

FREQUENCY OF READING FOR AIA: UNDER RESEARCHED?

Stephen A. Douglas & Richard D. Jones, The Douglas/Jones Group

The economies of publishing and ad agency management have changed dramatically in the last ten years. Additionally, media proliferation in the United States has provided media planners and buyers with more choices than ever before. This has aided a large scale, fundamental shift from mass markets and mass media vehicles to niche market targeting and niche media.

As a result of these trends, demands have been made on syndicated research to provide not only lower cost research that measures more print titles, but also to measure targeted influence categories. In 1994 these colliding goals contributed to Simmons Market Research Bureau's decision to shift from a screen and stripped version of Through-the-Book to a more economical model of Recent Reading.

As importantly, the past decade has seen an explosion in readership studies covering various niche markets in the United States. Various industries and influential markets are well supported, such as automotive, computers and technology, travel, affluent adults, agriculture, opinion leaders, and business purchasers' influence.

The frequency of reading question used by MRI (TGI before) and most other countries, help National Readership Studies produce the all important C1 and C2 estimates which drives reach and frequency analysis. At the Montreal symposium, the Marty Frankel and Adam Richard contended the best way to get this information was with a two interview system using specific issue recognition.

The short lived Brand Rating Index (BRI) was the only personal interview study in the states that used the frequency of reading interview for the AIA. Studies based on the AIA readership data captured by the Frequency of Reading Question are now a major factor in the United States. This process is used by 9 major direct mail studies.

Those studies are:

Monroe Mendelsohn,	People earning over \$ 60,000 ('94)
JD Power	Car and truck name plate
IQ CIMS	Total computer decision makers
FARMS - Roper Starch Worldwide	Ag Decision makers \$10K+ in sales
Purchase Influence of American Business	Business purchase influencers
- Erdos & Morgan	
Opinion Leaders -Erdos & Morgan	Influentials in bus., govt, etc.
CompPro - Simmons	High Tech Purchase influencers
Simmons Top Management	Top management in business
Adams	High Tech Purchase influencers

Appendix B gives a summary description of the methodology, sample size and universe description of these nine direct mail studies. Also included in that appendix are summary descriptions of the major personal interview studies methodologies, samples, etc. These studies do not estimate an AIA using frequency of reading, rather like most national readership surveys around the world, these provided the data to produce the estimates of C1 and C2. It is very difficult to compare the results of each of these studies because they serve different universes. Even the two computer studies are difficult to compare because of the Universe estimating procedure.

The Frequency of Reading question has taken many forms. Politz in 1967 used this form in experiment comparing the data produced by the question described below to compare with the results of the Politz traditional Through the Book, a Pure Gold Standard TTB - no screen, the use of multiple full issues for a small number of titles (less than 20).

Time Magazine is put out once a week. Next to Time Magazine, please check the box that best describes how many issues of Time, if any you personally have read or looked into in the last four weeks. This includes all issues of Time 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.

Then, if you have read **Time Magazine in the last 4 week**; thinking about the last issue of Time you read, please check the box that indicates whether the last issue you read was in your own home or else where outside your own home ?

		Read now	In the last 4 weeks, I read				The last time	
	Did not	and then but	1	2	3	4	In	Outside
	Read	not last 4 wks.	issues	issues	issues	issues	Home	Home
Time	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

The nine different direct mail studies have different wordings, different probabilities applied to the frequency of reading response, and ask the question in two different sequences 4 of 4 first vs. 4 of 4 last. The nine different studies' wordings, assignment of probabilities and sequences are presented and described in detail in Appendix A. The data and tables below summarizes these differences.

Only 5 of the nine direct mail studies use the traditional wording in some form. We could find no discussion of this issue in historical papers. None of the companies have presented papers on why they use different wording. We know from earlier Symposium work that **different wording produces different results**.

	Last 4 Issues	Past 4 Issues	Usually Read	Every/Usually	Occasionally Regularly
Number of Different Wordings	1	4	1	2	1

The frequency of reading's average issue audience estimate is calculated by applying weights to the respondents reading frequency answer. An example, from Simmons CompPro, of one of the weighting schemes is shown below.

< than one out of 4 = .125 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1

The difficulty is, as with wording, the same pattern holds true in the selection of which probability to use for the response less than 1 out of 4. By definition, that will produce a different answer. With the exception of FARMS, all the probabilities for 1, 2, 3, and 4 out of 4 are the same (.25, .50, .75 and 1.0 respectively).

Different Probabilities Less Than 1	0	.08	.10	.125
	5	1	1	2

FARMS uses a derived probability from multiple, specific issue covers over 3 waves of data each year. To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = .08 1 of 4 = .29 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .71 4 of 4 = .92

The careful reader will note that FARMS probabilities are different than the most commonly used values - 1 @ .25, 3 @ .75, and 4 of 4 @ 1. FARMS is changing its method from a cover recognition frequency of reading method. We will be interested in seeing what probabilities are used next.

Julian Baim of MRI and Gregg Lindner / Marty Frankel of Simmons have done some analysis of their respective frequency of reading data bases over the last few years. Perhaps some of that analysis will come out in other papers here in Berlin or at the US Readership Workshop in New York in January 1996.

MRI and SAR asks after the six month screen and before the recent reading question this frequency of reading question. Note the only people asked are those who say yes or maybe to the six month screen. This reduces the number of magazines asked about to a much smaller number than 220.

On average out of four issues that are published, how many issues of the publication do you read or look into?"

0 1 2 3 4

One other issue is of concern. The two different frequency sequences are used. Traditionally the respondent is asked to go from less than 1 out of 4 up the scale to 4 out of 4. The Erdos & Morgan Purchase Influence surveys start with 4 out of 4 and end with less than 1 out of 4. The Erdos and Morgan study was originally designed and commissioned by publishers who wanted the highest possible numbers. By asking 4 out of 4 in the first position the numbers the AIA is driven higher. Erdos is "stuck." They have a relative strong client base for this study and like all syndicators are reluctant to change methods.

We are left with a rather complex set of issues:

- Which wording is right?
- Which value is right for less than 1?
- What are the correct probabilities or what is the correct way to determine the correct probabilities?
- Which sequence is best 4 of 4, first or last?
- How did we get to this state of affairs?

To learn more about these issues we conducted an historical literature review and conducted an analysis of the three studies that captured frequency of reading information and where a common base could be developed.

Literature Review

The 1964 Agostini paper titled "The Case for Direct Questions and Reading Habits" seems to be an appropriate place to begin. He reported on an experiment whose purpose was to measure audience accumulation up to nine issues. He defined reader as "any person who after going through an issue with the interviewer, states that he is sure he has looked into that issue some time previous to the interview." Before asking this question, the respondents were asked a **direct** question on reading habits. Briefly he concluded:

1. Respondents gave reliable or stable statements on reading habits.
2. Reported reading habits closely agree with behavior as measured with editorial interest.
3. "Average issue" could be estimated from readers statements on reading habits.
4. Through simulation, statements on reading habits could be used to predict future audience.

This seems to be the beginning of the bromide that frequency of reading was in close agreement between reading habits and behavior. Something simpler than editorial interest Through-The-Book method could be used to capture readership.

In December, 1974 Tom Corlett in the Journal of Advertising Research commented on using the reading frequency technique. He reported that Bill Belson, the noted UK researcher had provided clear evidence that apparently simple questions on actual recent behavior seemed so unrealistic and trivial to most respondents that they have considerable difficulty believing we really mean what we say, quite apart in the difficulty of remembering the behavior.

Corlett reports that Belson's study showed that respondents tend to answer in terms of their usual reading habits. He noted that in 1963 Les Frankel of Audits & Surveys had suggested the purest form would be asking the respondent to describe his frequency of reading on an eleven point scale (0-10). Corlett's commentary on Agostini's paper was that in order to get the probabilities right, a separate series of issue recognition interviews would have to be conducted along with the frequency of reading question. He concluded "... the chief value of verbal frequency scales would be in extending the reading probabilities obtained by ordinary methods at the same interview, into estimates of net and cumulative audiences."

Corlett concludes with some prophetic observations:

1. If a numerical frequency scale for reading probabilities proves accurate for a wide variety of publications, than this would look like the answer (how measure reading).

2. If we continue to rely on the recall and recognition techniques, which involve actual as distinct from usual behavior, then we must be prepared to abandon initial filter (screening) questions. Obtaining accurate information on actual readership behavior requires very careful questioning procedures which are inevitably very crude by comparison.
3. I remain unconvinced that the editorial interest Through-The-Book aspects of the recognition technique can be properly applied by ordinary interviewers and ordinary respondents on more than six to eight publications in one interview.
4. Thus, to cover 60 to 80 periodicals at one interview, we must decide for which periodicals the recall (Recent Reading) technique is adequate and for which the recognition technique is essential. In the recognition technique, we must be prepared to show only a sample of six to eight periodicals at any one interview.
5. This would imply a survey which obtained at each interview: frequency of reading, using perhaps a simple verbal scale, for all publications covered, actual "Recent Reading" for certain publications (daily newspapers, perhaps Sunday newspapers and weekly magazines), and recognition data based on editorial interest technique for six to eight other publications (monthly magazines).

This article was prophetic because it correctly predicts that recognition cannot be used for the large numbers of magazines that need to be studied. He was certainly right on how recent reading evolved in major National Readership Studies around the globe.

