Memo to Users of Readership Survey Data

"The recency method has had a good run, but surely it is now time to put the poor beast out of its misery." Neil Shepherd-Smith, 1993

The attached paper "Average issue readership - there is something wrong!" by Neil Shepherd-Smith was presented at the M.R.G. Conference in Amsterdam. (He also presented a similar paper "Validating average issue readership levels by circulation and source of copy data" at the Worldwide Readership Symposium 1993.)

The paper is important as it clearly shows why the results from the "recency" method of measuring readership of magazines must be wrong. It should give all the protagonists of the "recency" method plenty to think about.

Also attached are our latest New Zealand readership results to September 1993 compared to those from Media Research Services who use the "recency" method.

Unfortunately many New Zealand media and advertising agency executives don't understand why the "recency" method obtains readership results which are ridiculously high.

The attached December 15 memo from Steve Burns' to "Buyers of Magazine and Newspaper Advertising Space" shows Media Research Services 1992/93 estimates for newspaper readership. Their 1992/93 newspaper readership using the "recency" method shows unrealistic relativities between readership estimates for daily newspapers and weekly newspapers; and daily newspapers and magazines.

Only when all audience measurements are realistic and believable can there be a truly multi-media instrument.

Only the Roy Morgan Readership Survey readership results in Australia and New Zealand show realistic relativities when comparisons are made between magazine and newspaper readership estimates and the number of people viewing specific TV programs and listening to specific radio stations. The Roy Morgan survey is truly a multi-media study.

Please contact me or Albert Waks if you'd like to receive more details on our latest Australian or New Zealand surveys.

Yours sincerely,

Gary C. Morgan,
EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN.