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## 1. Overview

The advertising industry is pushing strongly for newspapers to provide sectional readership data.

This is not new. It has been evident since the early 1990's when newspapers began taking advantage of colour and improved printing processes to segment their products.

The primary intent of these moves was to lift circulation and readership. But it also shifted newspapers from being mass media vehicles to becoming more tailored environments for advertisers.

Unsurprisingly, the advertising industry wanted to know more detail on how many and who it was that were reading the individual sections.
"Because most people automatically throw away sections of the newspapers, an overall readership figure does not help ad agencies accurately target the best pages for their ad client", Steven Farr of John Bevins Advertising, told Mediaweek in 1999.

Individual publishers partially met this demand by occasionally commissioning research into the profile of their newspapers' readership. This helped in product development as well as providing advertisers with snapshots of sectional readership from time to time.

But there has been a reluctance to publicly reveal sectional data. Nor has the industry moved to develop a common industry standard on readership that goes deeper than the total numbers.

It stands to reason. Sectional data shows that the component parts generally (the exception being some magazine inserts) have fewer readers than the newspaper as a whole.

There is legitimate concern that media buyers would use the data to drive down advertising rates.

Some in the ad industry claim otherwise.
"If I knew 50 percent of my target market read a particular section I would pay for it", Starcom's John Lambert told Mediaweek in the same 1999 article. "Potentially there is a chance to charge a premium."

But Steven Farr believed the publishers preferred not to know. " It might create a situation where it is more difficult to sell some sections than others."

Certainly, any decision to embrace sectional readership data would mean substantially changing the basis of the current sales and pricing models.

While the push for more detailed readership data has ebbed and flowed over the years, it has recently intensified. The advertising industry is arguing that if newspapers are following a segmentation strategy it is time they provided performance data in line with other sectors of the media.

This renewed interest reflects the intense pressure on the industry by clients to justify expenditure. In these days of tight cost controls and competitive revenue markets, advertisers want to minimise wastage.

This means targeting potential customers as closely as possible. The days are gone when marketing directors could joke that they waste half their budget, they just don't know which half.

Television is providing the ad industry with reams of data. Magazines, where there has been an explosion of titles covering every conceivable segment of interest, provide suitably substantiated niche audience options.

The issue for the newspaper industry is how best to take advantage of its greatest strength its enormous readership.

There is no easy choice.
The danger in acceding to the industry's demands is that it will involve change, the outcome of which may be neither predictable nor comfortable. The risk is that ad rates will be driven down as the large global readership numbers are disaggregated into smaller units.

The danger in doing nothing is that advertising revenue may inevitably drift to other media which is prepared to measure their product in greater detail.

There is evidence this is already occurring.
Newspapers, particularly Metro/National daily publications, have lost substantial share of the national advertising market over the past decade.

To counter this drift, Roy Morgan Research believes there are potential revenue opportunities for newspapers in moving to an industry-wide measure of sectional readership which would permit more concrete cases to be made for specialised target audiences.

A measure that adds an accepted "value multiple" to raw sectional data has the potential to improve newspapers' market share of the advertising pie. But it will not be easy.

The separate newspaper companies operate under different business models that reflect their distinctive market positioning. Any change may impact in different ways.

No one wants to be involved in another OzTam situation where one network was unprepared for the outcome.

An agreement on a joint course of action will necessarily involve the piloting of data collection, analysis and assessment of results and negotiation to incorporate differing needs or points of view before any common set of standards are agreed.

## 2. Current Newspaper Measurement

At present the newspaper industry uses two methods of measuring the performance of their publications.

- Circulation as confirmed by the Audit Bureau of Circulation. These figures are released half yearly, interspersed with two publishers' statements.

On a trend basis the figures show that total numbers of newspapers sold have declined significantly over the past decade, with the exception of Sunday papers.

- Readership. This is independently assessed by Roy Morgan Research and released quarterly. Readership has shown very similar trends to circulation, with decreases in the number of readers for the majority of newspapers, again with the exception of Sundays.

The situation is exacerbated when population growth is factored in.
Each newspaper company stresses their own particular competitive advantage:
News Limited focuses on its substantial lead in both circulation and total readership over its Fairfax rivals.
Fairfax concentrates on its advantage in AB readership.
West Australian Newspapers mixes both.
Their respective advertising sales approaches are shaped accordingly.

