disagree" (scale point 3) and "Agree" (scale point 4) on being brief and easy to read. Experience Score 9 (It reinforces my faith) has the lowest average experience with μ =2.2, indicating that across these 100 magazines, readers nearly "Disagree" (scale point 2) with the statements regarding their faith being reinforced.

Table 1 also provides P values (sixth column) testing the null hypothesis that there is no variation in the means across magazines (i.e., $H_0 : \sigma_m^2 = 0$), implying that readers of all magazines have the same experience. For example, if the variance of Experience Score 16 were 0, we would conclude that all magazines are perceived as equally sexy. So for all 39 experience factors, we can reject the null hypothesis that there is no variation in mean experience level across magazines. We conclude that magazines differ in the level or degree for each of the different experiences.

The values of σ_m (fifth column) indicate how much experiences vary across magazines. The highest variation is for Experience Score 14 (It helps me keep track of celebrities.) with $\sigma_m = 0.42$. This indicates that magazines vary substantially on the celebrity experience. Under the assumption that the means across magazine are normal, we can conclude that 68% of magazines have celebrity means between $3.1 \pm .42$, 95% of magazines have means between $3.1 \pm .0424 \times 2$, etc. Readers of some magazines have particularly high means on the celebrity factor, while readers of others have particularly low means on the celebrity factor. Other experiences that have large variation across magazines include Experience Score 16 (It helps me look good; it's sensual, even sexy), Experience Score 11 (I save and refer to it), Experience Score 9 (It reinforces my faith), and Experience Score 6 (I'm touched). Experience Scores such as 31 (It's part of my routine) have much smaller variation across magazines, indicating that magazines are more similar on these experiences.

It may also be of interest to examine the variation in experience in a different way. The values of σ in the last column indicate the extent to which readers of a magazine agree on the experience. Experience Scores such as 11 (I save and refer to it) with $\sigma = .92$, 9 (It reinforces my faith) with $\sigma = .81$, and 12 (This magazine's web site is important to me.) with $\sigma = .81$ have particularly large values, indicating large variation within-magazine. Readers of magazines do not agree about saving a magazine - some save it and others don't. There is more agreement on Experience Score 27 (It's brief and easy for me to read) with $\sigma = .48$.

4.2 Relationship between Reader Usage Measure (RUM) and Experience Scores

We now focus on the critical question of whether the 39 experience scores as indicated by their associated

survey question measures are really common experiences across magazines. To test this, we relate each of the experiences to the RUM for each of the 100 magazines analyzed simultaneously with hierarchical linear models, also known as random coefficient models (e.g., see Kreft and DeLeeuw 1998). Recall that the logic of our approach is that if an experience is common across magazines it should be related to the usage across the 100 magazines. Further: If the experience is uncorrelated with usage and the variance of the correlations for individual magazines is positive, then experience is idiosyncratic. If the experience is uncorrelated with usage and the variance for individual magazines is low, then the experience is uninteresting.

Statistically, we use hierarchical linear models (HLM) of the following form:

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

where y_{ij} is the RUM of person j of magazine i, x_{ij} is the experience score for some factor, α is the overall intercept, a_i is the random effect on the intercept for magazine i having means 0 and standard deviation σ_a, β is the overall slope, b_i is the random effect on the slope for magazine i having mean 0 and standard deviation σ_b, 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.

Estimates from the 39 estimated models are provided in Table 2 below. The Experience Scores are sorted in descending order of the slope estimates. The experience having the largest slope is Experience Score 1 (I get value for my time and money). Across magazines, the average slope (across magazines) for Experience Score 1 is $\beta = .75$. For every unit increase in this scale, on average RUM increases by .75 scale points. Some slopes are negative. The slope for Experience Score 20 (it disappoints me) is $\beta = -.73$, indicating that the more a person agrees with this statement, the less the person reads the magazine.

