

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Patterns of Viewing Behaviour during Advertisement Breaks in Different Television Programmes

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Marketing at Massey University

Maureen Syn

2002

MASSEY UNIVERSITY

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF REQUEST TO EMBARGO A THESIS
(Pursuant to AC98/168 (Revised 2), Approved by Academic Board 16.02.99)

Name of Candidate: Maureen Sun I.D. Number: 86029022

Degree: Ph.D Dept / Institute / School: Marketing, Business

Thesis Title: Patterns of viewing behaviour during advertisement
breaks in different television programmes

Name of Chief Supervisor: Dr. M. Brennan Telephone Ext: 5576

As author of the above named thesis, I request that my thesis be embargoed from public access until (date) 1 February 2004 for the following reasons:

- Thesis contains commercially sensitive information.
- Thesis contains information which is personal or private and / or which was given on the basis that it not be disclosed.
- Immediate disclosure of thesis contents would not allow the author a reasonable opportunity to publish all or part of the thesis.
- Other (specify) : _____

Please explain here why you think this request is justified:

Additional time is needed for possible publication of parts
of the thesis.

Signed (Candidate): Maureen Sun Date: 30.1.03

Endorsed (Chief Supervisor): M Brennan Date: 31.1.03

Approved / ~~Not Approved~~ (Representative of VC): M Blogg Date: 12/2/2003

Note: Copies of this form, once approved by the representative of the Vice Chancellor, must be bound into every copy of the thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisors Mike Brennan and Zane Kearns for the guidance and kind support they have given to me. Many thanks to Mike who constantly advised me on the next step and, gave me ideas, suggestions and feedback to help me move along. My sincere thanks to Zane who was always there to explain and clarify issues for me.

Acknowledgement should also be given to the Department of Marketing at Massey University and the International Pacific College who funded the equipment used for the research. Without the financial assistance, it would take many more years to initiate and to finish this project.

I owe a huge debt to my husband, Peter Chow who has consistently over the years supported me financially and emotionally. He was also the "labourer" who had to transport and physically carry the recording equipment used to collect the data for this research. But most of all, his encouragement, pragmatism and excellent sense of humour had helped me enormously and enabled me to get over many stressful situations during the stages of this research.

ABSTRACT

This thesis sets out to examine the viewing behaviour of television audiences during advertising breaks. The results reported are based on the analysis of in-home video recordings of 14 families watching television in their own homes over an 8-day period.

In total, the viewing of 6017 advertisements was examined, and the status of the viewer was recorded at 3-second intervals. Each 3-second observation was accorded one of four possible states: the viewers were directing their attention to the screen (*EOS only*); they were directing their attention to the screen but engaging in additional behaviours (*EOS + behaviour*); they were not directing their attention to the screen (*No EOS*); or they were not present.

Across all advertisements, visual attention to the screen was generally low, despite viewers being present for a high proportion of the time during the ad breaks. Viewers were present during the ad breaks for 78% of the time, but were only paying attention to the screen fully 14% (*EOS only*), and looking as well as doing something else simultaneously 11% of the time (*EOS + behaviour*). About half the time during the ad break (52%), no one was looking at the screen.

However, more significantly for advertisers, ad-viewing behaviour differed by programme type. For example, some programmes could command as much as eight times the proportion of eyes-on-screen time than other programmes. Moreover, the proportions of particular ad-viewing behaviour differ in an unpredictable way for different programmes. Thus different conclusions might be reached when for an example, an advertiser sought to optimise a media plan in terms of *EOS only* than when the choice was made to optimise another characteristic of ad viewing, say eye-on-screen and doing something else simultaneously (*EOS + behavior*).

In examining three specific methods of classifying programmes, none of them provided workable descriptions of ad-viewing behaviour. This problem manifests itself in a number of ways, but primarily, the aggregation of programmes into categories masks considerable within-group variation, pointing to the need to consider the effect of programmes at a much more disaggregate level, perhaps even to the extent of considering each episode or segment of the programme before the ad break separately.

Thus, this research has raised questions about programme ratings and demonstrated that the size of an audience may not reflect how attentive that audience is. Even programmes of small audience sizes may have a high proportion of attentive ad viewers and may thus be of interest to advertisers since advertisements placed within such programmes may be equally (if not more) effective than programmes with a larger audience size.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Objectives of Study	8
1.3 Outline of the Chapters	9
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Television Ratings Measurement	12
2.2.1 Diary method	12
2.2.1.1 Non-meter diaries	12
2.2.1.2 Metered diaries	14
2.2.2 Peplemeter research	17
2.2.2.1 Historical overview	17
2.2.2.2 The Peplemeter technology	18
2.2.2.3 Peplemeter use in New Zealand	20
2.2.3.4 Criticisms of Peplemeter	21
2.3 Television Audience Viewing Research	33
2.3.1 Introduction	33
2.3.2 Peplemeter studies	34