## 3. Competitive Environment

In this paper we will focus on the newspaper industry's position in the market for national advertising expenditure, ie that component (usually of display nature) primarily placed by national advertisers through advertising agencies.

We do so because it is in this arena that sectional readership is particularly relevant. While each organization has substantial classified and direct business, these depend more on total readership results (although over time this may also change).

An analysis of the newspaper industry's performance in the national advertising expenditure market over the past decade exposes serious issues.


Appendix One shows that the national advertising pie in Australia grew 59.4 percent between 1993 and 2002 to $\$ 4.25$ billion in sales.

However, over that period Metro/National dailies national revenue rose only 32.8 percent. Metro Sunday newspapers did better but at 55.8 percent were still under the media industry average. The big movers among newspapers were regionals and suburbans, but off a very low base.

Overall, the newspaper sector's national ad revenue grew 45.5 percent over the decade. (Compounding at just under 4 percent annually, this is roughly the equivalent of having invested funds in a savings account with a major bank.)

Television also underperformed but not so badly. Revenue grew 54.2 percent over the period.
Radio performed well, growing 95.8 percent. Outdoor was up 64.8 percent.
The most pertinent competitor for newspapers, however, is magazines. Here revenue boomed, rising 103.7 percent. This was evident across all three categories, women's, general interest and special interest. Special interest magazines did particularly well.

The past decade has been a tale of two different markets.
Across the media, sales of national advertising for the period 1993-1998 were extremely strong growing 48.7 percent. Increasing 59.9 percent, Metro/National newspapers performed above the market.

But from 1998-2002, when the overall national ad market grew only 7.2 percent, newspapers' performance literally collapsed, dropping 17 percent for Metro/Nationals and 11.2 percent overall. It was by far the weakest performance of any medium.

Magazines, radio, TV and outdoor all continued to grow, albeit slowly. But grow they did.


The past year has seen a pronounced improvement in the national advertising market.
Newspapers have participated in these better market conditions over 2003. But there has been no evidence of a retrieval of market share.

According to the AFR this week, Zenith Optimedia estimates of 2004 and 2005 national adspend growth have newspapers growing at less than the market average.

Steve Allen of Fusion Strategy disagrees. He has newspapers' national ad revenue rising 8.4 percent this year against the total market's 7.4 percent.

Still, the performance over the decade to 2002 is of particular concern as it indicated a very rapid deterioration in newspapers' ability to compete with other media. Of particular note is the poor relative performance against magazines. This is evident in market share data but also readership comparisons for the past decade (see Appendix Two).

Once quite distinct products, newspapers and magazines now play in the same yard because of the proliferation of inserted colour sections, supplements and magazines.

The characteristics of the magazine sector have been rapid fragmentation and diversification evident in an explosion of titles - and a willingness to shape and measure publications to advertisers' needs.

There is no definitive evidence but it is certainly worth asking the question whether the measurable, highly targeted audiences that magazines were able to offer advertisers resulted in this better performance in the national ad market over the decade.

Like newspapers, the magazine industry is broadening its offering. But unlike newspapers the magazine industry gives the advertising sector performance data on each new product.

Under the current measurement framework this is difficult for newspapers.


## 4. Market Opportunities

The market for national advertising expenditure was valued by CEASA at $\$ 4.25$ billion in 2002 and growth estimates for 2004 and 2005 range in the 5-7.5 percent range.

The task for newspapers, having lost market share over the past decade, is to reverse the trend.
It is evident, from the market share trends discussed above, that the current reliance on global (total) readership numbers is no longer working for newspapers as it once did.

Moving to a sectional approach could provide significant opportunities for newspapers.

- It would meet client needs
- It could match magazines' ability to deliver targeted audience
- It could provide a larger range of premium positions in newspapers

It would also enhance the publishers' understanding of the performance of their own sections enabling improved allocation of resources in pursuit of circulation, readership and advertising.

Creating an industry standard would keep publishers' needs central to any decision on sectional measurement. If no action is taken the advertising industry may well seek to create its own.

