

# **The Effect of Signal Quality and Contiguous Word of Mouth on Customer Acquisition for a Video On Demand Service**

Sungjoon Nam  
Puneet Manchanda  
Pradeep K. Chintagunta<sup>1</sup>

June 2006

This version: October 2009

---

<sup>1</sup> Sungjoon Nam is Assistant Professor of Marketing at the Rutgers Business School at the Rutgers University, Puneet Manchanda is Professor of Marketing at the Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan and Pradeep K. Chintagunta is Robert Law Professor of Marketing at the Booth School of Business at the University of Chicago. The authors would like to thank Hongsuk Yang, seminar participants at the Winter AMA Educators' Conference 2008, MSI/USC 2007 Conference, PDMA Conference 2006, University of Chicago, the Wharton School, INSEAD, NYU, Toronto, the University of Missouri-Columbia, Korea University, Rutgers Business School, the London Business School 2006 Summer Camp and at the 2006 Marketing Science conference in Pittsburgh for valuable feedback, an anonymous firm for providing the data and Sridhar Narayanan, Hongju Liu, and Neal Rich for help with the data. All three authors would like to acknowledge research support from the Kilts Center for Marketing at the University of Chicago. All correspondence may be addressed to authors at [nam@business.rutgers.edu](mailto:nam@business.rutgers.edu) (Nam), [pmanchan@bus.umich.edu](mailto:pmanchan@bus.umich.edu) (Manchanda) and [pradeep.chintagunta@Chicagobooth.edu](mailto:pradeep.chintagunta@Chicagobooth.edu) (Chintagunta). Correspondence by mail can be sent to Manchanda at 701 Tappan St., Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

# **The Effect of Signal Quality and Contiguous Word of Mouth on Customer Acquisition for a Video On Demand Service**

## **Abstract**

This paper documents the existence and magnitude of contiguous word of mouth effects of signal quality of a Video On Demand (VOD) service on customer acquisition. We operationalize contiguous word of mouth effect based on geographic proximity and use behavioral data to quantify the effect.

The signal quality for this VOD service is exogenously determined, objectively measured and spatially uncorrelated. Further, it is unobserved to the potential subscriber and is revealed post-adoption. For a subscriber, the signal quality translates directly into the number of movies available for viewing, thus representing a part of overall service quality. The combination of signal quality along with location and neighborhood information for each subscriber and potential subscriber allows us to resolve the typical challenges in measuring causal social network effects.

We find that contiguous word of mouth affects about 8% of the subscribers with respect to their adoption behavior. However, this effect acts as a double-edged sword as it is asymmetric. We find that the effect of negative word of mouth arising from poor signal quality is more than twice as large as the effect of positive word of mouth arising from excellent signal quality. Besides contiguous word of mouth, we find that advertising and the retail environment also play a role in adoption.

*Keywords: Services, New Products, Service Quality, Word of Mouth, Contagion, High Technology, Hazard Models*

## 1. Introduction

This paper quantifies the effect of signal quality of a Video On Demand (VOD) service on customer acquisition while accounting for the possible spillover effects arising via word of mouth interactions between current customers and potential subscribers. We use a new, behavioral dataset that contains not only an objective and exogenous measure of signal quality, but also household level information on factors that could influence spillover effects. Since a subscriber cannot observe the signal quality she will obtain prior to adoption of the service, we investigate whether the signal quality level spills over and influences new customers' activation behavior via (inferred) word of mouth interactions with current customers who experience the signal quality post-adoption. As signal quality is one of the major determinants of the performance of the VOD service (we provide these details in a later section) and the word of mouth effect about signal quality is inferred, our measure is akin to an *indirect* measure of service quality.

The existence of the indirect effect of service quality been hypothesized in theory and has been shown using survey data but has not been tested for using actual behavioral data (Anderson 1998). Since it is hard to measure service quality and even harder to ascertain whether the current customers actually communicate with potential new customers, the indirect effect of service quality is difficult to quantify.

By contrast, the features of our data enable us to test for the existence of the indirect effect of service quality. The data we use in this paper come from the launch of a new VOD service that requires activation, monthly maintenance and rental fees. The data span a period from October 2003 to November 2004 and come from three different geographic markets. The service - which we will refer to as DirectMovie<sup>2</sup> - does not require any physical

---

<sup>2</sup> Due to confidentiality reasons, we cannot reveal the actual name of the service.

connection to a cable service or to the Internet. The digital (movie) signals are transmitted from terrestrial TV towers using spare television broadcast bandwidth, usually that of a local PBS station. These digital signals are then decoded by a set-top box (the DirectMovie player or DMP) that is in turn connected to a regular television. Besides the decoder, the DMP contains a hard drive allowing it to store up to one hundred movie titles. Each week, ten new movies are broadcast and the DMP updates its stored movie assortment by adding these ten movies and dropping the ten “oldest” movies. The quality of the update is a function of the signal quality of the TV signal received by each DMP. In other words, the noisier the signal that is delivered to the DMP, the fewer the number of movies that get updated. Note that the signal quality only affects whether a movie was downloaded or not. It does *not* affect the picture quality of the downloaded movie.

