

# What is it to Watch TV-Dialogue

## May 25, 2016

---

RICHARD ZACKON: It's kind of unique. We've not done something like this before. First of all, everyone, take a look at Shelley, who we never see, up in the upper left hand corner, at least on my screen. Just be thankful for her management.

What this is about is exploring this topic, "What is it to watch TV?" And I'll tell you how it came about.

I've used that question as the first day of class from my NYU course on audience measurement for years, just to get people thinking about the topic. And then about a year ago, Horst Stipp, of the ARF, was in a CRE Meeting and he said, "What is it to watch TV anyway?" And I resonated with my own thinking there, and I've been thinking about it. We had an event in March with that as a title and we're having a second in July with that as the title. And what this event today is designed to do is to kick up some dust on the topic, invite people in on the thinking; I'll share my initial thinking.

What is it to watch TV? And I'll share with you the questions I've broken it down into. And what I'm looking to do is if we're successful today, if people feel the time was well spent, over the course of the summer we'll explore these different topics for the purpose of identifying research questions that the CRE can answer, or elsewhere in the industry people might be looking at. Because my motivation is I don't think we know what it is to watch TV. I think we're at the threshold of learning a lot with a lot of new techniques and that's my thinking.

The questions I've broken it down into, "What is it to watch TV?" What is TV? It's not what it used to be when I was a kid and had TV. What was it to watch? And I think that's the core question. What is that thing we call watching or viewing or whatever we call that? The behavior, the subjective experience, all of that. What is that?

Third question, and we spent a lot of our time as researchers on this, "Who's watching?" We're looking at aspects of the audience itself. That's part of the question.

Then, how are they watching? I have a couple of categories. There could be more. One is what are the conditions that they're viewing? Are they co-viewing? Are they using other screens? What's going on there? And how do they navigate? The on/off switch, the channel switch, fast forward. They're all elements of watching.

And then what are the effects of watching? What we most care about is whether brand recall, political impact; so what are the effects of the watching?

And then I'd like to add to these five different conversations over the course of several weeks, one on neurometrics. The CRE is working – Howard Shimmel, Beth Rockwood – actually right now they're working with the group to better understand how we might apply to our metric learning, this whole set of questions.

So that's what I got. If anyone has something right off the top to say, say something, we're listening. And we'll with the first person that says their name.

CERIL SHAGRIN: Ceril. I think it varies by age group. My 18-year old granddaughter thinks she is watching TV regardless of the device or the source of the TV.

My sister, on the other hand, would think if it wasn't on the TV screen, it wasn't TV.

RICHARD ZACKON: So is that in answer to the question, "What is TV?"

CERIL SHAGRIN: I'm saying it varies.

RICHARD ZACKON: Okay. I'd be interested, rather than going to answers, if we stay at the level of questions where there are some broad categories because we could answer these questions, we'd be out of here in 20 minutes with our current understanding of what the answers are. I'd like to keep the conversation about what are the questions?

TIM: Richard?

RICHARD ZACKON: Who's that? Is that Tim?

TIM BROOKS: This is Tim. Yeah. I think...

RICHARD ZACKON: Introduce yourself. Not everyone knows you on this call. Just give your name and five seconds.

TIM BROOKS: Tim Brooks.

RICHARD ZACKON: Okay.

TIM BROOKS: I think it might be helpful at the start to enunciate the reasons we're asking the questions because those will, to a large degree, frame how we answer them, I think. Why are we asking the questions? I can suggest some reasons, but why don't you enunciate that.

RICHARD ZACKON: I will on the condition that you, then, give your reasons after I do.

My primary reason is to generate thinking for CRE research projects. CRE is focused on measurement. Audience measurement. So what are these sets of questions that I raised? How do they relate to audience measurement? And, again, I am less looking for answers to those questions, and we'll discuss them. But I'd like to stay at the level of the question. Is there whole sent question about "What is it to watch TV" that I completely overlooked? And I imagine there is. That's my answer, Tim.

TIM BROOKS: You can go off into psychological analyses of people. I mean, to me, the basic reason we do is we want a commercial measurement system. We want a way of knowing how commercial.