## 5. A Potential Solution

Any shift to sectionalised readership data has to enhance the publishers' argument that newspapers are a valuable environment for national advertising. It cannot result in a worse revenue outcome.

We know that, apart from some inserted magazines, newspaper sections are read by smaller numbers than read the paper as a whole.

Morgan Research (Appendix Four) shows that only seven sections are typically read by 40 percent or more of readers.

These are National News at 71 percent, Local News at 68 percent and International News at 63 percent. (Note: We are speaking in broad terms as individual sections in specific papers perform above or below the aggregated figures we are using here.)

The next level is Sport (45 percent), TV listings (45 percent) and Letters to the Editor (39 percent).

All other sections lie in the 10-35 percent range.
However, readership habits vary with profile type. For example the Socially Aware Values Segment rate very high on Travel (46 percent) and Film and Video Reviews (41 percent).

It is less easy to judge readership of named sections since Morgan's current work measures category of reading rather than individually branded products.

But Roy Morgan Research did carry out a survey of particular newspapers sections in 1997 for a private client who wished to know how to best target premium customers.

This confirmed the pre-eminence of news related sections as the most read parts of the newspaper. But some non news sections were also notable for their strength.

Readership of The Sydney Morning Herald's Good Living section was high. So too was The Weekend Australian's Travel/Books/Art section.

Because we know no section will achieve 100 percent of a paper's readers, it is essential that the industry define a 'value multiple' which, when factored with the raw data, gives a measure of the real value of the readership to advertisers.

This multiple - yet to be defined- could take into account such factors as reader income or net worth, AB's, big spenders, propensity to purchase or consume relevant category items, eg home renovators, new car buyers, mobile phone intenders, etc.

Clearly, the final components and their respective weightings would be central to a successful outcome.

Once such a system was established individual publishers could determine how best it be used. The options are numerous.

At the end of a process of investigation the industry could:

- Choose to do nothing
- Measure everything
- Measure key sections

Or there could be combinations and variations.

However the issue is finalised, it is crucial that the publishers can predict how it will impact on their business.

It must be of high value to the newspaper industry, improving its competitive outlook in what we can see is an intensely competitive media market. It must also be something which makes sense to users and is simple to administer.

## 6. Recommendations

Roy Morgan Research has the resources and ability to undertake the work necessary for the Publishers to formulate an industry position which puts them in control of the agenda.

The 'work' is a substantial consulting exercise involving data collection, analysis, consultation, review and formulation of solutions. It would be done for and on behalf of the Publishers but would permit advertiser input to the process. Essentially Roy Morgan Research would be aligned with the Publishers allowing them to go back to the industry with a coherent, considered position.

Greg Hywood would lead the project, as an 'independent insider' with the back-up of William Burlace and the resources of Roy Morgan Research. Additional relevant expertise would be sourced as required.

Protocols would be developed for data sharing so that each Publisher involved was comfortable with the process. Confidentiality will be guaranteed.

Qualitative aspects of the reading of sections would also be assessed, eg time spent reading, number of times read, involvement with section, etc.

It is recommended that Roy Morgan Single Source respondents are re-contacted for this exercise and given specific self-completion materials to generate new detailed information which can be linked back to, but is inherently distinct from, the readership currency. This methodology has been successfully used in the past on issues with some similarity to this project.

Data could be generated fairly swiftly in this manner should the Publishers wish to move the matter forward quickly.

It must be stressed that this exercise, with its potential to rejuvenate the role of newspapers in the media framework, is more about senior assessment and consultation than simply another research project.

The rumblings from other stakeholders in the advertising process are growing. It is better to lead than be led. The apparent market failure of newspapers, particularly in the last five years, is actually quite the opposite when seen as a springboard for opportunity. Roy Morgan Research wants to see newspapers reach for their full potential.

We believe "it's time".