A few of the experiences have slopes that are approximately 0. The P-values in the next column evaluate the null hypothesis $H0 : \beta = 0$, that the experience factor has no linear effect on readership, against a two-sided alternative. We cannot reject this null hypothesis for Experience Score 36 (I want more ad information), 12 (This magazine's web site is important to me.), and 21 (It leaves me feeling bad). At least with the data we have, we cannot conclude that these experiences have an effect on RUM.

The value of sb tells how much the slopes vary across magazines; if it were 0, then the slopes would have no variance, implying that all magazines have the same slope. For Experience Score 2 (It makes me smarter), SAS is unable to detect variance across magazines and the estimate is 0, indicating that based on these data, the slopes for Experience Score 2 do not vary across magazines. Making the reader smarter has the same effect on readership for all magazines. This is the case with most experience factors. In some cases SAS is able to estimate positive variation across magazines, but the variance term is not significantly different from 0. For example, with Experience Score 1 (I get value for my time and money) the standard deviation in slope across magazines is σ_b =.022, but the P-value testing the null hypothesis that this standard deviation is 0 is 0.395.

But there is significant, or nearly significant, variation in slopes across magazines for some of the experiences. Factor 12 (This magazine's web site is important to me) has σ_b =.085, which is highly significant (P=.009). This indicates that for some magazines, using the web is more correlated with readership than for other magazines. Experience Score 21 (It leaves me feeling bad) has a nearly significant variance in slopes, yet the grand slope b is not significantly different from 0. This indicates that this factor is idiosyncratic. For some magazines, making a person feel bad affects readership but for others it has no effect. Our sample sizes for each magazine are, on average, 40. Larger sample sizes would likely allow for more variation across magazines to be estimated.

In view of the across-magazine relationships between the experiences and usage behavior obtained here, the data is sufficient to establish that almost all of the experiences relate to RUM. Across magazines, experiences 36 (I want more ad information), 21 (It leaves me feeling bad.), and 12 (This magazine's web site is important to me.) have correlations that are not significantly different than zero, suggesting at most only a weak relationship to RUM. The other experience scores relate to usage behavior across magazines in a manner that implies that they are potentially useful metrics for any magazine and

certainly for magazines as a medium.

5 Conclusions

These research results confirm that involvement with magazines, as a medium, is a rich set of multidimensional experiences. The research identifies experiences that are common across 100 of the most widely-read magazines. The data further indicates that these experiences apply not only to magazines as a medium but very generally to individual magazines. Certainly attention to these experiences is warranted by the magazine industry. Individual magazines should realize that these experiences are likely to be important for their readers.

A test of whether each experience is implicated in the reading behavior across magazines confirms that these experiences are indeed general. Greater usage is associated with higher levels of experience (the three potential exceptions are noted in the results above). Thus, the methodology used in this research directly assessed the extent to which the experience-usage relationship varies across magazines. To reiterate, the results indicate a robust relationship such that it is worthwhile to consider these experiences in connection with magazines as a medium or with any individual magazine.

Once the existence of common experiences is established, it is of most interest to note that magazines as a medium are certainly higher on some experiences than others and individual magazines vary in their level or degree of an experience.

Table 1 displays a picture of the overall pattern of how the industry and individual magazines stand on the experiences identified in this research. Magazines as a medium are high on experiences such as: "It's brief and easy for me to read (27)," "I learn things first here (25)," "It makes me smarter (2)," "I get value for my time and money (1)" and "It grabs me visually (13)." Our conclusion from these results is that these experiences represent the strengths of the medium. There may be strategic reasons for any individual magazine to discount one or more of them, but otherwise individual magazines ignore them at their peril. They represent a new, more complete way of looking at the value that magazines provide.

Beyond this, the broader implications of this research are, in our view, five-fold:

1. Magazine readership cannot be entirely understood or evaluated only in terms of usage behavior (and given our RUM results, especially not in terms of narrow measures of usage). There is a subjective, qualitative side of readership that must be considered as well.

