IT’S EASY TO FIND REFERENCES TO THE DECLINING TV NEWS AUDIENCE, but we wanted to go beyond that kind of blanket statement. Is the entire household audience declining? Is it declining everywhere? Is it declining evenly? Is there more to the story?

• The local TV news audience is slowly — but not consistently — shrinking. Mostly, the local TV news audience is aging.

• The 55+ local TV news audience is actually increasing — as the U.S. baby boomer population ages.

• The shrinking local TV news audience is less a function of fewer 18 to 34-year-old viewers than it is a loss of 35 to 54-year-old viewers.

• Ongoing urbanization of the U.S. population is contributing to a drop in local TV news viewing in key markets. Eight local TV markets account for 88 percent of the decline in nationwide local news viewing.

• There are a number of local TV markets experiencing rising audiences of 18 to 34 and 35-to-54 year-olds. The question is what they’re doing that’s different from so many others.

We used data from the Nielsen Company for all 210 local television markets for 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2016. We had both ratings data and household data for people 18+, 18 to 34, 35 to 54, and 55+, and broken down for both men and women.

The data included all local TV news between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. (morning); 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. (early evening); and 9 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. (late evening).

Our total of all market households for P18+ for 2016:

- Morning: 12,693,868
- Early Evening: 19,716,749
- Late night: 19,449,209
GOING BEYOND THE DECLINING AUDIENCE

There is a universal belief that local TV news ratings are down. We’ve said it repeatedly in this series of reports for the Knight Foundation, and it’s certainly true. But, as with much in life, the precise numbers are a bit more complicated that just “down.”

First, there are two distinct measures to consider. One is ratings — the percentage of people watching TV among those who could watch. Since the population of the U.S. grows and shifts steadily, nationwide TV has to accumulate a steadily increasing number of viewers just to maintain the same ratings. The other measure is viewership — the actual number of people — really households — that are watching local TV news.

From 2009, the earliest year Nielsen has detailed figures available for (almost) all 210 TV markets, through 2016, overall, local TV news ratings are down. Overall, they’re down in the early morning (6 a.m. to 7 a.m.); they’re down more in the late afternoon (5 p.m. to 7 p.m.) and down even more at night (9 p.m. to 11:30 p.m.).

Overall percentage of TV markets where ratings are up, down and the same:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>% TV Markets Up</th>
<th>% TV Markets Same</th>
<th>% TV Markets Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 a.m. – 7 a.m.</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 p.m. – 7 p.m.</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 p.m. – 11:30 p.m.</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, based on 18+ households, note that not all TV markets are down. Most are, but not all. In addition, 49 markets (23 percent of the total) are within half a rating point of their overall audience from 2009, and 50 markets are between half a point and one point behind. So, almost two-thirds of all local TV markets are running within one rating point of what they were doing in 2009 — or even running ahead. That’s part of why the local TV news business is holding up so well. And if we look at raw numbers of viewers, we get another picture.

Overall percentage of TV markets where viewership is up or down:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>% TV Markets Up</th>
<th>% TV Markets Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 a.m. – 7 a.m.</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 p.m. – 7 p.m.</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 p.m. – 11:30 p.m.</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of households, almost half of local TV markets went up in morning news audience. It’s a little farther apart in the early evening, and down substantially late evening. Down enough to send the overall numbers down.

But that decrease in audience (viewing households) is heavily concentrated. Between 2009 and 2016, the total number of U.S. households watching local TV news fell by 13.6 percent. You might think that loss was spread relatively evenly across the country, but it wasn’t. Eight TV markets accounted for 88 percent of the total U.S. drop in local news households:

- NEW YORK CITY
- DALLAS
- LOS ANGELES
- SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND/SAN JOSE
- PHILADELPHIA
- DENVER
- PHOENIX
- MINNEAPOLIS/ST. PAUL

Those eight markets make up 22.9 percent of total U.S. TV households, but they accounted for 88 percent of the total drop in local TV news audience.
In households, overall, morning local news audience is up 2.1 percent. Early evening, total local TV news audience is down 0.1 percent. Late night audience is down a huge 30.2 percent.

To combat the losses, stations are running more and more local news at more and more times. From 2009 to 2016, 8.9 percent more local TV stations ran 14 percent more news. As the news pie has increased, individual audience slices for each newscast have frequently gotten smaller. That’s a business issue that each station has to contend with.

But if we’re looking at where people get their local news, then the overall figure is up in the morning and slightly down in the early evening and down significantly in late evening. If we counted ALL local TV news — including the increasing amount of local news running from 4 a.m. to 6 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 5 p.m., and 7 p.m. to 8 p.m., then we suspect that the overall number of people watching local TV news would probably still be down — but not much.
The perception appears to be that the audience is a monolithic entity that moves up, down or sideways — largely in unison. That’s not at all the case.