## Appendices

1. CEASA data - National Advertising Expenditure 1993, 1998, 2002
2. Gross and Net Readership of Newspapers \& Magazines Sep 93, Sep 98, Sep 03
3. Newspapers: Circulation, readership, RPC Mar93, Jun 98, Jun 03
4. Sectional Reading Examples

## Appendix 1

| CEASA figures | National Advertising (\$000) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix 2



| FILTER: New South Wales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sep-93 | Sep-98 | Sep-03 |  |  |  |
| Population of New South Wales |  | 5,009 | 5,312 | 5,655 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 12.9 |
| Total Newspapers | Gross | 18,883 | 18,517 | 17,731 | -1.9 | -4.2 | -6.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 3,693 | 3,852 | 3,902 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 5.7 |
| M-F Newspapers | Gross | 12,794 | 12,310 | 11,755 | -3.8 | -4.5 | -8.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 2,772 | 2,710 | 2,665 | -2.2 | -1.7 | -3.9 |
| Saturday Newspapers | Gross | 2,696 | 2,667 | 2,579 | -1.1 | -3.3 | -4.3 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 2,268 | 2,253 | 2,219 | -0.7 | -1.5 | -2.2 |
| Sunday Newspapers | Gross | 3,393 | 3,540 | 3,397 | 4.3 | -4.0 | 0.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 2,645 | 2,810 | 2,808 | 6.2 | -0.1 | 6.2 |
| Total Magazines (excl. inserts) | Gross | 18,576 | 18,863 | 25,269 | 1.5 | 34.0 | 36.0 |
|  | Net | 4,241 | 4,311 | 4,544 | 1.7 | 5.4 | 7.1 |
| FILTER: Victoria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sep-93 | Sep-98 | Sep-03 |  |  |  |
| Population of Victoria |  | 3,589 | 3,733 | 4,050 | 4.0 | 8.5 | 12.8 |
| Total Newspapers | Gross | 17,434 | 16,603 | 16,579 | -4.8 | -0.1 | -4.9 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 3,028 | 3,039 | 3,160 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 4.4 |
| M-F Newspapers | Gross | 12,696 | 11,763 | 11,793 | -7.3 | 0.3 | -7.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 2,736 | 2,610 | 2,716 | -4.6 | 4.1 | -0.7 |
| Saturday Newspapers | Gross | 2,794 | 2,720 | 2,605 | -2.6 | -4.2 | -6.8 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 2,326 | 2,239 | 2,196 | -3.7 | -1.9 | -5.6 |
| Sunday Newspapers | Gross | 1,944 | 2,120 | 2,181 | 9.1 | 2.9 | 12.2 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,760 | 1,921 | 2,016 | 9.1 | 4.9 | 14.5 |
| Total Magazines (excl. inserts) | Gross | 12,356 | 12,403 | 17,152 | 0.4 | 38.3 | 38.8 |
|  | Net | 3,013 | 2,910 | 3,211 | -3.4 | 10.3 | 6.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FILTER: Queensland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sep-93 | Sep-98 | Sep-03 |  |  |  |
| Population of Queensland |  | 2,446 | 2,765 | 3,026 | 13.0 | 9.4 | 23.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Newspapers | Gross | 6,770 | 6,181 | 6,383 | -8.7 | 3.3 | -5.7 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,737 | 1,799 | 1,911 | 3.6 | 6.2 | 10.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M-F Newspapers | Gross | 4,156 | 3,587 | 3,735 | -13.7 | 4.1 | -10.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,002 | 892 | 937 | -11.0 | 5.0 | -6.5 |
| Saturday Newspapers | Gross | 1191 | 1171 | 1158 | -17 | -11 | -2 8 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,068 | 1,020 | 1,037 | -4.5 | 1.7 | -2.9 |
| Sunday Newspapers | Gross | 1,423 | 1,423 | 1,490 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,423 | 1,423 | 1,490 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Magazines (excl. inserts) | Gross | 7,906 | 8,068 | 11,698 | 2.0 | 45.0 | 48.0 |
|  | Net | 2,051 | 2,207 | 2,426 | 7.6 | 9.9 | 18.3 |