The next paper of importance, by Wolfgang Schaefer in 1965, is titled "Scale Measures of Magazine Reading." He reports on several German studies of audience accumulation. Using Les Frankel's model adjusted to a 13 point scale, they produced audience estimates vs. measured estimates that were quite close. The studies were small in scale, but, he thought very provocative .

In December 1966, Journal of Advertising Research reported a paper by the Swede Bo W:Son Schyberger who wrote about a case titled A Case Against Direct Questions On Reading Habits. The purpose of the article was to present a comparison between the claimed reading frequency question and data based on issue reading.

Here is the first of a series of expected ratios:

Never	0.0
Seldom	0.13
Every 4th issue	0.25
Every 3rd issue	0.33
Every 2nd issue	0.50
Every issue	1.00

He found great over-estimates based on claimed frequency of reading. The data was based on a pencil and paper diary panel which has performed very poorly in the States in the collection of readership data. The German data and the Politz data cited later are based on personal interview TTB methods.

What is the source of these weights ?

< than one out of 4 = 0 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1

The first literature reference found to this model was written up by Robert J. Schrieber in his article on "Probability Assignments for Simulation of Media Reach and Frequency" in the late '60s.

The article concluded by questioning:

"that the assignment probabilities, real or simulated, for the purpose of calculating or simulating reach and frequency, offers technical problems which tend to diminish the promise of this tool for the analysis and selection of media schedules."

Bob's fears were obviously not shared by the market which now uses reach and frequency models all of the time. Our literature he did reference that famous hypothetical assignment of probabilities.

Don McGlathery, in a very famous March 1967 Journal of Advertising Research article titled "Claimed Frequency Vs. Editorial Interest Measures Of Repeat Magazine Audience," reached a conclusion after a very extensive analysis that:

"Compared with estimates from the editorial-interest technique, answers to direct questions on reading frequency tended to overestimate for monthly magazines and to underestimate for weeklies and bi-weeklies."

The implication of Don's paper is the Frequency of Reading question seems to advantage monthlies more than weeklies. That is exactly the same way as Recent Reading.

The editorial interest method of the time was the very high quality Politz study. Politz only studied ten monthlies using four complete issues, and four weeklies covering two issues of each. This was as close to the gold standard as we ever got. Going back to the basic Politz report, the authors reported that the levels were 7-15% higher, depending upon publishing frequency, for the frequency of reading method. The frequency of reading method Politz used followed these steps:

- Respondents were asked if they had read any particular magazines in the last four weeks.
- The next question checked how many issues they read or looked into in the last four weeks.

The absolute difference seemed very small when compared with the differences reported in the ARF Comparability Study of the differences between Recent Reading and Through-The-Book. The Recent Reading practiced by Simmons and MRI shows great advantages with these other monthlies.

The following tables, based on the ARF Comparability Study samples (total adults) demonstrates that unlike the RR method the frequency method overstates the TTB estimates by about the same amounts **regardless of publishing frequency.**

	RR/TTB Index	
	Recent Reading	Frequency
Weeklies	127	136
Monthlies	186	141

Sources: Val Appel Special Tabulation of the ARF Comparability Study of 1979 done for this paper.

Implication

This literature does not help us very much. The review suggests that the frequency of reading question, while crude, is probably no cruder than Recent Reading. It may in fact be closer the gold standard full through the book with no screen and multiple complete specific recent issues.

Since there's no standard of truth, the market continues to seek cheaper methods. The one step, claimed frequency of reading method may be the answer.

An Analysis of some new and Quite Different Data

As a starting point for the first analysis, we asked Mendelsohn Research if we could use their data (which in 1994 was based on HHI \$60,000+) in a comparison of MRI and Simmons Pilot SAR. Dr. Julian Baim agreed to convert the MRI data into a frequency of reading AIA using the same model as MMR. Gregg Lindner, Technical Director, of Simmons also agreed to provide the same tabulations on the same \$60,000 base for this comparison. Before we get to the comparison, let's make certain everyone remembers the differences and similarities in these studies:

Both MRI and Simmons SAR

- 1) Random probability sample (with over sample of the high income and metro areas).
- 2) Response rate 68 to 72%.
- 3) Personal Interviewer.
- 4) Sort board with black and white logo cards.
- 5) Six month screening question.
- 6) Frequency of reading question and a five point scale <1, 2, 3, 4 of 4.
- 7) Recent Reading question follows using the sort board.

For the benefit of the Europeans looking at this information for the first time, the Simmons Survey of American Readership recent reading methodology (half hour personal interview vs. an hour personal interview for MRI) used a very limited number of highly trained interviewers for the pilot test upon which this data is based. The Simmons SAR pilot study was based on 10,000 interviews (half the sample of the entire study) which was collected in a two month period. MRI data is based on a 12 month 20,000 person sample. The SAR produced much higher levels on recent reading and frequency of reading than MRI. The screen in levels are also higher which will be covered by other papers at this symposium.

MMR

- 1) Random probability sample (with over sample of the high income and metro areas).
- 2) Response rate 60%.
- 3) Mail interviewer.
- 4) Self administered 18 page questionnaire - four rotations.
- 5) NO screening question.
- 6) Frequency of reading question and a five point scale <1, 2, 3, 4 of 4.

The results of the analysis show some major relational differences between the levels and the reader per copies of the two data bases.

THE FINDINGS

MRI Frequency Compared to MMR:

The comparisons of the average issue audiences, using a frequency of reading method, show that for weeklies using MRI and Simmons frequency of reading, there are much higher levels than the Monroe Mendelsohn direct mail method. The raw data is included in Appendix D so that others may wish to use and analyze it.

All 8 weeklies and both bi-weeklies using MRI frequency of reading have higher coverage numbers. The percent differences are quite dramatic. The Weeklies 5 coverage difference was 35% greater on MRI and 42 % greater in the SAR. The Bi-Weeklies were 11% and 13% greater respectively.

The largest differences from MRI to MMR were Business Week (+72%), and Newsweek (+48%). For the Simmons SAR, the greatest differences were The New Yorker (+80%), Business Week (+55%). The rank orders are different from Mendelsohn and from Simmons. People Weekly is first in coverage among weeklies by a substantial number on both Mendelsohn and MRI. TV Guide is first on Simmons. Which rank order is correct?

**Average % Coverage Difference of MRI/SAR
Relative To MMR**

	MMR	MRI	Simmons
Weeklies	100	135	142
Bi-Weeklies	100	111	113

Base: HHI \$60,000+. All AIA calculated using Mendelsohn weighting scale.

Looking at reader per copy for the weeklies, we have the table below. The Weeklies have the advantage in Recent Reading. The monthlies and secondarily the Bi-weeklies would seem to be better off in with the direct mail frequency of reading method.

**Comparison of Average Reader Per Copy
AIA is Calculated Using MMR Frequency of Reading Model**

	MMR	MRI	% Difference	Simmons SAR	%Diff
Weeklies	1.97	2.48	+25.8%	2.69	+36.5%
Bi-Weeklies	2.97	3.04	+2.4%	3.23	+ 8.8%
Monthlies	2.24	1.76	-21.4%	1.83	-18.3%

Base: HHI \$60,000+

The bi-weeklies are made up of Forbes and Fortune. Needless to say, the monthlies and bi-weeklies would tend to prefer Mendelsohn, the weeklies would prefer MRI or SAR. The implication of this table is that you would make different magazine buying selections between frequency interval and perhaps books, depending upon the method used.

The pattern is much different for the monthlies. Some are higher or lower, and the rank order does change. We studied 22 monthlies. The table below shows that 6 were higher than Mendelsohn and 16 lower for MRI. 9 were higher, and 13 lower for SAR. The pattern of differences between the personal interview studies and Monroe Mendelsohn continues. It is comforting that 6 of books which were higher and 11 books which were lower WERE THE SAME on both studies. The remaining titles were either tied or very close and 1 was significantly different. The different magazine, Self, is very small and could be subject to wide tolerance shifts.

	Higher	Lower
N = 22		
MRI Frequency of Reading	6	16
SAR - Frequency of Reading	9	13
Same	6	11

The following magazines show how significant the differences can be.

	Percent Difference to MMR	
	MRI	SAR
Vogue	+36	+40
Smithsonian	+22	+12
Reader's Digest	+11	+19
US Air	-40	-48
Golf	-25	-30
Travel & Leisure	-24	-34

Comparing the RPC data from the two studies we find that the weeklies are advantaged the most on recent reading. Weeklies are still advantaged but not to the same degree as the frequency of reading question.

**Comparison of Average Reader Per Copy
AIA is Calculated Using Recent reading for MRI and Simmons**

	MMR	MRI	% Difference	Simmons SAR	% Diff
Weeklies	1.97	2.15	9.1%	2.42	22.8%
Bi-Weeklies	2.97	2.78	-6.4	3.04	+2.4
Monthlies	2.24	1.88	-16.1	2.02	-9.8

Using the same type of analysis developed earlier by Val Appel, we can highlight the difference in the effects of the two methods questioning techniques. SAR is stronger for the Weeklies regardless of method. Recent Reading produced closer RPC levels to the Direct mail method than personal interview frequency of reading does to frequency of reading Direct mail.