There could be other things. There could be political influences, there could be social influences, but we're talking, when we're talking about Nielsen, and my understanding about a commercial measurement system. So that's why we need to define these terms. Is that acceptable?

RICHARD ZACKON: Yeah, that's fair. I think that is the context of the CRE and our community together and, yes, this set of questions.

JANET GALLANT: This is Janet. One of the things...

RICHARD ZACKON: Janet Gallant. Can you tell us...? Janet, just quickly, where you work. Again, not everyone knows everyone.

JANET GALLANT: Oh, Janet Gallant, at NBC/Universal.

RICHARD ZACKON: Okay.

JANET GALLANT: One of the things that occurs to me that increasingly people, we watch, in some ways, Nielsen measures the television set. But the larger question is people are viewing television programming on many different platforms. So when we say "What is television?" Some people...in the old days, it used to just be I'm watching television because I'm watching on the TV set. But television programming is also nuanced now. Like do people think when they watch original programming on Netflix that that's television programming? In some ways, what are we measuring when we say watching television?

RICHARD ZACKON: That would seem to me to go to the question of "What is TV?" Within TV -- one second Peter, I'll introduce you -- within TV there is content and then there is the technology itself. And we are raising the question of the programming of the content.

JANET GALLANT: Correct.

RICHARD ZACKON: Yeah, good. Peter. Peter Fondolas (sp).

PETER FONDOLAS: Peter Fondolas from HUB Research. Yeah, I mean at some point I think we have to wonder whether the term "TV" really applies anymore. Or is it kind of too broad of a term or becoming too broad of a term because TV can mean everything from the source from which you get content. It can mean the content itself. It could mean the device you're watching it on. And that's what it always meant in the past, I think, just because in the past it was very limited. It was on a certain type of box, from a certain type of source, a certain type of content. Now things are changing so much that, and one example that pops into my mind is short form content.

So if you are watching a [Cudeny – 08:44] video, is that TV? If you're watching it on a computer, is it TV? If you're watching it on a connected TV set, is that TV? Even content that is related to actual traditional TV shows like a webisode from The Walking Dead. If it's a five

minute video, is that TV or is that something different from TV because it's not a half hour format or an hour format that you're watching necessarily on a TV set from a TV network.

So, to me, it's a really; it's an important question. It may be an academic question because it's just so much now that could be included that trying to kind of restrict all of these things into some firm like TV may not really tell us a whole lot.

JUANNA DAN (Sp): I that's a great question. This is Lana Dan from Nielsen. That's what I was going to say as well.

In terms of language and people refer to watching content; when people say I'm watching TV it often means they're sitting on the couch surfing through the channels. Whereas if they watch something on their computer, they're saying, no, I'm watching XYZ show because it was a conscious decision to go look for the show, watch that, and then put the computer down to something else. They're not just sitting there browsing through in general. But many times, I'm not sitting there browsing through a channel. Maybe a sub question of "What is it to watch TV," is what do people think it is to watch TV.

RICHARD ZACKON: Under the question of "What is it to watch TV," there are two ways I can think of to ask that question. One is from our perspective as participants in the industry. And then the other, and I think the more important one, is from the audience perspective, what is it for them? How does the world of TV programming, technology, etc., show up to them?

LESLIE WOOD: Richard, this is Leslie Wood.

RICHARD ZACKON: Hi Leslie. Tell people where you work. Not everyone knows you.

LESLIE WOOD: I work for Nielsen Catalina Solutions.

RICHARD ZACKON: Thank you.

LESLIE WOOD: So, I think to ignore the perspective of our side also makes a mistake because our side, there are two different camps. There's the camp that is concerned with watching content, and then there's the camp that's interested in watching commercials. Did you see a commercial? There are very different definitions and the same content can be carried in many different places and not have the same commercial carry with it. So what is audience? There's a commercial audience and then there's a program audience.

You do need to keep...in terms of thinking about a rating or a why is that important to us? It's important because we care whether or not it's a commercial rating or not.

RICHARD ZACKON: whose voice was that? I'm sorry.

LESLIE WOOD: It's Leslie Wood.

RICHARD ZACKON: Oh, okay. Your voice broke up in the middle. I didn't realize that was ongoing with you.