2. The magazine reading experience is highly multidimensional. We have identified at least 36 experiences that appear to be sufficiently separate enough constructs to warrant consideration in further research and practice.

3. 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 magazines/companies. This would have the incidental benefit of refining the present experience measures and adding new ones.

4. These results also bear on the issue of media-neutral media planning. To the extent that magazine reading experiences are eventually 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.

5. A better understanding of experiences may also be of beneficial in designing and evaluating magazine advertising creative.

In future work, we will explore the following: whether stronger experiences in magazines enhance advertising; whether experiences differ across reader segments; and how magazines can change reader experiences.

6 References

- Calder, Bobby J. Understanding Consumers. In Dawn Iacobucci (ed.), *Kellogg on Marketing*, Wiley, 2001, pp. 151–164.

- Calder, Bobby J. and Edward C. Malthouse (2003), The Behavioral Score Approach to Dependent Variables, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13(4): 387-94.

- Kreft, Ita and Jan DeLeeuw (1998), *Introducing Multilevel Modeling*, Sage Publications.
- Malthouse, Edward C. and Bobby J. Calder (2002), Patterns of Readership: A Qualitative Variable Approach,“ *International Journal of Media Management*, 4(4), 248–260.

Table 1: Results from random-effects ANOVA model comparing mean experience levels across magazines (see text for definition of terms)

#	Label	μ	$SE(\mu)$	σ_m	P	σ
27	It's brief and easy to read	3.5158	0.0135	0.1083	<.0001	0.4771
25	I learn things first here	3.4879	0.0183	0.1546	<.0001	0.5800
2	It makes me smarter	3.4489	0.0211	0.1887	<.0001	0.5545
1	I get value for my time and money	3.4400	0.0192	0.1573	<.0001	0.6538
13	It grabs me visually	3.3960	0.0226	0.2059	<.0001	0.5472
29	I like seeing people of color in this magazine	3.3916	0.0266	0.2464	<.0001	0.5839
4	I trust it	3.3911	0.0199	0.1742	<.0001	0.5667
19	I like some of the ads a lot	3.3739	0.0165	0.1365	<.0001	0.5496
3	The stories absorb me	3.3690	0.0202	0.1769	<.0001	0.5729
5	I find the magazine high-quality and sophisticated	3.3332	0.0186	0.1558	<.0001	0.5977
33	I like its seasonality	3.3106	0.0345	0.3233	<.0001	0.6776
36	I want more ad information	3.2799	0.0195	0.1569	<.0001	0.6818
37	I think others in the household would enjoy this magazine	3.2747	0.0262	0.2409	<.0001	0.6008
28	I feel good when I read it	3.2356	0.0235	0.2106	<.0001	0.6102
15	It's my personal timeout	3.2065	0.0164	0.1294	<.0001	0.6057
32	I often reflect on it	3.1989	0.0165	0.1323	<.0001	0.5938
35	I get a sense of place	3.1545	0.0262	0.2350	<.0001	0.6733
14	It helps me keep track of celebrities	3.1023	0.0444	0.4234	<.0001	0.7553
22	It's relevant and useful to me	3.0953	0.0190	0.1572	<.0001	0.6307
31	It's part of my routine	3.0932	0.0171	0.1289	<.0001	0.6782
7	I'm inspired	3.0929	0.0250	0.2212	<.0001	0.6859
30	I find unique and surprising things	3.0922	0.0179	0.1469	<.0001	0.6021
38	I relate to the ads	3.0889	0.0274	0.2518	<.0001	0.6160
39	It requires me to focus	3.0525	0.0194	0.1442	<.0001	0.7811
6	I'm touched	3.0354	0.0347	0.3233	<.0001	0.7210
8	It improves me and try new things	3.0226	0.0297	0.2784	<.0001	0.5851
17	I read the ads	3.0177	0.0254	0.2242	<.0001	0.6969
24	It's for people like me	2.9700	0.0216	0.1904	<.0001	0.5958
11	I save and refer to it	2.9232	0.0341	0.3027	<.0001	0.9230
18	I dislike some of the ads	2.9151	0.0162	0.1321	<.0001	0.5552
20	It disappoints me	2.8978	0.0166	0.1420	<.0001	0.5140
10	I build relationships by talking about and sharing	2.8949	0.0180	0.1427	<.0001	0.6567
34	I feel I know the writers	2.8193	0.0234	0.1957	<.0001	0.7648
26	This magazine irritates me	2.6458	0.0159	0.1308	<.0001	0.5435
16	It helps me look good; it's sensual, even sexy	2.6121	0.0366	0.3507	<.0001	0.5807
23	I keep or share articles	2.5466	0.0226	0.1881	<.0001	0.7414
21	It leaves me feeling bad	2.5363	0.0300	0.2678	<.0001	0.7876
12	This magazine's web site is important to me	2.2297	0.0267	0.2298	<.0001	0.8056
9	It reinforces my faith	2.2233	0.0345	0.3156	<.0001	0.8129