**Comparison of Average Reader Per Copy
AIA is Calculated Using Recent reading for MRI and Simmons**

	MMR	MRI		Simmons SAR	
		Freq of Reading	RR	Freq of Reading	RR
Weeklies	100	126	109	136	122
Bi-Weeklies	100	102	94	108	102
Monthlies	100	79	84	82	91

Base: \$60,000 + HHI

This analysis has certainly confirmed the following:

- Different methods used to measure the same populations, will definitely produce different levels and relationships.
- MRI and Simmons while producing different levels from MMR, but are directionally similar.
- Recent Reading executed in a personal interview mode, seems to produce closer results than closer results to a direct mail frequency of reading study than frequency of reading method executed in a personal interview.

Some of our German colleagues might advise us to take Mendelsohn and all the direct mail studies and weight them to the "official" source of recent reading. Of course, in the States we have a problem. We have 2 recent reading levels. We have Anti Trust laws which make it difficult to restrict business entry when there is no absolutely correct answer or standard.

This analysis also clearly shows that there are different relationships for the publication frequencies. In short, these are very crude methods. The literature, in fact, suggests that recent reading may be less accurate than frequency of reading. It seems only Belson in his third degree interviews and Schyberger's panel data have contradicted that point of view. Better in the USA is defined here as closer to TTB using no screen on a limited number of magazines with complete issues. "Better" in Europe is defined as close to the *current recent reading method* (NOT THE BEST RECENT READING METHOD) regardless of whether that method has changed or not.

In the absence of gold standard work, it is clear that recent reading as practiced everywhere is very crude. It is also clear that the institutionalization of the recent reading numbers in the UK (TGI adjusted to the NRS levels, etc.) and in Germany (all studies adjusted to the AGMA levels) is a crude cosmetic solution. OK. But many of the young agency executives, sales people and your bosses forget these are only estimates. They are surprised when the "official authorities" can not explain clearly why the numbers are unstable. The frustration of senior executives and owners with this kind of variation makes the executives who advocated these crude "official estimates" (that change from year to year) seem strange and perhaps not too bright. Perhaps that is why the research function is losing power and prestige in many publishing companies.

I pose a question, to my British and German colleagues particularly. As recent reading has expanded to measure more and more magazines, it remains the standard of Europe. In the States, we worried that through the book as practiced by Simmons is a very impure version of Politz. The worry was justified. It fell apart when it was pushed too far. The gold standard of recent reading in Europe could be Henry VIII partially leaded gold. The question is, what's the percentage of lead in the gold standard of Germany or the UK? Do you care?

The USA has taken the more market driven approach. Any research company who can collect data and sell it, is allowed to. The market will pick the data base to meet its needs. Recent reading is a very useful method for measuring 220 magazines. Sampling tolerances, interviewer affects and the 55 other variables cited by Langschmidt (Appendix C) truly define recent reading as a crude method. With both methods we accept name confusion as a way of life.

The nine direct mail methods, two personal interview methods clearly show that we are producing a variety of audience estimates and relationships. Most buyers and sellers of space will not be aware of the relationship was "real" or is in fact, some artifact of wording or execution. Perhaps it could also be an artifact of the assignment of probabilities to the frequency of reading model, or numerous other variables.

Does it matter to the researchers? Should it matter to the Owners and Publishers? It should! The buying relationships are different.

Conclusion

The new data from this paper supports the notion that Frequency of Reading AIA information collected with a direct mail questionnaire are closer to recent reading than frequency of reading data collected in a personal interview. The literature (Politz) specifically supports the notion that Frequency of Reading AIA captured in a purer form are closer to full through the book.

We strongly recommend :

- A much more systematic review be conducted of the all aspects of the direct mail frequency of reading studies be conducted?
- We also suggest that a postal direct mail study using frequency of reading be a lower cost option than personal interview Recent Reading.

It would be ironic if the next method to challenge recent reading in the United States, on a national level, may not be the high tech electronic approach described in the technology section, but rather a low tech, postal, frequency of reading method. A national postal Frequency of Reading Readership Study would be cheap, and no less crude. There is no gold standard. There is no will to execute one so the market may have its way. What do you think? I am looking forward to discussing the implications with you.

References

- AGONTINI, J.M. The Case for Direct Questions on Reading Habits, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol 4, No. 2, June 1964, pp. 28-33
- BELSON, WILLIAM. Measuring and Then Increasing the Accuracy of Britain's National Readership Survey: A Validation Project. From the New Orleans 1981 Readership Symposium. Proceedings edited by Harry Henry.
- CORLETT, THOMAS. The IPA National Readership Survey: Some Problems and Possible Solutions, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol 4, No. 4, December 1964, pp. 4-10
- DOUGLAS, STEPHEN A. & MALLETT, DANIEL T. "The Profit Per Copy Model" *Barcelona Readership Symposia* 1989.
- FRANKEL, MARTY and RICHARD, ADAM. A Comparison of Reach and Frequency Estimates: Single Versus Dual Interview Approaches. From the Montreal 1983 Readership Symposium. Proceedings edited by Harry Henry.
- MCGLATHERY, DONALD. Claimed Frequency vs. Editorial-Interest Measures of Repeat Magazine Audiences, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 7, No. 1, March 1967, pp. 7-15
- SCHAEFER, WOLFGANG. Scale Measures of Magazine Reading. *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 5, No. 4, December 1965, pp. 21-26
- SCHRIEBER, ROBERT J. "Probabilities Assignments for Simulation of Media Reach and Frequency" *Journal of Advertising Research* - Volume 8 No. 2
- SCHYBERGER, BO W:SON. A Case against Direct Questions on Reading Habits, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, December 1966, pp. 25-29
- An Experimental Study Comparing Magazine Audiences as Determined by Two Questioning Procedures, Alfred Politz Media Studies, 1967

Appendix A The questions and the weights

Monroe Mendelsohn

Readership Question: Number of past 4 issues read or looked into in past 7 days for weekday publications (5 issues), past 4 weeks for weeklies, past 2 months for bi-monthlies, past 4 months for monthlies, number of past 4 issues for publications issued less than monthly. To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = 0 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1

No screen

FARMS

Have you read or looked into any issue, either the issue shown on this page or any other issue) at home or at anywhere else in the last 6 months. Please indicate below how many of the last 4 issues of this publication, you, yourself, have read or looked into.

Pictured to the right is the cover of a recent issue of this publication. Have you read or looked into this specific issue.

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = .08 1 of 4 = .29 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .71 4 of 4 = .92

David Napior, Technical Director of Roper/Starch Farms, developed this model based on data from using multiple specific covers from the FARMS study over three waves. The technique used was Specific Issue (visual probability was the cover of a specific issue) in a direct mail survey. A sample of the questionnaire page is in Appendix.

J.D. Power

Screen: May have read or looked into in the past six months? Yes No

Readership Question: If yes, mark *how many of the past 4 issues you may have read or looked into?*

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = 0 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1

IQ CIMS

Screen: May have read or looked into in the past six months? Yes No

Readership Question: If yes, mark *how many issues do you usually read or look into out of every four (or every five in the case of daily newspapers) that are published.*

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = .10 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1.0

Purchase Influence of American Business (Erdos & Morgan)

Screen: Read/looked into in the last six months? Yes (only).

Readership Question: If yes, check *how many of the past 4 issues you may have read or looked into*

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

4 of 4 = 1 3 of 4 = .75 2 of 4 = .50 1 of 4 = .25 <1 of 4 = 0

Opinion Leaders (Erdos & Morgan) four of four asked first.

Screen: Read/looked into in the last six months? Yes (only).

Readership Question: If yes, check *Which of the publications do you read regularly, that is at least three out of the four issues published. If not regularly, which do you read occasionally 1 or 2 out of four issues?*

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

3 & 4 = .50 and 1&2 = .50

CompPro (Simmons)

Screen: May have read or looked into in the past six months? Yes No

Readership Question: For each publication that you have read or looked into in the last six month, mark X in th box which tells *how many of every four issues publishes you usually read or look into.*

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = .125 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1.0

Adams Study

Screen: May have read or looked into in the past six months? Yes No

Readership Question: If yes, mark how many of the past 4 issues you may have read or looked into.