LESLIE WOOD: That's my, you know, whatever, phone issues.

RICHARD ZACKON: By the way, we're recording this and I'm looking forward to transcribing this. If anyone objects to that, we won't include what you have to say on the transcript.

JASPER: This is Jasper from the ARF. I think, Peter – hi everyone – I think Peter really hit the nail on the head there in terms of there's a kind of inherent conflation in the entire conversation here, right, which is the fact that 20 years ago, 10 years ago, even, the notions of the content type and the platform were inextricably linked. And when you said TV, we were actually talking about this intertwined combination of the content type which is effectively video and the big black box on the wall.

But now, this is where it becomes something of an academic question, "What is TV now?" The reality is that those two things are completely free to go their different ways. So there is a conversation around digital errant knowledge. There's a conversation around video content. And there's a conversation on the other side of the room around what happens on the black box on the wall.

The conflation of TV; the conflation of video plus black box on the wall no more exists. So you have to separate them.

KEVIN NEWMAN: This is Kevin Newman from Nielsen, I'm sorry; from NBC/Universal. I used to work at Nielsen. And in all the data providers that we deal with and that we've seen, even in the old analysis, in the old days when I worked at the Yankee Group and the Gardener Guys, all those guys in the industry still refer to this as multi channel video. Right.

So multi channel video is basically on any channel, on any kind of device, but its content, regardless of where it is, and, so we separate long... [Audio dropped.]

RICHARD ZACKON: Kevin, we just lost audio.

KEVIN NEWMAN: Sorry. We're concerned of separating the long form video from short form video to the point raised earlier where we look at those two things separately.

And even when we look at data amalgamators like the one we used, I'm trying to think of the name, Media Morph.

Media Morph is a company that will actually segregate your long views from your short views for your digital programming. So I think it's important to separate right from the out start, the long form video from short form video when we're defining what TV is.

RICHARD ZACKON: Mm hmm. Thanks Kevin.

CHERYL: This is Cheryl from Scripps. And I'll add another dimension to that which is live vs. VOD. So, we're starting to have discussions inside Scripps about the OTT solutions and our apps and our website and people can stream live on that, or they can watch the [inaudible – 14:51]. So understanding how people is all that TV to people whether it's live or it's video on demand, or if it's more the live experience that is irrespective of the device that it's on, it is really watching TV.

JANET GALLANT: I would like to also add to that part of it that it's...

RICHARD ZACKON: whose voice is...when you start speaking...just announce yourself.

JANET GALLANT: Oh, this is Janet.

RICHARD ZACKON: Hey Janet.

JANET GALLANT: Hi. The whole notion of professionally produced content and how, again, it goes back to what Peter said about is [Cudy Pi – 15:28] considered among young people to even be professionally produced. Like there is nomenclature that we use that younger generations don't use or there's just...they may not even know the difference between broadcast and cable. I mean the world has changed so much for them and for us that it also speaks to what Kevin was saying earlier about how do you define, you know, that's not multi channeled, but it is very; we put our clips up there, so it's professionally produced stuff that is in my short segment that we want to monetize and we're competing against the other guys. How do we, in this industry, sort of wangle those terms so that we can make that clear to, as a primary researcher, the consumers?

PETER: This is Peter again, I think that's a great point, Janet, and I think everybody is making good points about how things are changing and what the definition of TV is and how it's changing. And as a researcher, I think of it, primarily, from a consumer perspective and how they would define it. Naturally, that's one perspective. There's the industry's perspective and the industry defined as content providers, distributors, hardware manufacturers, etc. and how they either define it or would like to have it defined.

But from the consumer perspective, I'm thinking about the day when that might be now or it might be in the near future where you ask a consumer, "Did you watch TV last night?" And they may say yes, they may say no, and unless we define what we mean by that exactly, what kind of content – short form, long term, what source, was it online, was it from a broadcast network, was it linear? Unless we define it, we're not sure what their answer means.

So I think it's getting to the point where so much could potentially be included or not included in the definition of TV that it's really important if we're going to continue to use that term to make sure that we're all on the same page when it comes to how we're defining it.