One unique feature of the data set is that it records a subscriber’s TV signal quality level. This is obtained by the firm from the DMP, which is connected to the firm’s main server through the phone line. If a subscriber receives a lower quality TV signal, she might not have access to all the new movies that would have been available if the updating process had been carried out. Her choice set would then be limited to past movies (that she might already have seen), thus degrading the quality of her experience with the DirectMovie service. Further, the level of signal quality is “exogenous” to the subscriber as she can neither pick a level of quality (as is typical in the services literature) nor can she influence the level of quality received. As we discuss later, this feature of the data is critical for the identification of the contiguous word-of-mouth effect.

Another unique feature of the data set is that it contains the street level addresses of all subscribers. This allows us to test for the existence and magnitude of spillover (contiguous word of mouth) effects. These street level addresses are converted into distance measures among customers. These inter-household distances are then used as proxies for

social interaction and its effect on customers' adoption behavior (Conley and Topa 2007, Bell and Song 2007, Manchanda, Xie and Youn 2008). Note that, as described above, the key to identifying the contiguous word of mouth effect is that the received signal quality by a household is exogenous to and idiosyncratic for that household. Even if households are located close to one another, they are "endowed" with different levels of signal quality.<sup>3</sup>

Our identification strategy for these effects arises from both the main effect of neighbors *and* the interaction between the number of neighbors and their realized signal quality, while controlling for other geographic and demographic covariates. The main effect can be seen if a higher number of (subscribing) neighbors leads to a higher probability of adoption for a household. The interaction effect implies that more neighbors with higher (lower) signal quality will lead to a higher (lower) probability of adoption. Given the spatially uncorrelated, independent and exogenous variation in signal quality for each household, this interaction allows us to quantify the indirect effect of signal quality. It is also this interaction effect that also distinguishes our study from previous efforts to identify word of mouth effects such as Bell and Song (2007) and Manchanda, Xie and Youn (2008). In those studies, the identification of the word of mouth effect is from the main effect of number of neighbors (who have adopted). In our case, the additional information on whether or not these neighbors receive good or bad signals and the differential impact of this signal quality on adoption enhances identification of the word of mouth effect.

Thus the mechanism that allows us to obtain a statistically significant interaction is that of information spillover about signal quality in a local neighborhood. We use the label "contiguous word of mouth" for this spillover even though we do not observe inter-

---

<sup>3</sup> The signal quality received by a specific DMP is a function of the geospatial and line-of-sight characteristics of the subscriber's residence with respect to the nearest terrestrial TV tower. Thus, two subscribers who are neighbors could receive different signal qualities if, for example, one subscriber had a tall tree in her yard while the other does not, or if one subscriber's TV room faces north versus south. Formal tests of signal quality (described later) also showed a lack of spatial correlation in signals.

subscriber communication. This is because potential subscribers do not have any information about their realized service quality prior to adoption (we discuss this in the detail later). However, given our data, other labels - “neighborhood effects” or “geographic contagion” – could also be used. Note also that, due to the data limitations, we also cannot explicitly model word of mouth communication that occurs *outside* the geographic bands e.g., at the workplace or over electronic media. In other words, our identification of the contiguous word of mouth effect is subject to our definition of a physical neighborhood.

Specifically, we find that 8% of new subscribers are affected by spillover effects from current subscribers. Interestingly, the magnitude of this indirect effect of signal quality for DirectMovie is comparable to the magnitude reported by the same households when they are directly surveyed. We find that the effect of negative word of mouth arising from poor signal quality is more than twice as large as the effect of positive word of mouth arising from excellent signal quality.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we describe the data. We then describe the model in Section 3. Section 4 contains a discussion of the results. We conclude in Section 5.

## **2. Data**

In this section, we describe the VOD service, the firm’s marketing activity and its subscriber base. We then explain the role of signal quality. We then address the identification of the contiguous word of mouth effect of service quality in our data.