To derive average issue audience weighted at -

<1 of 4 = 0 1 of 4 = .25 2 of 4 = .50 3 of 4 = .75 4 of 4 = 1

Simmons Top Management

The same as CompPro

Appendix B

SPECIALTY STUDIES - TECHNICAL SUMMARIES

SERVICE	INTERVIEW	UNIVERSE	SAMPLE	MAGAZINES	METHOD
Farms Roper Starch	Mail	Subscriber Lists	8,000 DM's \$10 K+	Ag Puhs	Cover Req & Freq Read
JD Power	Mail	Car Owners	35,000	Con & Bus	Freq Read
MMR	Mail	HHH \$60 K+	18,000	Con & Bus	Freq Read
Opinion Leaders Erdos & Morgan	Mail	OL Lists	1,700	Con & Bus	Freq Read
PIAB Erdos & Morgan	Mail	D&B \$1 mil +	6,000+	Con & Bus	Freq Read
Simmons Top Management	Mail	3 Lists \$1 mil +	6,300	Con & Bus	Freq Read

NEW STUDIES SERVING THE COMPUTER FIELD

SERVICE	INTERVIEW	UNIVERSE	SAMPLE	MAGAZINES	METHOD
Adams	PS Mail	D&B Site	2,000 +	Comp & Bus	Freq Read
CompPro II	PS Mail	D&B Site	5,000 +	Comp & Bus	Freq Read
CIMS - IQ	PS Mail & Disc	HHH + D&B	8,700 2,700+ HHH	Comp & Bus/Con	Freq Read

NATIONAL "MASS" STUDIES USE Frequency of Reading FOR C1 & C2

SERVICE	INTERVIEW	UNIVERSE	SAMPLE	MAGAZINES	METHOD
Simmons	Personal	Total US	16,000+	Con & Bus	Recent Read
BRI	Personal	Total US	15,000	Con & Bus	Freq Read
TGI	Personal /Self Adman Media and product	Total US	20,000	Con & Bus	Recent Read
NRI Product	Personal Self Administered	Total US	20,000 Ascribed	Con & Bus	Recent Read
Simmons SAR and SMM	Personal RDD Self Administered	Total US	20,000 20,000 (Benchmarked)	Con & Bus product booklet	Recent Read

Appendix C

Wally Langschmidt's Chart of Multiple Variables

FACTORS THAT AFFECT READERSHIP MEASUREMENT

1. AGE OF PUBLICATION (i.e. WHEN ESTABLISHED)	31. QUESTIONNAIRE LENGTH - INTERVIEWING TIME
2. AGE OF THE ISSUE BEING TESTED	32. QUESTIONNAIRE - THE WORDING USED
3. CURRENT CIRCULATION OF THE PUBLICATION	33. READING ABILITY OF THE UNIVERSE (EDUCATION)
4. CIRCULATION TREND & FLUCTUATIONS	34. READING DAYS - No. OF AND INTERVAL BETWEEN
5. CONFUSION BETWEEN COMPARABLE PUBLICATIONS	35. READER - SEX - RATIO
6. FAVOURED NUMBERS - ROUNDING OFF	36. REPLICATION OF READING
7. FIELDWORK - DAY OF INTERVIEW	37. RECALL AIDS USED
8. FIELDWORK - PERIOD OVER WHICH IT OCCURS	38. RECENCY OF THE 'LAST' READING EVENT
9. FIELDWORK - 'QUALITY' OF THE INTERVIEWING	39. ROTATION OF PUBLICATION TYPES
10. FIELDWORK - NUMBER OF FIELDWORK 'CYCLES'	40. ROTATION OF RECALL AIDS
11. FILTER PERIOD USED	41. ROUNDING OFF OF REPLIES - TIME AND NUMBERS
12. FORMAT OF THE PUBLICATION	42. SAMPLE SIZE - TOTAL VS. EFFECTIVE
13. FREQUENCY - NUMBER OF POINTS IN THE SCALE	43. SAMPLE - CONTACT LEVELS ACHIEVED
14. FREQUENCY OF READING PROFILE (OF PUBLICATION)	44. SPECIAL OR SENSATIONAL EVENTS
15. FREQUENCY SCALE - VERBAL OR NUMERIC	45. STATUS OF 'READING'
16. INTENTIONAL VS. INCIDENTAL READING	46. STATUS OF THE PUBLICATION
17. INTERVIEWER - IDENTITY OF	47. SUBSCRIPTION TO CIRCULATION RATIO
18. INTERVIEWER - PERSONALITY OF	48. SUPPLEMENTS - COMMON OR SEPARATE IDENTITY
19. INTERVIEW - WHO RECORDS THE REPLIES	49. TELESCOPING OF TIME
20. IMPACT OR MEMORABILITY OF THE TEST ISSUE	50. THOROUGHNESS OF THE 'READING'
21. I.Q. OF THE READERS	51. TIME OF DAY OF THE INTERVIEW
22. LIFE OF THE PUBLICATION	52. TOPICALITY OF THE EDITORIAL MATTER
23. MEMORY DECAY - RATE OF	53. UNIVERSE SIZE - POPULATION & CROSSING UP
24. ORIGIN OF THE LAST COPY - WHO BOUGHT IT?	54. WHERE THE INTERVIEW TOOK PLACE
25. PARALLEL READERSHIP	55. WHERE THE ORIGINAL READING TOOK PLACE
26. PENETRATION LEVEL - CIRCULATION : POPULATION	56. YARDSTICK USED FOR DEFINING 'READERSHIP'
27. PICTURES TO EDITORIAL RATIO	57. ZERO - DENIAL OF 'NIL' OR NON-READERSHIP
28. POSTAL DELAYS	● LIST UPDATED IN OCTOBER 1987
29. PUBLISHING DAY - AND 'YESTERDAY' READING	
30. PUBLISHING INTERVAL OR ISSUE PERIOD	

Appendix D The Data

Household Income \$60,000+

	1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Frequency of Reading		Freq. Cov. % Diff.	Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		RR Cov. % Diff.
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.		Audience	% Cov.	
	46,999		43,260					
People	9,822	20.9	10,618	24.5	17.2%	10,960	25.3	21.1%
TV Guide	8,647	18.4	9,330	21.6	17.4%	9,010	20.8	13.0%
Time	7,560	16.1	9,011	20.8	29.2%	8,141	18.8	16.8%
Sports Illustrated	6,620	14.1	7,860	18.2	29.1%	7,041	16.3	15.6%
Newsweek	6,441	13.7	8,815	20.4	48.9%	8,159	18.9	38.0%
US News	4,108	8.7	5,090	11.8	35.8%	3,870	8.9	2.3%
Business Week	2,374	5.1	3,785	8.8	72.5%	2,873	6.6	29.4%
New Yorker	1,642	3.5	1,996	4.6	31.4%	1,576	3.6	2.9%
Fortune	2,499	5.3	2,420	5.6	5.7%	2,263	5.2	-1.9%
Forbes	2,290	4.9	2,481	5.7	16.3%	2,220	5.1	4.1%

Household Income \$60,000+

	1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Frequency of Reading		Freq. Cov. % Diff.	Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		RR Cov. % Diff.
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.		Audience	% Cov.	
	46,999		43,260					
Reader's Digest	11,089	23.6	11,379	26.3	11.4%	12,522	28.9	22.5%
National Geographic	10,283	21.9	9,685	22.4	2.3%	10,252	23.7	8.2%
BH&G	10,004	21.3	8,805	20.4	-4.2%	9,510	22.0	3.3%
Money	4,886	10.4	4,557	10.5	1.0%	4,965	11.5	10.6%
Southern Living	4,531	9.6	3,339	7.7	-19.8%	3,640	8.4	-12.5%
House Beautiful	3,780	8.0	2,780	6.4	-20.0%	2,795	6.5	-18.8%
Golf Digest	3,262	6.9	2,440	5.6	-18.8%	2,556	5.9	-14.5%
Smithsonian	3,234	6.9	3,326	7.7	11.6%	3,134	7.2	4.3%
Arch. Digest	3,044	6.5	2,262	5.3	-18.5%	2,692	6.2	-4.6%
Bon Appetit	2,982	6.3	2,572	5.9	-6.3%	2,412	5.6	-11.1%
Travel & Leisure	2,893	6.2	2,027	4.7	-24.2%	1,912	4.4	-29.0%
Golf Magazine	2,815	6.0	1,926	4.5	-25.0%	1,880	4.3	-28.3%
Sunset	2,510	5.3	2,432	5.6	5.7%	2,480	5.7	7.5%
Gourmet	2,245	4.8	2,051	4.7	-2.1%	1,897	4.4	-8.3%
Vogue	2,133	4.5	2,646	6.1	35.6%	3,171	7.3	62.2%
Vanity Fair	2,042	4.3	1,960	4.5	4.7%	2,219	5.1	18.6%
Working Woman	1,912	4.1	1,210	2.8	-31.7%	1,216	2.8	-31.7%
US Air	1,883	4.0	1,048	2.4	-40.0%	1,286	3.0	-25.0%
Food & Wine	1,821	3.9	1,628	3.8	-2.6%	1,589	3.7	-5.1%
Self	1,850	3.9	1,341	3.1	-20.5%	1,279	3.0	-23.1%
Sky Magazine	1,778	3.8	748	1.7	-55.3%	1,108	2.6	-31.6%
Conde Nast Trav.	1,662	3.6	1,214	2.8	-22.2%	1,215	2.8	-22.2%
Home	1,712	3.6	1,414	3.3	-8.3%	1,368	3.2	-11.1%

	Household Income \$60,000+				SMM/MMR Freq. Cov. % Diff.	Simmons Recent Reading		SMM/MMR RR Cov. % Diff.
	1994 MMR		Simmons Freq. of Reading			Audience	% Cov.	
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience % Cov.	% Cov.				
	46,999		45,000			45,000		
People	9,822	20.9	11,381	25.3	21.1%	11,353	25.2	20.6%
TV Guide	8,647	18.4	11,496	25.5	38.6%	10,973	24.4	32.6%
Time	7,560	16.1	10,027	22.3	38.5%	9,279	20.6	28.0%
Sports Illustrated	6,620	14.1	8,437	18.7	32.6%	7,999	17.8	26.2%
Newsweek	6,441	13.7	8,933	19.9	45.3%	8,428	18.7	36.5%
US News	4,108	8.7	5,131	11.4	31.0%	4,128	9.2	5.7%
Business Week	2,374	5.1	3,576	7.9	54.9%	2,998	6.7	31.4%
New Yorker	1,642	3.5	2,827	6.3	80.0%	2,363	5.3	51.4%
Fortune	2,499	5.3	2,673	5.9	11.3%	2,301	5.1	-3.8%
Forbes	2,290	4.9	2,539	5.6	14.3%	2,597	5.8	18.4%