Diving deeper into the Nielsen numbers, we looked at market groupings and age and gender household breakouts.

**MARKETS 1–25**

What’s really happening in local TV news is that there’s been a sizeable drop in audience in the top 25 markets. Markets 1 through 25 include almost half of the U.S. population, so what happens there has a huge effect overall.

In those top markets, we find the morning household audience down 10.8 percent, the late afternoon/early evening household audience down 13.8 percent, and the late evening household audience down a whopping 30.6 percent. Again, the comparison is total household audience 2009 to 2016.

Households with men and then women 35 to 54 led the drop in every time period. Households with men and women 55+ rose in the morning, split in early evening, and both dropped in late evening. (See full data in the Appendix.)

**MARKETS 26–50**

The next 25 markets saw much more moderate declines. Here, the morning household audience went up 4 percent, the late afternoon/early evening household audience went down 2.1 percent, and the late evening household audience dropped 16.3 percent.

All groups went up in the morning except households with men and women 35 to 54. Households with men and women 35 to 54 led the declines in all cases, while households with men and women 55+ rose throughout. (See Appendix for full details.)

Why was the change so much different in markets 26 to 50 than in top 25 markets? The Nielsen numbers only tell us what happened; they don’t explain
why, and we can only speculate. We do know that newspapers in medium-sized cities have been particularly hard hit by audience preferences for digital content, for example, so their loss may have literally meant gain for local TV news outlets. But, frankly, those are surprising differences given that all of the top 50 markets use the same audience measuring technique.

MARKETS 51-100

In this market group the data may be less reliable, as most of the ratings information for individual DMAs came from diaries. This year, Nielsen is phasing out the paper TV diary rating system, which it was still using to record ratings in 140 local markets through much of 2017. Paper diaries are notoriously unreliable as they depend on people to record their viewing choices — commonly reconstructing that viewing from memory rather than actually recording it as it happens.

Even so, the numbers for markets 51 to 100 are fairly similar to markets 26 to 50. The morning household audience went up 8.5 percent in this market category, the late afternoon/early evening household audience was unchanged, and the late evening household audience was down 8.9 percent.

As with other market groupings, men and women 55+ led the increases with men and women 35 to 54 heading down. (See Appendix for full details.)

MARKETS 101 – 150

This is another down group, and our data come from diaries once again. Here the morning household audience was down 8.9 percent, the late afternoon/early evening household audience was down 13.5 percent, and the late evening household audience was down 22 percent.

What was different here was that the declines were led by women and men 18 to 34. (See Appendix for full details.)

MARKETS 151+

Using the same diaries-based data, the smallest markets were mixed, up and down. The morning household audience was up 6.4 percent. The late afternoon/early evening household audience was barely up 0.9 percent. The late evening household audience was down a more modest 6.8 percent.

As with markets 101 to 150, the declines were led by women and men 18 to 34 rather than 35 to 54. (See Appendix for full details.)
AGE AND GENDER

In all cases, men and women 55+ led the increases — or, in the case of late evening and some early evenings, they helped moderate the drop. All other age-related demographic household groupings were down in all time periods.

Overall, men and women 35 to 54 were actually watching less (in percentages and in actual numbers) than men and women 18 to 34. And since there have historically been more men and women 35 to 54 watching local TV news, the decline in this household group is easily the most significant. While there isn’t a big difference between the drop in households with men 35 to 54 and households with women 35 to 54, households with men were tuning out just a bit more in all three local news time periods.
THE ROLE OF POPULATION CHANGE

Are the household audience viewing numbers simply a reflection of available audience? The sizes of local TV markets go up and down based on a number of factors. Mostly, it’s a reflection of population shifts: births vs. deaths; in-migration vs. emigration. But, it’s also a reflection of some people who are chucking their TVs altogether. Looking at the 209 markets that we can evaluate (market 210, Glendive, Mont., can’t be tabulated in this analysis), Nielsen calculated that 77 local TV markets went up in TV household population, 131 markets fell, and one market remained the same.

The biggest change reflected in the available household numbers is the continuing urbanization of America:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market size</th>
<th>Percent of DMAs with more TV households</th>
<th>Percent of DMAs with fewer TV households</th>
<th>Percent of DMAs with the same number of TV households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 150</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151+</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, this may look like a decline in TV homes across America. It’s not, but it’s not much of an increase either. Overall, the number of TV homes rose 0.2 percent from 2009 through 2016. That’s not even keeping up with population growth, but it’s still up.
So, did a higher or lower number of TV households help determine whether more or fewer people watched local TV news? The short answer is no.