| FILTER: South Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sep-93 | Sep-98 | Sep-03 |  |  |  |
| Population of South Australia |  | 1,189 | 1,211 | 1,249 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 5.0 |
| Total Newspapers | Gross | 4,948 | 4,901 | 5,019 | -0.9 | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,044 | 1,062 | 1,054 | 1.7 | -0.8 | 1.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M-F Newspapers | Gross | 3,350 | 3,209 | 3,353 | -4.2 | 4.5 | 0.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 772 | 772 | 799 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saturday Newspapers | Gross | 831 | 855 | 895 | 2.9 | 4.7 | 7.7 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 750 | 759 | 781 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 4.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunday Newspapers | Gross | 767 | 837 | 771 | 9.1 | -7.9 | 0.5 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 767 | 837 | 771 | 9.1 | -7.9 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Magazines (excl. inserts) | Gross | 4,015 | 3,975 | 4,519 | -1.0 | 13.7 | 12.6 |
|  | Net | 988 | 986 | 979 | -0.2 | -0.7 | -0.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FILTER: Western Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sep-93 | Sep-98 | Sep-03 |  |  |  |
| Population of Western Australia |  | 1,348 | 1,449 | 1,585 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 17.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Newspapers | Gross | 5,781 | 5,696 | 5,341 | -1.5 | -6.2 | -7.6 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 1,202 | 1,277 | 1,333 | 6.2 | 4.4 | 10.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M-F Newspapers | Gross | 3,802 | 3,673 | 3,224 | -3.4 | -12.2 | -15.2 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 883 | 883 | 844 | 0.0 | -4.4 | -4.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saturday Newspapers | Gross | 1,096 | 1,149 | 1,207 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 10.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 999 | 1,035 | 1,078 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 7.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunday Newspapers | Gross | 883 | 874 | 910 | -1.0 | 4.1 | 3.1 |
| (total of those above) | Net | 883 | 874 | 910 | -1.0 | 4.1 | 3.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Magazines (excl. inserts) | Gross | 3,678 | 4,137 | 6,345 | 12.5 | 53.4 | 72.5 |
|  | Net | 1,077 | 1,106 | 1,219 | 2.7 | 10.2 | 13.2 |