Table 2: Results from HLM analysis regressing readership on each experience factor separately

#	Label	β	P	σ_b	P	σ^2
1	I get value for my time and money	0.7528	.000	0.0215	.395	0.9485
2	It makes me smarter	0.6882	.000	0.0000	.000	1.0401
3	The stories absorb me	0.5457	.000	0.0418	.220	1.0922
15	It's my personal timeout	0.5302	.000	0.0000	.000	1.0837
32	I often reflect on it	0.5239	.000	0.0000	.000	1.0950
25	I learn things first here	0.5169	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1010
31	It's part of my routine	0.4677	.000	0.0330	.241	1.0907
28	I feel good when I read it	0.4556	.000	0.0352	.282	1.1143
5	I find the magazine high-quality and sophisticated	0.4501	.000	0.0465	.151	1.1140
10	I build relationships by talking about and sharing	0.4446	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1035
4	I trust it	0.4375	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1292
22	It's relevant and useful to me	0.4269	.000	0.0392	.271	1.1196
27	It's brief and easy to read	0.3882	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1531
30	I find unique and surprising things	0.3775	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1373
8	It improves me and try new things	0.3684	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1357
11	I save and refer to it	0.3361	.000	0.0155	.434	1.0935
37	I think others in the household would enjoy this magazine	0.3360	.000	0.0348	.305	1.1474
24	It's for people like me	0.3330	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1495
6	I'm touched	0.3067	.000	0.0141	.452	1.1349
35	I get a sense of place	0.3034	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1435
7	I'm inspired	0.3002	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1431
13	It grabs me visually	0.2963	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1568
23	I keep or share articles	0.2927	.000	0.0183	.437	1.1420
34	I feel I know the writers	0.2656	.000	0.0178	.430	1.1502
33	I like its seasonality	0.2544	.000	0.0245	.373	1.1525
29	I like seeing people of color in this magazine	0.2522	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1714
19	I like some of the ads a lot	0.2394	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1732
14	It helps me keep track of celebrities	0.1934	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1673
17	I read the ads	0.1384	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1800
38	I relate to the ads	0.1315	.000	0.0000	.000	1.1797
39	It requires me to focus	0.1010	.000	0.0564	.037	1.1822
16	It helps me look good; it's sensual, even sexy	0.0864	.004	0.0000	.000	1.1897
9	It reinforces my faith	0.0442	.045	0.0192	.436	1.1913
12	This magazine's web site is important to me	0.0381	.115	0.0846	.009	1.1879
36	I want more ad information	0.0164	.533	0.0000	.000	1.1850
21	It leaves me feeling bad	−0.0049	.250	0.0600	.062	1.1882
18	I dislike some of the ads	−0.1967	.000	0.0380	.295	1.1784
26	This magazine irritates me	−0.2465	.000	0.0479	.213	1.1738
20	It disappoints me	−0.7278	.000	0.0000	.000	1.0486