In markets where local TV news ratings were up, 35.1 percent of the markets saw a rise in available TV households, and 64.9 percent saw a drop. In markets where local TV news ratings were down, 36.8 percent of the markets saw a rise in available TV households, 62.6 percent saw a drop, and 0.6 percent were unchanged.

So there’s no relationship between a growth or decrease in available TV households and ratings going up or down. But since ratings are a percentage of available viewership, we really shouldn’t expect to see a relationship.

Where you’d expect to see a correlation is in the number of households that watched local TV news and the number of available TV households in the market. In other words, where the local market shrinks, we’d expect to see fewer people watching local TV news, and where the local market goes up in population (available TV households), we’d expect to see an increase in TV households watching local TV news.

But we don’t.

In markets where the number of households watching local TV news went up, 37.8 percent of the markets saw an increase in the number of available households, 61 percent were down in available households, and one remained the same.

In markets where the number of households watching local TV news went down, 36.2 percent of the markets experienced an increase in the number of available households, and 63.8 percent saw that number decrease.

No relationship. There is, apparently, free will involved in how many people watch local TV news.
Examining the data by age and gender offers some small insights and raises some new questions. Let’s start with the total local news audience, age 18+, and look at increases and decreases by market size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market size</th>
<th>Percent TV news ratings up</th>
<th>Percent TV news ratings down</th>
<th>Percent TV news ratings unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151+</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By number of households, the picture looks a little different – except for the top 25 markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market size</th>
<th>Percent TV news audience up</th>
<th>Percent TV news audience down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 150</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151+</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, there’s a significant issue in top 25 markets.
What about geography? We divided the TV markets into four regions: Northeast, Midwest, South and West (consistent with standard RTDNA/Hofstra University Survey divisions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent TV news ratings up</th>
<th>Percent TV news ratings down</th>
<th>Percent TV news ratings unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market size</th>
<th>Percent TV news audience up</th>
<th>Percent TV news audience down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>58.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The search for some pattern or logic is elusive.
Of stations that went up in total local news audience (18+), we noted the gender and age groups showing the biggest percentage increases. Households with:

- Women 55+ 39%
- Men 55+ 37.8
- Men 18 to 34 13.4
- Men 35 to 54 4.9
- Women 18 to 34 2.4
- Women 35 to 54 1.2
- Women 18 to 34 1.2

We also noted which particular demographic increased the most in actual numbers. In many ways, this is more telling. Households with:

- Women 55+ 56.3%
- Men 55+ 34
- Men 35 to 54 4.9
- Men 18 to 34 1.9
- Women 35 to 54 1.9
- Women 18 to 34 1

Of stations that went down in total local news audience (18+), we noted the gender and age groups showing the biggest percentage drops. Households with:

- Women 18 to 34 33.6%
- Men 18 to 34 28
- Women 35 to 54 23.2
- Men 35 to 54 15.2

We also noted which particular demographic decreased the most in actual numbers. In many ways, this, again, is more telling. Households with:

- Women 35 to 54 43.9%
- Men 35 to 54 29.9
- Women 18 to 34 13.4
- Men 18 to 34 7.3
- Women 55+ 3
- Men 55+ 2.4

Clearly, local TV news is going to have to figure out a way of attracting more, younger viewers if it is to prevent a slow, steady slide down. Most critically, it needs to get more of the 35 to 54-year-olds that it used to have.
Is this a hopeless enterprise? Not necessarily.

We have identified a dozen local TV markets where the younger audience, households with ages 18 to 34 and 35 to 54, have largely held steady or even grown across the ratings from 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2016. Alphabetically:

- Cincinnati, Ohio: market 36
- Columbus, Ohio: market 32
- Hattiesburg/Laurel, Miss.: market 168
- Madison, Wisc.: market 80
- Nashville, Tenn.: market 29
- Providence, R.I.: market 52
- Raleigh, N.C.: market 24
- Reno, Nev.: market 112
- Rochester, Minn.: market 153
- Salisbury, Md.: market 144
- Tulsa, Okla.: market 58
- Victoria, Texas: market 203

So, what do those markets have in common? Only one (Raleigh) is a top 25 market. Three are in markets 26 to 50; three are in markets 51 to 100; two are in markets 100 to 150; three are in markets 151+.

Geographically, two are in the Northeast; four are in the Midwest; three are in the South; three are in the West.
Only two of the markets rose in local TV news ratings from 2009 to 2016, but all rose in the number of households watching local TV news from 2009 to 2016. The smallest household increase was 1.2 percent in Cincinnati up to 52.1 percent in Hattiesburg, Miss. The average increase was 18.3 percent; the median increase was 11.2 percent. And they did that even as seven of the 12 markets actually lost available TV households between 2009 and 2016.