CHERYL: One point I'd like to add from our longitudinal study that we did is that people started to define watching TV as watching YouTube on their Smart TV because now that there are apps on the TV we're really, again, confusing things a lot by the fact that you can watch something that has digital content on the TV and that feels like watching TV.

RICHARD ZACKON: I'm not going to call on people that don't know that I'm going to call on them. But I will call on Heather Coffin (sp) who knew I was going to call on her. And Heather, from GFK, was responsible for our longitudinal ethnography which Cheryl was just referring to.

So what would you like to add here on any of the number of topics we've addressed, Heather?

HEATHER: Well, just adding to Cheryl's point that typically what we saw was when people were watching YouTube, and especially on mobile devices or computers they did not consider that watching TV, they considered it watching video. When you take that and put it on a TV, then it's

“I’m watching TV,” but I’m watching video on TV. So it’s very...it’s really complex and I think that from a viewers point of view, they consider everything, for the most part, to be watching TV unless it’s a video short form or a movie. But when you’re going to survey them, you almost don’t want to even use TV because that, like you said, that could mean anything and how do they even answer that question. Right. So.

RICHARD ZACKON: Heather, I said I was going to turn to you. I didn’t tell you I’d put you on the spot. Something just occurred. Not to worry.

Where’s good work being done that you know that you could direct us to on this very question about how this technology world and content world, long form, short form, blah, blah, blah shows up for consumers? Where do we get to learn about how they see it?

HEATHER: Richard, I’m not sure where I understand your question. I’m sorry. Can you re-...?

RICHARD ZACKON: Yeah, our ethnography was an attempt to get at that.

HEATHER: Right.

RICHARD ZACKON: But I’m sure there’s some semi-scholarly, scholarly articles, some people doing some deep thinking on that. Where might we be looking for that?

HEATHER: I don’t know. Good question. Do you have any thoughts about that?

RICHARD ZACKON: You don’t have to answer now. Can I make a request, Heather?

HEATHER: Sure.

RICHARD ZACKON: Just come back and tell us or send an email we’ll share with everyone. Because you’re in the UX area, right? That’s what you do.

HEATHER: Yes.

RICHARD ZACKON: Yeah, so you know how people see the technology, see the content. It would just be helpful if we had some kind of general reference pieces you might have seen that are good. They could be GFKs. They could be someone else’s.

HEATHER: Okay, yeah. Absolutely. We can do that.

RICHARD ZACKON: Is that unfair? I don’t think so.

HEATHER: What was that?

RICHARD ZACKON: I said was that unfair?

HEATHER: No. I think it’s just going to contribute to the conversation.

RICHARD ZACKON: And anyone else, if you have that kind of reference I think we’d all love to see some pieces.

TIM BROOKS: What about the Journal of Advertising Research from the ARF? They have a lot of pieces that are fairly deep analyses. Anything in there?

MALE VOICE: Not off the top of my head, Tim. I can found out.

RICHARD ZACKON: This is an ongoing source going back a number of years addressing these issues.

MALE VOICE: There's also a library, of course, at the ARF so if Kevin could look at that, that would be great.

CERIL SHAGRIN: In order to get closer to the answer, one of the sub questions we would have to ask is how much does the device they're viewing influence whether or not they think they're watching TV? And how much does the content influence whether or not? And because Nielsen tells people "Press your button if you're watching TV," I think it's really important for us to start to learn how most people who aren't in the business think about TV.

MALE VOICE: Absolutely.

JANET GALLANT: So you're absolutely right. Because, again, this is Janet. I go back to this whole notion of people watching YouTube Jimmy Fallon clips. Are they then watching TV because it's the same content that was on the, even though it's not on their TV because they're watching it on their digital device? Would they say that they're watching TV then? Because, again, I got back to monetization. It's really critical we understand it.

PETER: And I think in addition to device, in addition to the content type I think the source of it is important too. So are you watching from a NBA PD subscription or are you watching Netflix?