	Household Income \$60,000+				SMM/MMR Freq. Cov. % Diff.	Simmons Recent Reading		SMM/MMR RR Cov. % Diff.
	1994 MMR		Simmons Freq. of Reading			Audience	% Cov.	
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience % Cov.	% Cov.				
	46,999		45,000			45,000		
Reader's Digest	11,089	23.6	12,651	28.1	19.1%	14,167	31.5	33.5%
National Geographic	10,283	21.9	10,383	23.1	5.5%	11,125	24.7	12.8%
BH&G	10,004	21.3	8,553	19.0	-10.8%	10,017	22.3	4.7%
Money	4,886	10.4	4,631	10.3	-1.0%	5,039	11.2	7.7%
Southern Living	4,531	9.6	3,992	8.9	-7.3%	4,104	9.1	-5.2%
House Beautiful	3,780	8.0	2,622	5.8	-27.5%	2,876	6.4	-20.0%
Golf Digest	3,262	6.9	2,463	5.5	-20.3%	2,491	5.5	-20.3%
Smithsonian	3,234	6.9	3,778	8.4	21.7%	3,842	8.5	23.2%
Arch. Digest	3,044	6.5	2,375	5.3	-18.5%	2,790	6.2	-4.6%
Bon Appetit	2,982	6.3	2,330	5.2	-17.5%	2,512	5.6	-11.1%
Travel & Leisure	2,893	6.2	1,858	4.1	-33.9%	1,866	4.1	-33.9%
Golf Magazine	2,815	6.0	1,643	3.7	-38.3%	1,588	3.5	-41.7%
Sunset	2,510	5.3	2,011	4.5	-15.1%	2,102	4.7	-11.3%
Gourmet	2,245	4.8	2,238	5.0	4.2%	2,186	4.9	2.1%
Vogue	2,133	4.5	2,830	6.3	40.0%	3,140	7.0	55.6%
Vanity Fair	2,042	4.3	2,208	4.9	14.0%	2,212	4.9	14.0%
Working Woman	1,912	4.1	NA					
US Air	1,883	4.0	932	2.1	-47.5%	1,363	3.0	-25.0%
Food & Wine	1,821	3.9	1,815	4.0	2.6%	1,698	3.8	-2.6%
Self	1,850	3.9	1,880	4.2	7.7%	1,973	4.4	12.8%
Sky Magazine	1,778	3.8	938	2.1	-44.7%	1,710	3.8	0.0%
Conde Nast Trav.	1,682	3.6	1,367	3.0	-16.7%	1,579	3.5	-2.8%
Home	1,712	3.6	1,628	3.6	0.0%	1,250	2.8	-22.2%

Household Income \$60,000+

	1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI		MRI/MMR Cov. % Diff.	Simmons		SMMM/MR Cov. % Diff.
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	Freq. of Reading % Cov.		Audience	% Cov.	
	46,999		43,260			45,000		
People	9,822	20.9	10,618	24.5	17.2%	11,381	25.3	21.1%
TV Guide	8,647	18.4	9,330	21.6	17.4%	11,496	25.5	38.6%
Time	7,560	16.1	9,011	20.8	29.2%	10,027	22.3	38.5%
Sports Illustrated	6,620	14.1	7,860	18.2	29.1%	8,437	18.7	32.6%
Newsweek	6,441	13.7	8,815	20.4	48.9%	8,933	19.9	45.3%
US News	4,108	8.7	5,090	11.8	35.6%	5,131	11.4	31.0%
Business Week	2,374	5.1	3,785	8.8	72.5%	3,576	7.9	54.9%
New Yorker	1,642	3.5	1,996	4.6	31.4%	2,627	6.3	80.0%
Fortune	2,499	5.3	2,420	5.6	5.7%	2,673	5.9	11.3%
Forbes	2,290	4.9	2,481	5.7	16.3%	2,539	5.6	14.3%

Household Income \$60,000+

	1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI		MRI/MMR Cov. % Diff.	Simmons		SMMM/MR Cov. % Diff.
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	Freq. of Reading % Cov.		Audience	% Cov.	
	46,999		43,260			45,000		
Reader's Digest	11,089	23.6	11,379	26.3	11.4%	12,651	28.1	19.1%
National Geographic	10,283	21.9	9,685	22.4	2.3%	10,383	23.1	5.5%
BH&G	10,004	21.3	8,805	20.4	-4.2%	8,553	19.0	-10.8%
Money	4,886	10.4	4,557	10.5	1.0%	4,631	10.3	-1.0%
Southern Living	4,531	9.6	3,339	7.7	-19.8%	3,992	8.9	-7.3%
House Beautiful	3,780	8.0	2,780	6.4	-20.0%	2,622	5.8	-27.5%
Golf Digest	3,262	6.9	2,440	5.6	-18.8%	2,463	5.5	-20.3%
Smithsonian	3,234	6.9	3,326	7.7	11.6%	3,778	8.4	21.7%
Arch. Digest	3,044	6.5	2,282	5.3	-18.5%	2,375	5.3	-18.5%
Bon Appetit	2,982	6.3	2,572	5.9	-8.3%	2,330	5.2	-17.5%
Travel & Leisure	2,893	6.2	2,027	4.7	-24.2%	1,858	4.1	-33.9%
Golf Magazine	2,815	6.0	1,926	4.5	-25.0%	1,643	3.7	-38.3%
Sunset	2,510	5.3	2,432	5.6	5.7%	2,011	4.5	-15.1%
Gourmet	2,245	4.8	2,051	4.7	-2.1%	2,238	5.0	4.2%
Vogue	2,133	4.5	2,646	6.1	35.6%	2,830	6.3	40.0%
Vanity Fair	2,042	4.3	1,980	4.5	4.7%	2,208	4.9	14.0%
Working Woman	1,912	4.1	1,210	2.8	-31.7%	NA		
US Air	1,883	4.0	1,048	2.4	-40.0%	932	2.1	-47.5%
Food & Wine	1,821	3.9	1,628	3.8	-2.6%	1,815	4.0	2.6%
Self	1,850	3.9	1,341	3.1	-20.5%	1,880	4.2	7.7%
Sky Magazine	1,778	3.8	748	1.7	-55.3%	938	2.1	-44.7%
Conde Nast Trav.	1,682	3.6	1,214	2.8	-22.2%	1,367	3.0	-16.7%
Home	1,712	3.6	1,414	3.3	-8.3%	1,628	3.6	0.0%

Household Income \$60,000+

	1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI		MR/MMR	Simmons		SAR/MMR
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.	RR Cov. % Diff.	Audience	% Cov.	RR Cov. % Diff.
	48,999					45,000		
People	9,822	20.9	10,960	25.3	21.1%	11,353	25.2	20.6%
TV Guide	8,647	18.4	9,010	20.8	13.0%	10,973	24.4	32.6%
Time	7,560	16.1	8,141	18.8	16.8%	9,279	20.6	28.0%
Sports Illustrated	6,620	14.1	7,041	16.3	15.6%	7,999	17.8	26.2%
Newsweek	6,441	13.7	8,159	18.9	38.0%	8,428	18.7	36.5%
US News	4,108	8.7	3,870	8.9	2.3%	4,128	9.2	5.7%
Business Week	2,374	5.1	2,873	6.8	29.4%	2,998	6.7	31.4%
New Yorker	1,642	3.5	1,576	3.6	2.9%	2,363	5.3	51.4%
Fortune	2,499	5.3	2,263	5.2	-1.9%	2,301	5.1	-3.8%
Forbes	2,290	4.9	2,220	5.1	4.1%	2,597	5.8	18.4%