Seven of the markets saw their highest growth rate in local TV news viewing among households with 18 to 34-year-olds or 35 to 54-year-olds — or both.

The 12 markets had a combined 18 to 34 and 35 to 54-year-old average rating of 7 in 2009, with a median combined rating of 5.8. In 2016, the group had an average combined rating of 6.4 and a median combined rating of 6.2.

For comparison purposes, over that same time frame, New York, market #1, went from a combined rating of 4.3 to 3.1. Los Angeles, market #2, went from 3.7 to 2.7. Chicago, market #3, went from 4.7 to 3.9.

The point is, those rating numbers for our group of 12 are more than impressive.

Those are ratings (percentages). Even more impressive is the growth in the actual number of households of 18 to 34-year-old and 35 to 54-year-old local TV news viewers. As a group — all 12 stations combined — the total 18 to 54-year-old household audience was up 26.1 percent from 2009 to 2016. Per market, the average increase was 37.8 percent, and the median increase was 30.7 percent.

All this suggests that the stations in these markets did something (or, perhaps, didn’t do something), that enabled them to hold on to and even expand younger audiences. We would suggest that the 18-to-34 and 35 to 54-year-old audiences found something of value in these markets that their counterparts in many comparable markets did not. The local TV news industry just needs to find out what that is.
If the devil is in the details, perhaps the real news here involves the nuances. Though previous analyses have viewed household audience losses in local TV news in the aggregate, the fact that two-thirds of local TV markets have remained relatively stable or even improved in news ratings since 2009 is essential to understanding why so many industry leaders remain bullish on their business. People are still watching local news on television.

However, this analysis also suggests a strategy shift for local TV news operations. Though efforts to attract younger demographics, those aged 18 to 34, have merit, more focus is needed on the traditional advertisers’ sweet spot – those aged 35 to 54. As this older demographic increasingly turns away from TV and moves toward other digital news sources, local TV news content may have to follow.
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The analysis was conducted using data from the Nielsen Company for all 210 Local Television markets. In all cases, ratings from the four major seasonal ratings periods (February, May, July and November) were combined into a single, yearly average. That calculation was made by the Nielsen Company. For our analysis, we used those annual averages for 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2016. Nielsen supplied both ratings data and household data for households with People 18+, 18 to 34, 35 to 54 and 55+ and both men and women.

Ratings data told us how local TV news markets were performing over time — given that ratings reflect the percentage of available audience. Household data allowed us to evaluate market combinations (e.g. top 25, 26 to 50, markets in the South or West, etc.).

MARKETS 1 – 25:
In the morning, 6 a.m. to 7 a.m., the biggest declines are for households with men 35 to 54 years old, who dropped 24.5 percent, followed by households with women 35 to 54 and 18 to 34 — both down 20.6 percent. On the other side, households with men 55 and older went up 17.9 percent and households with women 55+ rose 13.9 percent.

In the early evening, 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., the biggest drop came from households with men 35 to 54, down 23.6 percent; followed by households with women 35 to 54, down 21 percent; and households with men 18 to 34, down 19.2 percent. There wasn’t much other side. Only households with women 55+ went up, and just barely: 1.1 percent. Even households with men 55+ slid down by a point.

Late evening, 9 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., the household audience plunged 30.6 percent. Leading the retreat: households with men 35 to 54, down 39.1 percent; women 35 to 54, down 37.5 percent; and men and women 18 to 34, both down more than 35 percent. There was no other side. Even households with men and women
55+ dropped by around 15 percent.

**MARKETS 26 – 50:**

In the morning, 6 a.m. to 7 a.m., the biggest increases were for households with men 55+, who jumped 43.9 percent; followed by households with women 55+, up 34.4 percent; and households with men and women 18 to 34, up 13.5 percent and 10.8 percent respectively. On the other side, households with both men and women 35 to 54 fell by around 5 percent.

In the early evening, 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., the biggest jump came from households with men 55+ at 19.1 percent; followed by households with women 18 to 34, up 15.8 percent; households with women 55+ and men 18 to 34, both rose by 10.6 percent. Households with men and women 35 to 54 both dropped by about 7 percent.

Late evening, 9 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., the audience drop was led by households with both men and women 35 to 54, down 22.2 percent and 20.8 percent respectively. Households with men 18 to 34 fell 12.1 percent and women 18 to 34 dropped 9.3 percent. Only households with men and women 55+ went up – 9.5 percent and 2.9 percent respectively.