I think that there are probably some people out there who would say I didn't watch TV last night, I watched Netflix, but they watched a show on Netflix. They watched Orange is the New Black or whatever it might be. So or even a show that used to be or was originally from a broadcast network but is now on Netflix. So I think that's another variable as well, that you could go out and you could ask people, tell me what you did last night and they'll explain what they did and you'll say, well what did you consider that? Was it watching TV? Was it watching video? Was it watching Netflix? Whatever. We could all kind of, we're all smart here, we could come up with a study probably in 10 minutes that would help us understand which variable has the most impact on how people define TV. But I think all of those things need to be taken into account.

RICHARD ZACKON: I'd like to hear from someone we haven't heard from. I assume everyone...

MALE VOICE: I'd like to ask a question. Has this ever been asked of another platform, like what does it mean to listen to radio? You know, if you listen to Spotify, because that's not a terrestrial broadcast, is that, technically, are you listening to radio?

RICHARD ZACKON: It's an analogous question.

MALE VOICE: Yep.

RICHARD ZACKON: I learned something. I did a little research for our conversation. The word “audience” was first applied to people who read books in common in the 1850s. I learned that the word “watch” is related to I believe it’s the German word [urwachen awake – 24:24]. To watch means to stay awake, like the night watch. By which is a pretty low standard of attention, but you’re watching so long as you’re awake. I think it’s a similar question for other media, not just for TV.

JASPER REGGIE: I think you’re right. Great, great analog there. I think it’s similar, but I dare say, and this is a pump, this is a guess, I dare say that if you ask consumers what they were doing when they were listening to Pandora and Spotify, they might say radio more than they would say TV when they were watching something on YouTube. That might well be due to the, if the hypothesis is correct, it might well be due to the fact that the content is less variant on radio and digital versions of radio than it is on TV when you look at radio and YouTube [inaudible – 25:22].

So it’s definitely an analog, but I don’t think it will get us all the way there if we were to answer [inaudible – 25”29].

RICHARD ZACKON: Another unheard...

KEVIN NOONAN: Sorry. That’s a really great point, Jasper. This is Kevin Noonan from NBC.

Back in 1997 when Nielsen first conducted its commerce internet research demographics study, we spent an inordinate amount of time explaining the difference between somebody who was on AOL and somebody who was on the web. Because back then everybody who was on AOL thought they were on the web and they weren’t. They were in basically a walled garden of content. So we had to structure the question very specifically to first of all explain what the web was vs. what AOL was and then ask people at follow-up were you watching? Were you on AOL or were you on the World Wide Web?

RICHARD ZACKON: So it’s interesting to me when I looked at the questions I thought of in response to the broad question, I thought the interest would be on what is it to watch. But there is a lot of interest here on what is TV, which is a more fundamental question.

KEVIN NOONAN: Right.

RICHARD ZACKON: I think if we do go forward with this we should have a full discussion of what is TV. Right, I might work with someone who will want to put it together. Go ahead.

JANET GALLANT: Richard, this is Janet. I feel like you have to first figure out what is television before you can even say what is it to watch it. It’s really the first part of the question. We have to define it.

RICHARD ZACKON: It’s the first question I had. I just thought for today’s conversation, the second one would be juicier, but I’m impressed that the first one is as juicy as it is.

I'm also delighted we've had 50 people on this call. That was half the people the invite went out to. So it touched some kind of a nerve. Whether they'll return, we'll wait and see what our second episode is, but...another question on TV?

TIM BROOKS: It seems to me we've had some discussions on the MCA Committee about video content as a more descriptive terms than TV, which has traditionally meant a box and a piece of equipment, basically. A lot of that can be measured electronically now. Albeit it quite the importance of the terminology, you may still need it in recall studies. We all know what the problems with recall studies are, especially in currency measurements.

So I think a lot of this point to electronic definitions of what is that's on the screen like coding and embedded codes, things like that.

CHERYL: One point I wanted to make is a lot of it isn't measured right now unless you piece together different sources like we're dealing with right now. Snap Chat, for example, isn't measured in Nielsen or Com Score. And a lot of the Facebook video that's being viewed right now, we have no way of...we get something from Facebook, but Com Score or Nielsen can't measure all the video views that we have going on on Facebook.

So we'd like to think it's all being measured and it's being measured somewhere, but is it being measured in someplace that can bring it all together? Not so much. So that's a challenge.