Household Income \$60,000+

	1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI		MR/MMR	Simmons		SAR/MMR
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.	RR Cov. % Diff.	Audience	% Cov.	RR Cov. % Diff.
	48,999					45,000		
Reader's Digest	11,089	23.6	12,522	28.9	22.5%	14,167	31.5	33.5%
National Geographic	10,283	21.9	10,252	23.7	8.2%	11,125	24.7	12.8%
BH&G	10,004	21.3	9,510	22.0	3.3%	10,017	22.3	4.7%
Money	4,886	10.4	4,965	11.5	10.6%	5,039	11.2	7.7%
Southern Living	4,531	9.6	3,640	8.4	-12.5%	4,104	9.1	-5.2%
House Beautiful	3,780	8.0	2,795	6.5	-18.8%	2,876	6.4	-20.0%
Golf Digest	3,262	6.9	2,556	5.9	-14.5%	2,491	5.5	-20.3%
Smithsonian	3,234	6.9	3,134	7.2	4.3%	3,842	8.5	23.2%
Arch. Digest	3,044	6.5	2,692	6.2	-4.6%	2,790	6.2	-4.6%
Bon Appetit	2,982	6.3	2,412	5.6	-11.1%	2,512	5.6	-11.1%
Travel & Leisure	2,893	6.2	1,912	4.4	-29.0%	1,866	4.1	-33.9%
Golf Magazine	2,815	6.0	1,880	4.3	-28.3%	1,588	3.5	-41.7%
Sunset	2,510	5.3	2,480	5.7	7.5%	2,102	4.7	-11.3%
Gourmet	2,245	4.8	1,897	4.4	-8.3%	2,186	4.9	2.1%
Vogue	2,133	4.5	3,171	7.3	62.2%	3,140	7.0	55.6%
Vanity Fair	2,042	4.3	2,219	5.1	18.6%	2,212	4.9	14.0%
Working Woman	1,912	4.1	1,216	2.8	-31.7%			
US Air	1,883	4.0	1,286	3.0	-25.0%	1,363	3.0	-25.0%
Food & Wine	1,821	3.9	1,589	3.7	-5.1%	1,698	3.8	-2.6%
Self	1,850	3.9	1,279	3.0	-23.1%	1,973	4.4	12.8%
Sky Magazine	1,778	3.8	1,108	2.6	-31.6%	1,710	3.8	0.0%
Conde Nast Trav.	1,682	3.6	1,215	2.8	-22.2%	1,579	3.5	-2.8%
Home	1,712	3.6	1,388	3.2	-11.1%	1,250	2.8	-22.2%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Fall '94 MRI		Simmons		Cov. % Diff. SMMMRI
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.	
	43,260		45,000		
People	10,618	24.5	11,381	25.3	3.3%
TV Guide	9,330	21.8	11,496	25.5	18.1%
Time	9,011	20.8	10,027	22.3	7.2%
Newsweek	8,815	20.4	8,933	19.9	-2.5%
Sports Illustrated	7,860	18.2	8,437	18.7	2.7%
US News	5,090	11.8	5,131	11.4	-3.4%
Business Week	3,785	8.8	3,576	7.9	-10.2%
New Yorker	1,998	4.6	2,827	6.3	37.0%
Forbes	2,481	5.7	2,539	5.6	-1.8%
Fortune	2,420	5.6	2,673	5.9	5.4%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Fall '94 MRI		Simmons		Cov. % Diff. SMMMRI
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.	
	43,260		45,000		
Reader's Digest	11,379	26.3	12,651	28.1	6.8%
National Geographic	9,685	22.4	10,383	23.1	3.1%
BH&G	8,805	20.4	8,553	19.0	-6.9%
Money	4,557	10.5	4,631	10.3	-1.9%
Smithsonian	3,328	7.7	3,778	8.4	9.1%
Southern Living	3,339	7.7	3,992	8.9	15.6%
House Beautiful	2,780	6.4	2,622	5.8	-9.4%
Vogue	2,646	6.1	2,830	6.3	3.3%
Bon Appetit	2,572	5.9	2,330	5.2	-11.9%
Golf Digest	2,440	5.6	2,463	5.5	-1.8%
Sunset	2,432	5.6	2,011	4.5	-19.6%
Arch. Digest	2,282	5.3	2,375	5.3	0.0%
Gourmet	2,051	4.7	2,238	5.0	6.4%
Travel & Leisure	2,027	4.7	1,858	4.1	-12.8%
Golf Magazine	1,926	4.5	1,643	3.7	-17.8%
Vanity Fair	1,960	4.5	2,208	4.9	8.9%
Food & Wine	1,628	3.8	1,815	4.0	5.3%
Home	1,414	3.3	1,628	3.6	9.1%
Self	1,341	3.1	1,880	4.2	35.5%
Conde Nast Trav.	1,214	2.8	1,367	3.0	7.1%
Working Woman	1,210	2.8	NA		
US Air	1,048	2.4	932	2.1	-12.5%
Sky Magazine	748	1.7	938	2.1	23.5%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Fall '94 MRI		Simmons		Cov. % Diff. SMMMRI
	Recent Reading		Recent Reading		
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.	
			45,000		
People	10,960	25.3	11,353	25.2	-0.4%
TV Guide	9,010	20.8	10,973	24.4	17.3%
Newsweek	8,159	18.9	8,428	18.7	-1.1%
Time	8,141	18.8	9,279	20.6	9.8%
Sports Illustrated	7,041	16.3	7,999	17.8	9.2%
US News	3,870	8.9	4,128	9.2	3.4%
Business Week	2,873	6.6	2,998	6.7	1.5%
New Yorker	1,576	3.6	2,363	5.3	47.2%
Fortune	2,263	5.2	2,301	5.1	-1.9%
Forbes	2,220	5.1	2,597	5.8	13.7%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Fall '94 MRI		Simmons		Cov. % Diff. SMMMRI
	Recent Reading		Recent Reading		
	Audience	% Cov.	Audience	% Cov.	
Reader's Digest	12,522	28.9	14,167	31.5	9.0%
National Geographic	10,252	23.7	11,125	24.7	4.2%
BH&G	9,510	22.0	10,017	22.3	1.4%
Money	4,965	11.5	5,039	11.2	-2.6%
Southern Living	3,640	8.4	4,104	9.1	8.3%
Vogue	3,171	7.3	3,140	7.0	-4.1%
Smithsonian	3,134	7.2	3,842	8.5	18.1%
House Beautiful	2,795	6.5	2,876	6.4	-1.5%
Arch. Digest	2,692	6.2	2,790	6.2	0.0%
Golf Digest	2,556	5.9	2,491	5.5	-6.8%
Sunsét	2,480	5.7	2,102	4.7	-17.5%
Bon Appetit	2,412	5.6	2,512	5.6	0.0%
Vanity Fair	2,219	5.1	2,212	4.9	-3.9%
Gourmet	1,897	4.4	2,186	4.9	11.4%
Travel & Leisure	1,912	4.4	1,866	4.1	-6.8%
Golf Magazine	1,880	4.3	1,588	3.5	-18.6%
Food & Wine	1,589	3.7	1,698	3.8	2.7%
Home	1,388	3.2	1,250	2.8	-12.5%
Self	1,279	3.0	1,973	4.4	46.7%
US Air	1,266	3.0	1,363	3.0	0.0%
Conde Nast Trav.	1,215	2.8	1,579	3.5	25.0%
Working Woman	1,216	2.8	N.A.		
Sky Magazine	1,108	2.6	1,710	3.8	46.2%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on: MRI Fall '94		1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Frequency of Reading		Freq. RPC % Diff.	Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		RR RPC % Diff.
	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC		Audience	RPC	
		46,999			43,260					
People	3,366	9,822	2.92	10,818	3.15	8.1%	10,960	3.26	11.6%	
Business Week	917	2,374	2.59	3,785	4.13	59.4%	2,873	3.13	21.0%	
New Yorker	790	1,642	2.08	1,996	2.53	21.6%	1,576	1.99	-4.0%	
Newsweek	3,184	6,441	2.02	8,815	2.77	36.9%	8,159	2.56	26.7%	
Sports Illustrated	3,378	6,620	1.96	7,860	2.33	18.7%	7,041	2.08	6.4%	
US News	2,301	4,108	1.79	5,090	2.21	23.9%	3,870	1.68	-5.8%	
Time	4,273	7,560	1.77	9,011	2.11	19.2%	8,141	1.91	7.7%	
TV Guide	14,514	8,647	0.60	9,330	0.64	7.9%	9,010	0.62	4.2%	
Fortune	804	2,499	3.11	2,420	3.01	-3.2%	2,263	2.81	-9.4%	
Forbes	810	2,290	2.83	2,481	3.06	8.3%	2,220	2.74	-3.1%	

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on: MRI Fall '94		1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Frequency of Reading		Freq. RPC % Diff.	Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		RR RPC % Diff.
	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC		Audience	RPC	
		46,999			43,260					
US Air	428	1,883	4.40	1,048	2.45	-44.3%	1,286	3.00	-31.7%	
House Beautiful	1,003	3,760	3.77	2,780	2.77	-26.5%	2,795	2.79	-26.1%	
Sky Magazine	475	1,778	3.74	748	1.57	-57.9%	1,108	2.33	-37.7%	
Arch. Digest	936	3,044	3.25	2,282	2.44	-25.0%	2,692	2.88	-11.6%	
Travel & Leisure	1,090	2,893	2.65	2,027	1.84	-30.7%	1,912	1.75	-33.9%	
Gourmet	887	2,245	2.53	2,051	2.31	-8.6%	1,897	2.14	-15.5%	
Bon Appetit	1,239	2,982	2.41	2,572	2.08	-13.7%	2,412	1.95	-19.1%	
Golf Magazine	1,175	2,815	2.40	1,926	1.64	-31.6%	1,880	1.60	-33.2%	
Working Woman	799	1,912	2.39	1,210	1.51	-36.7%	1,216	1.52	-36.4%	
Golf Digest	1,385	3,262	2.36	2,440	1.76	-25.2%	2,556	1.85	-21.6%	
Money	2,109	4,886	2.32	4,557	2.16	-6.7%	4,965	2.35	1.6%	
Food & Wine	855	1,821	2.13	1,628	1.90	-10.6%	1,589	1.86	-12.7%	
Vogue	1,051	2,133	2.03	2,646	2.52	24.1%	3,171	3.02	48.7%	
Conde Nast Trav.	883	1,682	1.90	1,214	1.37	-27.8%	1,215	1.38	-27.8%	
Vanity Fair	1,088	2,042	1.88	1,960	1.80	-4.0%	2,219	2.04	8.7%	
Southern Living	2,467	4,531	1.84	3,339	1.35	-26.3%	3,640	1.48	-19.7%	
Sunset	1,494	2,510	1.68	2,432	1.63	-3.1%	2,480	1.68	-1.2%	
Home	1,055	1,712	1.62	1,414	1.34	-17.4%	1,388	1.32	-18.9%	
Self	1,268	1,850	1.46	1,341	1.06	-27.5%	1,279	1.01	-30.9%	
Smithsonian	2,234	3,234	1.45	3,326	1.49	2.8%	3,134	1.40	-3.1%	
National Geographic	7,241	10,283	1.42	9,685	1.34	-5.8%	10,252	1.42	-0.3%	
BH&G	7,544	10,004	1.33	8,805	1.17	-12.0%	9,510	1.26	-4.9%	
Reader's Digest	15,922	11,089	0.70	11,379	0.71	2.6%	12,522	0.79	12.9%	