**MARKETS 51 – 100:**

In the morning, 6 a.m. to 7 a.m., the biggest increases were for households with men 55+, who jumped 43.5 percent, followed by households with women 55+, up 42.9 percent. Households with women and men 18 to 34 years old just tipped in the positive side of the ledger. Households with women and men 35 to 54 fell by about 5.5 percent.

In the early evening, 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., households with women and men 55+ went up, 13.8 percent and 11.3 percent respectively. Households with men 18 to 34 and women 18 to 34 edged down 2.8 percent and 1.7 percent, respectively, and households with women and men 35 to 54 dropped 12.3 percent and 11.3 percent. And all of that left the total household audience in the early evening unchanged.

Late evening, 9 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., the audience drop was led by households with men and women 35 to 54 — both down about 20.7 percent. Households with women 18 to 34 and men 18 to 34 dropped by 15.1 percent and 13.1 percent.
respectively. Households with women and men 55+ both rose — 11.5 percent and 7.8 percent respectively.

**MARKETS 101 – 150:**

In the morning, the biggest drops came from households with women 18 to 34, down 34.1 percent and men 18 to 34, down 27.5 percent and households with women and men 35 to 54, both down around 24 percent. On the other side, households with men and women 55+ were both up around 12 to 13 percent.

In the late afternoon/early evening, the downward spiral was led by households with women and men 18 to 34, down 41.9 percent and 36.2 percent, respectively. That was followed by households with men and women 35 to 54, down about 32.5 percent. Even households with women and men 55+ were down: 0.3 percent and 4.3 percent respectively.

In the late evening, it’s the same story. Households with women and men 18 to 34 were down 50.9 percent and 47.8 percent, respectively. Households with men and women 35 to 54 were down 38.6 percent and 37.9 percent, respectively. Households with women and men 55+ were down 3.7 percent and 9.8 percent respectively.

**MARKETS 151+:**

In the morning, the increase was led by households with women and men 55+, up 28.1 percent and 23.6 percent, respectively. Those are the only two groups that were up. Households with women and men 18 to 34 were down 24.7 percent and 18.9 percent, respectively. Households with men and women 35 to 54 were down 9.2 percent and 6.2 percent, respectively. Households with women and men 55+ were down 9.2 percent and 6.2 percent, respectively.

Much the same was true in late afternoon/early evening. Households with women and men 55+ were up 11.6 percent and 8.8 percent, respectively. All other groups were down, led by households with women and men 18 to 34, down 31.1 percent and 27.9 percent respectively.

The late evening decline was led by households with women and men 18 to 34, down 35.8 percent and 29.3 percent respectively. The only up groups were households with women and men 55+, up 8.4 percent and 7.9 percent, respectively.
FROM THE NIELSEN COMPANY:

NIELSEN METERS. In 70 US markets, Nielsen measures television audiences via a meter. Today, Nielsen uses several different meters, including the People Meter, set top meter, or code reader. The type of meter Nielsen uses in a particular market depends upon the market's service level, methodological considerations, and other factors. The following offers an overview of how Nielsen's meters work, their monitoring service, and how they collect and process the data that meters collect. This information is for general information purposes only, and is not the full body of our methods, policies, or procedures.

PEOPLE METER. Nielsen has two different platforms of our Local People Meter (LPM), the Active Passive (AP) Meter and the Global Television Audience Measurement (GTAM) meter. These meters collect information about the station or channel to which the set is tuned, the program telecast, ‘over the top’ (OTT) viewing, and the household members in the room during the viewing session. Nielsen uses People Meters in the top 25 US markets. GTAM meter is a small electronic device (about the size of a paperback book). The LPM AP meter is a slightly larger electronic device similar to the size of larger cable or satellite set top box. Both meters are active/passive meters; they collect the information media outlets ‘actively’ encode in the signal and ‘passively’ collect audio signatures for the programming viewed. We install a meter on all working television sets in the household. Each household member uses the People Meter’s remote control to indicate his or her presence in the room for each viewing session. The panelist must manually enter presence of visitors on the AP meter. To produce our viewing estimates, we edit the data the meters collect and then apply weighting procedures to the edited data.

SET TOP METER. The set top meter is an electronic meter that collects information about the station or channel to which the set is tuned and the program telecast during the viewing event. Nielsen uses the set meter in 31 markets. In the markets where Nielsen uses the set top meter, it determines what household members were in the room for each viewing session via our ‘viewer assignment’ methodology (see below). To produce our viewing estimates, Nielsen edits the data the meters collect, applies our viewer assignment procedures, and applies weighting procedures to the edited data.