RICHARD ZACKON: So just collectively say yes or no or be silent. Is this worth further exploration by this group or some subset of this group?

GROUP: Yes.

RICHARD ZACKON: Maybe the two conventions go this smoothly. Thank you.

MALE VOICE: It'll always be ongoing as we have new devices, new technologies, new forms of content being introduced. I don't think we can just do it once. Like virtual reality, for example, last year wasn't even a word in anyone's vocabulary and now it's like virtual reality is all anyone talks about. So now, what is that? Is that even video content anymore? Is that...what do we call that? You know what I mean? There's a lot we have to keep in mind as we move forward.

PETER: This is Peter again. I'd like to suggest maybe that the emphasis be less on the term TV and more on what is it, what is within purview of this group of people, of the people who are interested in this? What is included in it that we want to look at and what is not included? And that is kind of a proxy for what is TV. What are the things that we really want to know when it comes to this behavior, this video viewing behavior?

MALE VOICE: I think that's a pretty good point because we can get very theoretical here quickly. And we need to know why we're doing it. I start out by saying is it a commercial measurement? But things like Snap Chat or whatever or maybe it's for a studio that wants to know the exposure of its product. That's not commercial measurement. That's how much their product is being used.

So it's nice to say we want all of this stuff, but we've got to be practical in this too. So let's be defined in what we're really trying to get at here.

RICHARD ZACKON: We have about 20 minutes. Let me raise the second question I had, which is what is it to watch? When we talk about people watching, what's occurring? What's occurring for them, but what do we observe? What do we imagine is occurring for them? And, again, I'd like to hear from people we haven't heard from.

So, an opportunity there. I'm open, then, to people we have heard from.

JASPER: This is Jasper again. I guess, for me, the same dichotomy in the fact that there might be more than two exists for this question as did for the second question. So the first question that kind of answers depends on why you're asking the question, right. "What is TV" is different if you are doing consumer survey from the situation where you're trying to measure how many people watch something.

Similarly, for watch, like there has to be a definition for watch which is relevant for the advertising and measurement community, whether it's OTS or whatever. And at the same time, there's a parallel definition which is what the consumer conceived it to be. Does that make sense?

RICHARD ZACKON: It does. We were on a call, some of us, on this call were on a call earlier today with Nielsen as part of our neuro effort and they were talking about the people meter and what "watch" means is what the people in the Nielsen sample say it means when they claim they're watching. They're told to depress their button when they're watching or listening. And there's not a lot more guidance than that given.

JASPER: Right. And if you look at the AMR data you'll see exactly how people watch their televisions. In fact, some households have dual meters, dual Nielsen people meters in them. Several many do. And so you're seeing what looks like duplicate records when in fact with no tuner ID given by Nielsen but they're, in fact, unique records where one guy is watching the same program in the living room as he is in his bedroom in the same five minute stretch of time.

So to that person, he's watching in both places and he's getting credit for both those impressions, although his reach is only counted one time.

RICHARD ZACKON: So there are two impressions counted against the same person for the same ad at the same time.

JASPER: Right.

RICHARD ZACKON: Right.

CERIL SHAGRIN: [Inaudible – 33:37].

JASPER: What's that Ceril?

CERIL CHAGRIN: Isn't Nielsen multiple processes that out so you can't...

JASPER: No they don't.

CERIL SHAGRIN: They used to.

JASPER: They don't actually...they don't give you tuner ID or station information so you don't know which tuner they were on to first if they had them both on at the same time. And we've asked them to do that. Hopefully, in the future, they're going to be adding that data field to the AMR tape so that we can actually get station information or tuner ID so we'll know exactly how the flow went within a household of the dual tuners.

CERIL SHAGRIN: If we want to get a good answer to some of these questions, we have to bring in a group of people who are not involved in the business because I think we'd get very different answers from them.

JASPER: Yeah, probably.

REGGIE: You know within that group, the younger folks.

RICHARD ZACKON: Reggie, you're a little muffled.

REGGIE: I said even when you bring in a group of people you're going to see differences looking at the younger folks vs. the older guys. I mean...

CERIL SHAGRIN: That's my point.