Household Income \$80,000+

	Circulation Based on			1994 MMR		Simmons Freq. of Reading		SMMMMR Freq. RPC	Simmons Recent Reading		SMMMMR RR RPC
	Fall '94 MRI	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	% Diff.	Audience	RPC	% Diff.
		46,999				45,000			45,000		
People	3,366	9,822	2.92	11,381	3.38	15.9%	11,353	3.37	15.6%		
Business Week	917	2,374	2.59	3,576	3.90	50.6%	2,998	3.27	26.3%		
New Yorker	790	1,642	2.08	2,827	3.58	72.2%	2,363	2.99	43.9%		
Newsweek	3,184	6,441	2.02	8,933	2.81	38.7%	8,428	2.65	30.8%		
Sports Illustrated	3,378	6,820	1.96	8,437	2.50	27.4%	7,999	2.37	20.8%		
US News	2,301	4,108	1.79	5,131	2.23	24.9%	4,128	1.79	0.5%		
Time	4,273	7,560	1.77	10,027	2.35	32.6%	9,279	2.17	22.7%		
TV Guide	14,514	8,647	0.60	11,496	0.79	32.9%	10,973	0.76	26.9%		
Forbes	810	2,290	2.83	2,539	3.13	10.9%	2,597	3.21	13.4%		
Fortune	804	2,499	3.11	2,673	3.32	7.0%	2,301	2.86	-7.9%		

Household Income \$80,000+

	Circulation Based on			1994 MMR		Simmons Frequency of Reading		SMMMMR Freq. RPC	Simmons Recent Reading		SMMMMR RR RPC
	MRI Fall '94	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	% Diff.	Audience	RPC	% Diff.
		46,999				45,000			45,000		
US Air	428	1,883	4.40	932	2.18	-50.5%	1,363	3.18	-27.6%		
House Beautiful	1,003	3,780	3.77	2,622	2.61	-30.6%	2,876	2.87	-23.9%		
Sky Magazine	475	1,778	3.74	938	1.97	-47.2%	1,710	3.60	-3.8%		
Arch. Digest	936	3,044	3.25	2,375	2.54	-22.0%	2,790	2.98	-8.3%		
Travel & Leisure	1,090	2,893	2.65	1,858	1.70	-35.8%	1,866	1.71	-35.5%		
Gourmet	887	2,245	2.53	2,238	2.52	-0.3%	2,186	2.46	-2.6%		
Bon Appetit	1,239	2,982	2.41	2,330	1.88	-21.9%	2,512	2.03	-15.8%		
Golf Magazine	1,175	2,815	2.40	1,643	1.40	-41.6%	1,588	1.35	-43.6%		
Working Woman	799	1,912	2.39	NA				0.00			
Golf Digest	1,385	3,262	2.36	2,463	1.78	-24.5%	2,491	1.80	-23.6%		
Money	2,109	4,886	2.32	4,631	2.20	-5.2%	5,039	2.39	3.1%		
Food & Wine	855	1,821	2.13	1,815	2.12	-0.3%	1,698	1.99	-8.8%		
Vogue	1,051	2,133	2.03	2,830	2.69	32.7%	3,140	2.99	47.2%		
Conde Nast Trav.	883	1,682	1.90	1,367	1.55	-18.7%	1,579	1.79	-6.1%		
Vanity Fair	1,088	2,042	1.88	2,208	2.03	8.1%	2,212	2.03	6.3%		
Southern Living	2,467	4,531	1.84	3,992	1.62	-11.9%	4,104	1.66	-9.4%		
Sunset	1,494	2,510	1.68	2,011	1.35	-19.9%	2,102	1.41	-18.3%		
Home	1,055	1,712	1.62	1,628	1.54	-4.9%	1,250	1.18	-27.0%		
Self	1,268	1,850	1.46	1,880	1.48	1.6%	1,973	1.56	6.6%		
Smithsonian	2,234	3,234	1.45	3,778	1.69	16.8%	3,642	1.72	18.8%		
National Geographic	7,241	10,283	1.42	10,383	1.43	1.0%	11,125	1.54	8.2%		
BH&G	7,544	10,004	1.33	8,553	1.13	-14.5%	10,017	1.33	0.1%		
Reader's Digest	15,922	11,089	0.70	12,651	0.79	14.1%	14,167	0.89	27.8%		

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on MRI Fall '94		1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Freq. of Reading		MR/MMR	Simmons Freq. of Reading		SMMMMR
	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	% Diff.	Audience	RPC	% Diff.
		46,999			43,260			45,000		
People	3,386	9,822	2.92	10,618	3.15	8.1%	11,381	3.38	15.9%	
Business Week	917	2,374	2.59	3,785	4.13	59.4%	3,576	3.90	50.6%	
New Yorker	790	1,642	2.08	1,996	2.53	21.6%	2,827	3.58	72.2%	
Newsweek	3,184	6,441	2.02	8,815	2.77	36.9%	8,933	2.81	38.7%	
Sports Illustrated	3,378	6,620	1.96	7,860	2.33	18.7%	8,437	2.50	27.4%	
US News	2,301	4,108	1.79	5,090	2.21	23.9%	5,131	2.23	24.9%	
Time	4,273	7,560	1.77	9,011	2.11	19.2%	10,027	2.35	32.6%	
TV Guide	14,514	8,647	0.60	9,330	0.64	7.9%	11,496	0.79	32.9%	
Fortune	804	2,499	3.11	2,420	3.01	-3.2%	2,673	3.32	6.9%	
Forbes	810	2,290	2.83	2,481	3.06	8.3%	2,539	3.13	10.9%	

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on MRI Fall '94		1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Freq. of Reading		MR/MMR	Simmons Freq. of Reading		SMMMMR
	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	% Diff.	Audience	RPC	% Diff.
		46,999			43,260			45,000		
US Air	428	1,883	4.40	1,048	2.45	-44.3%	932	2.18	-50.5%	
House Beautiful	1,003	3,780	3.77	2,780	2.77	-26.5%	2,622	2.61	-30.6%	
Sky Magazine	475	1,778	3.74	748	1.57	-57.9%	938	1.97	-47.2%	
Arch. Digest	936	3,044	3.25	2,282	2.44	-25.0%	2,375	2.54	-22.0%	
Travel & Leisure	1,090	2,893	2.65	2,027	1.86	-29.9%	1,858	1.70	-35.8%	
Gourmet	867	2,245	2.53	2,051	2.31	-8.6%	2,238	2.52	-0.3%	
Bon Appetit	1,239	2,982	2.41	2,572	2.08	-13.7%	2,330	1.88	-21.9%	
Golf Magazine	1,175	2,815	2.40	1,926	1.64	-31.6%	1,643	1.40	-41.6%	
Working Woman	799	1,912	2.39	1,210	1.51	-36.7%	NA			
Golf Digest	1,385	3,262	2.36	2,440	1.76	-25.2%	2,463	1.78	-24.5%	
Money	2,109	4,886	2.32	4,557	2.16	-6.7%	4,631	2.20	-5.2%	
Food & Wine	855	1,821	2.13	1,628	1.90	-10.6%	1,815	2.12	-0.3%	
Vogue	1051	2,133	2.03	2,646	2.52	24.1%	2,830	2.69	32.7%	
Conde Nast Trav.	883	1,882	1.90	1,214	1.37	-27.8%	1,367	1.55	-18.7%	
Vanity Fair	1088	2,042	1.88	1,960	1.80	-4.0%	2,208	2.03	8.1%	
Southern Living	2,467	4,531	1.84	3,339	1.35	-26.3%	3,992	1.62	-11.9%	
Sunset	1,494	2,510	1.68	2,432	1.63	-3.1%	2,011	1.35	-19.9%	
Home	1,055	1,712	1.62	1,414	1.34	-17.4%	1,628	1.54	-4.9%	
Self	1268	1,850	1.46	1,341	1.06	-27.5%	1,880	1.48	1.6%	
Smithsonian	2,234	3,234	1.45	3,326	1.49	2.8%	3,778	1.69	16.8%	
National Geographic	7,241	10,283	1.42	9,685	1.34	-5.8%	10,383	1.43	1.0%	
BH&G	7,544	10,004	1.33	8,805	1.17	-12.0%	8,553	1.13	-14.5%	
Reader's Digest	15,922	11,089	0.70	11,379	0.71	2.6%	12,651	0.79	14.1%	