2.3.2.1	Introduction	34
2.3.2.2	Ads	34
2.3.2.3	Programmes	38
2.3.2.4	Summary	39
2.3.3	Observational research	40
2.3.3.1	Historical overview	41
2.3.3.2	Viewing patterns	43
2.3.3.3	Relationship between programme and ad viewing	47
2.3.3.4	Summary	51
2.3.4	Effects of programme impact on viewing behaviour	52
2.3.4.1	Introduction	52
2.3.4.2	Demandingness according to Barwise and Ehrenberg (1988)	53
2.3.4.3	Involvement	56
2.3.4.4	Summary	61
2.4	Summary and Conclusions	63
3.	RESEARCH METHOD	66
3.1	Introduction	66
3.2	Sample	67
3.3	Equipment	72
3.4	Programme Involvement Rating Scale	74
3.5	Procedure	75
3.6	Coding	77
3.6.1	Coding overall viewing behaviours	77
3.6.2	Ad pod selection	79
3.6.3	Behaviour during ad breaks	80
3.6.4	Programme codes	81
3.7	Analysis	85

3.7.1	Complete ad pods	85
4.	RESULTS	87
4.1	Introduction	87
4.2	Overall Viewing Patterns of the Participants	88
4.2.1	Viewing time	88
4.2.2	Types of programmes	90
4.3	Behaviour during Advertisement Breaks	92
4.4	The Relationship between Programme Involvement and Ad Involvement	95
4.5	Ad-break Behaviours by Programme Type Using the Classifications Developed in Barwise and Ehrenberg (1988)	96
4.5.1	Comparison of behaviour during <i>demanding</i> and <i>less-demanding</i> programmes	97
4.5.2	Comparison of programmes within <i>demanding</i> programmes	98
4.5.3	Comparison of programmes within <i>less-demanding</i> programmes	99
4.5.4	Comparison of visual attention levels during <i>demanding</i> and <i>less-demanding</i> programmes	100
4.5.5	Comparing viewing behaviour within <i>demanding</i> programmes	101
4.5.6	Comparing viewing behaviour within <i>less-demanding</i> programmes	102
4.5.7	Summary	103
4.6	Ad-break Behaviour by Genres	105
4.6.1	Quality of viewing across different genres	107
4.6.2	Summary	114
4.7	Viewing Behaviours by Impact Categories Developed by Hoffman and Batra (1991)	116

4.7.1	Viewing behaviours associated with programme impact scores	117
4.7.2	Visual attention during presence	119
4.7.3	Comparing results on impact categories	121
4.7.4	Relationship between programme types by genres and impact categories	125
4.7.5	Summary	127
5.	DISCUSSION	129
5.1	Introduction	129
5.2	Presence Versus Attention	134
5.3	Viewing Behaviour and Programme Classification Systems	137
5.3.1	Barwise and Ehrenberg (1988) classification	138
5.3.2	Genre classification	140
5.3.3	Hoffman and Batra (1991) classification	142
5.4	Conclusion and Contribution	146
5.5	Limitations and Implications for Future Research	150
5.5.1	Limitations of research	150
5.5.2	Implications for future research	151
6.	REFERENCES	155
7.	APPENDICES	165
	Glossary	181

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A:	The C-Box	165
Appendix B:	Participant's Programme Evaluation Questionnaire	166
Appendix C:	Participant's Information Sheet	169
Appendix D:	Participant's Consent Form	172
Appendix E:	Summary of Participant Families	173
Appendix F:	Rationale for 30-second Criteria for Ad Pod Selection	174
Appendix G:	Examples of Ad-viewing Behaviour	179

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	ADRATIO by programme type	36
Table 2	Summary details of participants	71
Table 3	Household viewing time	88
Table 4	Time individual household members were present	89
Table 5	Proportion of time viewers were present during different programmes	90
Table 6	Viewing behaviour during complete ad pods	93
Table 7	Attention during complete ad pods	94
Table 8	Ad-break behaviours by programme type using Barwise and Ehrenberg (1988) categories	98
Table 9	Ratios of visual attention to actual presence	100
Table 10	Viewing behaviour by genre categories	106
Table 11	Visual attention and presence	108
Table 12	Viewing behaviour during comedy programmes	113
Table 13	Viewing behaviour by impact scores	117
Table 14	Viewing behaviour by impact scores during time present	120
Table 15	Viewing behaviour by Hoffman and Batra (1991)	123
Table 16	Viewing behaviour of this study	123
Table 17	Impact scores by programme types	126
Table A1	Comparison of ad-viewing behaviour	176
Table A2	Comparison of ad-viewing behaviour using data from viewers' personal evaluation of programmes (Hoffman & Batra, 1991)	177