Appendix 3

| NEWSPAPERS |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Apr-92 - } \\ \text { Mar-93 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Jul-97- } \\ & \text { Jun-98 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Jul-02 - } \\ & \text { Jun-03 } \end{aligned}$ | \% change 98 to 03 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% change } \\ 93 \text { to } 03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RPC change } \\ 98 \text { to } 03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RPC change } \\ 93 \text { to } 03 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population |  | 13,833,000 | 14,884,000 | 15,980,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Advertiser (M-F) | Circ. | 209716 | 204906 | 204,502 | -0.2\% | -2.5\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 621000 | 573000 | 584,000 | 1.9\% | -6.0\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 |  |  | 0.1 | -0.1 |
| Advertiser (Sat) | Circ. | 263316 | 271751 | 281,117 | 3.4\% | 6.8\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 738000 | 723000 | 752,000 | 4.0\% | 1.9\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.7 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.1 |
| Age (M-F) | Circ. | 212507 | 202573 | 197,700 | -2.4\% | -7.0\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 736000 | 675000 | 700,000 | 3.7\% | -4.9\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.5 |  |  | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Age (Sat) | Circ. | 355833 | 354362 | 315,250 | -11.0\% | -11.4\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1088000 | 1086000 | 1,009,000 | -7.1\% | -7.3\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Australian (M-F) | Circ. | 113439 | 124939 | 132,213 | 5.8\% | 16.5\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 400000 | 414000 | 459,000 | 10.9\% | 14.8\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.5 |  |  | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Australian Financial Review (M-F) | Circ. | 73514 | 90258 | 85,120 | -5.7\% | 15.8\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 279000 | 312000 | 296,000 | -5.1\% | 6.1\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.3 |
| Australian Financial Review (Sat) | Circ. |  | 77000 | 86,679 | 12.6\% |  |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. |  | 182000 | 178,000 | -2.2\% |  |  |  |
|  | RPC |  | 2.4 | 2.1 |  |  | -0.3 | 2.1 |
| Courier Mail (M-F) | Circ. | 234373 | 212675 | 219,451 | 3.2\% | -6.4\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 720000 | 584000 | 606,000 | 3.8\% | -15.8\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.8 |  |  | 0.1 | -0.3 |
| Courier Mail (Sat) | Circ. | 330848 | 341000 | 346,445 | 1.6\% | 4.7\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 974000 | 912000 | 941,000 | 3.2\% | -3.4\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.2 |
| Daily Telegraph (M-F) | Circ. | 480250 | 437986 | 407,498 | -7.0\% | -15.1\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1374000 | 1264000 | 1,224,000 | -3.2\% | -10.9\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Daily Telegraph (Sat) | Circ. | 352242 | 367941 | 341,062 | -7.3\% | -3.2\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1031000 | 1020000 | 982,000 | -3.7\% | -4.8\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 |  |  | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Herald Sun (M-F) | Circ. | 583513 | 563800 | 550,032 | -2.4\% | -5.7\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1679000 | 1530000 | 1,487,000 | -2.8\% | -11.4\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.2 |
| Herald Sun (Sat) | Circ. | 534340 | 524000 | 517,650 | -1.2\% | -3.1\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1467000 | 1442000 | 1,404,000 | -2.6\% | -4.3\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 |  |  | -0.1 | 0.0 |
| Sunday Age (VIC) | Circ. | 182172 | 205832 | 194,500 | -5.5\% | 6.8\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 584000 | 688000 | 654,000 | -4.9\% | 12.0\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 |  |  | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Sunday Herald Sun (VIC) | Circ. | 465369 | 524100 | 582,630 | 11.2\% | 25.2\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1313000 | 1429000 | 1,508,000 | 5.5\% | 14.9\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 |  |  | -0.1 | -0.2 |
| Sunday Mail (QLD) | Circ. | 555553 | 585400 | 611,298 | 4.4\% | 10.0\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1410000 | 1413000 | 1,494,000 | 5.7\% | 6.0\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.1 |
| Sunday Mail (SA) | Circ. | 308630 | 344778 | 340,667 | -1.2\% | 10.4\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 748000 | 822000 | 783,000 | -4.7\% | 4.7\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.3 |  |  | -0.1 | -0.1 |
| Sunday Telegraph - (NSW/QLD) | Circ. | 704717 | 715218 | 734,021 | 2.6\% | 4.2\% |  |  |
| circ, figs = NSW only | Re'ship. | 1829000 | 1944000 | 1,976,000 | 1.6\% | 8.0\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.7 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Sunday Times (WA) | Circ. | 333824 | 346397 | 352,000 | 1.6\% | 5.4\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 856000 | 866000 | 897,000 | 3.6\% | 4.8\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.1 |
| Sun-Herald (Sunday) - (NSW/QLD) | Circ. | 617160 | 612950 | 542,735 | -11.5\% | -12.1\% |  |  |
| circ. Figs. $=$ NSW only | Re'ship. | 1780000 | 1591000 | 1,518,000 | -4.6\% | -14.7\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.8 |  |  | 0.2 | -0.1 |
| Sydney Morning Herald (M-F) | Circ. | 240554 | 237847 | 225,737 | -5.1\% | -6.2\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 913000 | 903000 | 895,000 | -0.9\% | -2.0\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.0 |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Sydney Morning Herald (Sat) | Circ. | 394326 | 409980 | 391,678 | -4.5\% | -0.7\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 1351000 | 1317000 | 1,331,000 | 1.1\% | -1.5\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 |  |  | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Weekend Australian (Sat) | Circ. | 315500 | 309747 | 295,168 | -4.7\% | -6.4\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 934000 | 925000 | 917,000 | -0.9\% | -1.8\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| West Australian (M-F) | Circ. | 236848 | 227114 | 205,266 | -9.6\% | -13.3\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 696000 | 679000 | 576,000 | -15.2\% | -17.2\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |  |  | -0.2 | -0.1 |
| West Australian (Sat) | Circ. | 364820 | 389226 | 384,976 | -1.1\% | 5.5\% |  |  |
|  | Re'ship. | 954000 | 1011000 | 1,035,000 | 2.4\% | 8.5\% |  |  |
|  | RPC | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| TOTAL CIRCULATION |  | 8,463,364 | 8,681,780 | 8,545,395 | -1.6\% | 1.0\% |  |  |
| TOTAL READERSHIP |  | 24,475,000 | 24,305,000 | 24,206,000 | -0.4\% | -1.1\% |  |  |
| TOTAL RPC |  | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 |  |  | 0.0 | -0.1 |