RICHARD ZACKON: That's the "Who's watching." I'm going to offer something provocative and say whatever. I'd love to hear back no, yes. Part of the reason we're so challenged with this thing about engagement is that we don't have a very good set of models to deal with people's subjective experience. We don't know what's going on in there, as a common way to say it. And so when it comes to operationalizing, engagement, we're not sure. Other thoughts? I'm open.

DYAH: Hi Richard.

RICHARD ZACKON: Hey Dyah.

DYAH: Hey, how are you? You said you want to hear from someone new.

RICHARD ZACKON: You are someone new.

DYAH: So all the things you said made me think whether the hang up in going anywhere is just using the word "watch" and "television" because this is very, this thinking is very platform centric and maybe we should be more focused on content centric. Kind of like back in Copernicus day, everything was how do things revolve around the earth? But it turns out the earth was revolving around the sun. So the same thing here. We're so hung up on a platform measurement; maybe we should change the focus to content. Just throwing that out there.

RICHARD ZACKON: Okay and it could be both. My sense is both are legitimate conversations and then how do they relate. Kevin? Kevin Noonan, did you say something before? Your screen lit up.

KEVIN NOONAN: No, I didn't.

RICHARD ZACKON: Oh, okay.

LANA: This is Lana from Nielsen again. I do think that question about the perspective from which we're talking the question is really important here because from a content perspective, listening could be thought of as watching. I mean if I'm hearing what's going on on a show, I know what's going on. I might not see the actor and I might not see what's actually going on, but I hear it and I know. And that happens a lot with people that multi task. Like the example from the Nielsen household where the person be [inaudible – 37:01] maybe he's multi tasking, cleaning, vacuuming, whatever, and he's hearing the TV at the same time.

From an ad perspective, though, that might be a little bit different because you're not seeing the product. Hearing is only a part of it, but it's real important to see what the ad is about.

MALE VOICE: Well, in my example, they're actually seeing it in two different rooms. One in one room at one time, and then one in the other room. So they're hearing it, but they're also seeing it in at least one place.

PETER: That's a great point. In fact, you can make the same point about if you were seeing, but not hearing. So have the sound off, without watching, without hearing what's going on.

You know, to me, this question of what is it to watch is also a question that we need to step back and say why do we need to know this. How does this help us to define it? Watching could be anything from just having a screen in view and I can see it, even though I'm not paying attention to it. I'm not listening to it or I'm not even engaged with it to I am so immersed in what is on the screen that everything else is...I pay attention to nothing else that's around me. And anything in between.

So the question is how...is it important to know when there is something on the screen that somebody is in front of that they're actually paying attention to more so than something that's on the screen in front of them and they're really not paying attention. So all of that stuff I think we need to kind of think about what's the reason that we need to know this and then once we have that, we can think about ways to measure it most effectively.

RICHARD ZACKON: Peter, let me give my point of view on that since I posed the question. We talk about audience measurement. What are we measuring? We like to think we're measuring TV viewing. Something like that. Well, what is it to do that? And the clearer you get to the phenomenon you're trying to measure, the more likely you want to measure it well.

That it matters, also, that we got the response that we did to this call says it's intuitively interesting to a lot of people. Why that is, I don't know. We'll uncover that.

PETER: And I think the answer, I think, the question is going to be a little bit different depending on who you are. If you're an advertiser, if you're a network, if you're a content producer, if you're a consumer; I think how you define what watching means and what you want to understand when it comes to how people watch, I think, is going to differ.

RICHARD ZACKON: We've got time for a few more comments. I'd love to hear from people we haven't heard from. I'd like to hear from someone at Nielsen who hasn't spoken. Lana, I think

you've said something. But someone from Nielsen, just your perspective. [Silence.] You don't need a PowerPoint to say something, you can just say something.

MALE VOICE: We're waiting for a corrections file. [Laughs.]

RICHARD ZACKON: Okay.

CHERYL: While we're waiting, this is Cheryl at Scripps, and I'd just like to say one other thing which is we are talking about this like crazy right now inside Scripps to understand why people make the decisions they do about what device to watch on and the choice of which device they use and so forth and how that varies by whether you're an OTT person or someone on an MVPD app, someone on our internal apps. So there's a lot of discussion of this inside networks just trying to understand the motivations for viewing and how we satisfy those needs across the different devices and viewing opportunities.