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on MRI Fall '94			1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		MRI/MMR RPC % Diff	Simmons Recent Reading		SAR/MMR RPC % Diff
	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience		RPC		
	46,999					45,000					
People	3,366	9,822	2.92	10,960	3.26	11.6%	11,353	3.37	15.6%		
Business Week	917	2,374	2.59	2,873	3.13	21.0%	2,998	3.27	26.3%		
New Yorker	790	1,642	2.08	1,576	1.99	-4.0%	2,363	2.99	43.9%		
Newsweek	3,184	6,441	2.02	8,159	2.56	26.7%	8,428	2.65	30.8%		
Sports Illustrated	3,378	6,620	1.96	7,041	2.08	6.4%	7,999	2.37	20.8%		
US News	2,301	4,108	1.79	3,870	1.68	-5.8%	4,128	1.79	0.5%		
Time	4,273	7,560	1.77	8,141	1.91	7.7%	9,279	2.17	22.7%		
TV Guide	14,514	8,647	0.60	9,010	0.62	4.2%	10,973	0.76	26.9%		
Fortune	804	2,499	3.11	2,263	2.81	-9.5%	2,597	3.23	3.9%		
Forbes	810	2,290	2.83	2,220	2.74	-3.1%	2,301	2.84	0.5%		

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on MRI Fall '94			1994 MMR		Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		MRI/MMR RPC % Diff	Simmons Recent Reading		SAR/MMR RPC % Diff
	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience		RPC		
	46,999					45,000					
US Air	428	1,883	4.40	1,286	3.00	-31.7%	1,363	3.18	-27.6%		
House Beautiful	1,003	3,780	3.77	2,795	2.79	-26.1%	2,876	2.87	-23.9%		
Sky Magazine	475	1,778	3.74	1,108	2.33	-37.7%	1,710	3.60	-3.8%		
Arch. Digest	936	3,044	3.25	2,692	2.88	-11.6%	2,790	2.98	-8.3%		
Travel & Leisure	1,090	2,893	2.65	1,912	1.75	-33.9%	1,866	1.71	-35.5%		
Gourmet	887	2,245	2.53	1,897	2.14	-15.5%	2,186	2.46	-2.6%		
Bon Appetit	1,239	2,982	2.41	2,412	1.95	-19.1%	2,512	2.03	-15.8%		
Golf Magazine	1,175	2,815	2.40	1,880	1.60	-33.2%	1,588	1.35	-43.6%		
Working Woman	799	1,912	2.39	1,216	1.52	-36.4%	NA				
Golf Digest	1,385	3,262	2.36	2,556	1.85	-21.6%	2,491	1.80	-23.6%		
Money	2,109	4,886	2.32	4,965	2.35	1.6%	5,039	2.39	3.1%		
Food & Wine	855	1,821	2.13	1,589	1.86	-12.7%	1,698	1.99	-6.8%		
Vogue	1051	2,133	2.03	3,171	3.02	48.7%	3,140	2.99	47.2%		
Conde Nast Trav.	883	1,682	1.90	1,215	1.38	-27.8%	1,579	1.79	-6.1%		
Vanity Fair	1088	2,042	1.88	2,219	2.04	8.7%	2,212	2.03	8.3%		
Southern Living	2,467	4,531	1.84	3,840	1.48	-19.7%	4,104	1.66	-9.4%		
Sunset	1,494	2,510	1.68	2,480	1.66	-1.2%	2,102	1.41	-16.3%		
Home	1,055	1,712	1.62	1,388	1.32	-18.9%	1,250	1.18	-27.0%		
Self	1268	1,850	1.46	1,279	1.01	-30.9%	1,973	1.56	6.6%		
Smithsonian	2,234	3,234	1.45	3,134	1.40	-3.1%	3,842	1.72	18.8%		
National Geographic	7,241	10,283	1.42	10,252	1.42	-0.3%	11,125	1.54	8.2%		
BH&G	7,544	10,004	1.33	9,510	1.26	-4.9%	10,017	1.33	0.1%		
Reader's Digest	15,922	11,089	0.70	12,522	0.79	12.9%	14,167	0.89	27.8%		

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation		Fall '94 MRI		Simmons		Cov. % Diff. SMMM/MRI
	Based on:		Freq. of Reading		Freq. of Reading		
	Fall '94 MRI	Audience	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	
		43,260			45,000		
Business Week	917	3,785	4.13		3,576	3.90	-5.5%
People	3,366	10,618	3.15		11,381	3.38	7.2%
Newsweek	3,184	8,815	2.77		8,933	2.81	1.3%
New Yorker	790	1,996	2.53		2,827	3.58	41.6%
Sports Illustrated	3,378	7,860	2.33		8,437	2.50	7.3%
US News	2,301	5,090	2.21		5,131	2.23	0.8%
Time	4,273	9,011	2.11		10,027	2.35	11.3%
TV Guide	14,514	9,330	0.64		11,486	0.79	23.2%
Forbes	810	2,481	3.06		2,539	3.13	2.3%
Fortune	804	2,420	3.01		2,673	3.32	10.5%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation		Fall '94 MRI		Simmons		RPC % Diff. SMMM/MRI
	Based on:		Freq. of Reading		Recent Reading		
	Fall '94 MRI	Audience	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	
		43,260			45,000		
House Beautiful	1,003	2,780	2.77		2,622	2.61	-5.7%
Vogue	1,051	2,646	2.52		2,830	2.69	7.0%
US Air	428	1,048	2.45		932	2.18	-11.1%
Arch. Digest	936	2,282	2.44		2,375	2.54	4.1%
Gourmet	887	2,051	2.31		2,238	2.52	9.1%
Money	2,109	4,557	2.16		4,631	2.20	1.6%
Bon Appetit	1,239	2,572	2.08		2,330	1.88	-9.4%
Food & Wine	855	1,628	1.90		1,815	2.12	11.5%
Travel & Leisure	1,090	2,027	1.86		1,858	1.70	-8.3%
Vanity Fair	1,088	1,960	1.80		2,208	2.03	12.7%
Golf Digest	1,385	2,440	1.76		2,463	1.78	0.9%
Golf Magazine	1,175	1,926	1.64		1,843	1.40	-14.7%
Sunset	1,494	2,432	1.63		2,011	1.35	-17.3%
Sky Magazine	475	748	1.57		938	1.97	25.4%
Working Woman	799	1,210	1.51		NA		
Smithsonian	2,234	3,326	1.49		3,778	1.69	13.6%
Conde Nast Trav.	883	1,214	1.37		1,367	1.55	12.6%
Southern Living	2,467	3,339	1.35		3,992	1.62	19.6%
Home	1,055	1,414	1.34		1,628	1.54	15.1%
National Geographic	7,241	9,685	1.34		10,383	1.43	7.2%
BH&G	7,544	8,805	1.17		8,553	1.13	-2.9%
Self	1,268	1,341	1.06		1,880	1.48	40.2%
Reader's Digest	15,922	11,379	0.71		12,651	0.79	11.2%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on:			Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		Simmons Recent Reading		RPC
	Fall '94 MRI	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	% Diff. SMMM/MRI
		43,260				45,000		
People	3,366	10,960	3.26	11,353	3.37			3.6%
Business Week	917	2,873	3.13	2,998	3.27			4.4%
Newsweek	3,184	8,159	2.56	8,428	2.65			3.3%
Sports Illustrated	3,378	7,041	2.08	7,999	2.37			13.6%
New Yorker	790	1,576	1.99	2,363	2.99			48.9%
Time	4,273	8,141	1.91	9,279	2.17			14.0%
US News	2,301	3,870	1.68	4,128	1.79			6.7%
TV Guide	14,514	9,010	0.62	10,973	0.76			21.8%
Fortune	804	2,263	2.81	2,301	2.86			1.7%
Forbes	810	2,220	2.74	2,597	3.21			17.0%

Household Income \$60,000+

	Circulation Based on:			Fall '94 MRI Recent Reading		Simmons Recent Reading		RPC
	Fall '94 MRI	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	Audience	RPC	% Diff. SMMM/MRI
		43,260				45,000		
Vogue	1051	3,171	3.02	3,140	2.99			-1.0%
US Air	428	1,286	3.00	1,363	3.18			6.0%
Arch. Digest	936	2,692	2.88	2,790	2.98			3.6%
House Beautiful	1,003	2,795	2.79	2,876	2.87			2.9%
Money	2,109	4,965	2.35	5,039	2.39			1.5%
Sky Magazine	475	1,108	2.33	1,710	3.60			54.3%
Gourmet	887	1,897	2.14	2,186	2.46			15.2%
Vanity Fair	1088	2,219	2.04	2,212	2.03			-0.3%
Bon Appetit	1,239	2,412	1.95	2,512	2.03			4.1%
Food & Wine	855	1,589	1.86	1,698	1.99			6.9%
Golf Digest	1,385	2,556	1.85	2,491	1.80			-2.5%
Travel & Leisure	1,090	1,912	1.75	1,866	1.71			-2.4%
Sunset	1,494	2,480	1.66	2,102	1.41			-15.2%
Golf Magazine	1,175	1,880	1.60	1,588	1.35			-15.5%
Working Woman	799	1,216	1.52	N.A.				
Southern Living	2,467	3,640	1.48	4,104	1.66			12.7%
National Geographic	7,241	10,252	1.42	11,125	1.54			8.5%
Smithsonian	2,234	3,134	1.40	3,842	1.72			22.6%
Conde Nast Trav.	883	1,215	1.38	1,579	1.79			30.0%
Home	1,055	1,388	1.32	1,250	1.18			-9.9%
BH&G	7,544	9,510	1.26	10,017	1.33			5.3%
Self	1268	1,279	1.01	1,973	1.56			54.3%
Reader's Digest	15,922	12,522	0.79	14,167	0.89			13.1%