MALE VOICE: So Cheryl, does Scripps have relationships with the smart TV providers to receive their data?

CHERYL: Not yet. It's something I think [inaudible – 41:21].

MALE VOICE: Okay. That would help.

RICHARD ZACKON: We have an opportunity for two more people. And again, if you've spoken, thanks. We keep hearing from the same people. I'd love to hear from people we haven't heard from.

CLAIRE BROWN: I'll say something. It's Claire Brown at RPA.

RICHARD ZACKON: Okay, thanks Claire.

CLAIRE BROWN: Hi. I, you know, just from the agency side, I'll say that in the time I've been working with RPA, one of the biggest missed opportunities I think we've seen is sort of the lack of the term "engagement" catching on and having a true definable meaning.

And, you know, when we consider video content or television content as the right environment for our clients, frequently we use the word "engaging" to describe it even though we don't really know what it means. I think we intuitively understand that there's a value to that term. But since we've never really been able to define it as a research industry, I keep going back to that and thinking when I had just started, there was something there, but we could never really make it meaningful. And I think as we consider the value of what we're calling television content, one of the big values we assign to it here at RPA is that it's engaging. But we don't really know what that means.

So I would encourage a step on that as a good hard thing to make and agree on.

RICHARD ZACKON: That's my point about the subjective experience of the members of the audience. We don't have a good way to talk about, therefore, we don't have a good way to...we used to talk about attentiveness about 10, 12 years ago when engagement caught the attention in Silicon

Valley and them came to TV from that community. That way everyone is saying, “Oh, engagement.” We still don’t know.

Now, I can tell you we have a piece of research that CRE is doing with Nielsen Neuro and they have a particular description of what constitutes engagement at the neurometric level. And so we’re going to learn something from that. Pardon?

FEMALE VOICE: Maybe that’s a place to begin.

RICHARD ZACKON: Well, it’s something; at least we can see the meter move. That’s good. So we did say it would be over soon. I’d like to hear some, just some quick closing comments. It sounds like it’s something...

What we’ll do, what I’ll do, what Shelley and I will do is send a note out to everyone who was here today inviting you to the next event then probably scheduling what there are in the future. You can reply back if you want to participate with a little planning. That would be terrific. If you just want to attend, that’s fine. If you just want to be invited without committing to attend, that’s fine too.

But any last words from anyone who just wants to get something in there again. What would be great is someone we haven’t heard from.

Jasper, we have heard from...

JASPER: [Inaudible – 44:06]

RICHARD ZACKON: I’m not hearing Jasper.

JASPER: It was just [inaudible – 44:18].

RICHARD ZACKON: Shelley, are we okay? The screen froze.

SHELLEY DRASAL: I had to unmute myself. Jasper said it was just [inaudible – 44:37]

RICHARD ZACKON: Say that again Shelley.

SHELLEY DRASAL: I don’t think he was trying to speak.

RICHARD ZACKON: Oh, okay. Sorry, then Jasper. Very good. So we’ve got a technical glitch. That’s one thing we learned from this, the technical glitch.

By the way, I acknowledge everyone’s patience. I didn’t expect this many people on, otherwise, I would not have invited so many people. It’s a wonderful response. It’s a good problem to have.

CERIL SHAGRIN: Well, think we’ll all be on the next one. There are so many questions that have to be answered.

RICHARD ZACKON: There does seem to be a lot of interests. And I'm going to need to find a way to have it officially. I think we'll do more frequent with fewer people in each one. I don't know. We'll invent something.

If anyone wants to come play on the invention, send a note to Shelley or me. You've got our email. And I'm going to end it there. I'm going to end it before people say, "When's he going to shut up already." So I'm going to shut up now.

Thank you very much. This was a wonderful experiment and I report there are still 42 people on the call from the original 50. So we held 84% of the audience to the end, which surprises me.

MALE VOICE: You do that math in your head?

RICHARD ZACKON: No, I see the number on the screen.

Thanks everyone. I'd love to hear comments. We'll get an email out to you with the transcript.