### **2.1 Service Description, Subscriber Base and Marketing Activity**

The data come from a large entertainment company that tested a VOD movie rental service named DirectMovie from October 2003 to November 2004. The service was provided in three test markets - Jacksonville, FL, Salt Lake City, UT and Spokane, WA - and complete

data are available for 3650 (out of 4772) subscribers. Our analysis focuses exclusively on these 3650 subscribers or “adopters” and is therefore conditional on adoption. Jacksonville had the highest penetration ratio (0.2%) and accounted for 45% of total subscribers followed by Salt Lake City at 44% (Table 1). The data contain the subscription date of the service for *each customer* as well as the numbers of movies rented per week. Each subscriber paid a one-time activation fee of \$29.99 and a monthly subscription fee of \$7.99. The rental fee was \$3.99 for a new release and \$2.49 or \$ 1.99 for an old movie.

The primary marketing instrument used by the company to acquire new customers was television advertising. A notable feature of the advertising expenditure was that the temporal pattern of expenditure was virtually identical in all three markets. The advertising was of two types – the majority was conventional spot TV advertising (mean monthly spend \$ 282,000 with a standard deviation of \$ 111,000) and Direct Response TV (DRTV)<sup>4</sup> advertising (mean GRPs at 0.83 with a standard deviation of 0.14). Finally, we also have access to a small survey that was administered to a subset of subscribers. The survey data are based on responses from 304 randomly chosen respondents i.e., about 8% of our estimation sample, across all three markets.

The data include street level address information of each household in the area. We also collect street level address information for consumer electronics retailers that were demonstrating and selling subscriptions to DirectMovie and DMPs (Best Buy, Circuit City and Sound Quality), DVD rental stores and major shopping malls using each retailer’s web site and Google Maps. We then use this spatial information to compute the distance (using

---

<sup>4</sup> DRTV advertising essentially refers to television programs popularly known as “infomercials.” As this is a medium that is different from TV advertising we treat these two as different marketing instruments even though both are delivered via television. In addition, the company switched most of its advertising from network TV advertising to DRTV in months 11 through 14.

Geographical Information System software) between subscribers and consumer electronics retailers, rental shops, and major shopping malls.

We then supplemented these data with demographic information (income, age, cable access, Internet access, education, marital status, number of children, number of teenagers, and race) from the 603 census tracts across the three markets. The demographics for our subscribers show a mean income of \$62,297, mean age of 32 years, with the mean number of children and teenagers at 0.65 children and 0.51 respectively. 15% of the population is over 55 years old, 19% is single, and 7% is black. 19% have cable and 13% have at least a bachelor's degree, and 17% have Internet access. Table 2 provides individual level data on the time to activate (since launch), and (rental) usage, distance between each household and the nearest retail and rental outlet and census-tract level (aggregate) demographic information for the census tracts that these households are in. Since we do not directly observe the demographic information for our customers, for each customer we use the demographic data corresponding to the census-tract in which the customer resides.

In summary, our data is a blend of individual level data (activation, rental, distance to retail and rental stores) supplemented with aggregate demographic data at the census tract level. In addition, we have individual level survey data on from about 8% of the adopter households. Our model therefore is an individual level model with some controls at the aggregate level (described below).

## **2.2 Signal Quality**

The data include a measure of the signal quality received by the DMP. Recall that this reflects the quality of the terrestrial TV signal received by the DMP. The signal quality has a range from 0 to 2.4 and varies across and within households. Figure 1 shows the means and standard deviations of signal quality across households. In general, the higher the signal quality received by a household, the lower is the variation in this quality (the

correlation between the mean and standard deviation of signal quality across households is -0.29).

A unique feature of this signal quality is that there is a lot of variation across geographic locations. Figure 2 shows the household locations and their signal quality levels for the Jacksonville market. As can be seen from the figure, the signal quality is subscriber-specific, not location-specific (households right next to each other get different signal qualities). This is also reflected at a “coarser” geographic level. Specifically, the level of variation of signal quality within census tracts (standard deviation of 0.183) is higher than the level of variation of signal quality across census tracts (standard deviation of 0.117). We also computed the correlation between the signal quality for each subscriber and the mean signal quality received by her near neighbors and found the mean correlation to be 0.06. Finally, we carried out a formal test to see if there was any spatial correlation in the signal quality using the test for spatial correlation outlined in Conley and Topa (2002). The intuition behind the test is that it involves the computation of the spatial correlation of the subscribers’ signal qualities within a certain distance followed by the comparison with spatial correlation of independently distributed (simulated) signal qualities. Using a uniform kernel bandwidth of 0.05 miles, we find that there is no significant spatial correlation (at the 5% statistical significance level) at distances ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 miles.

As noted earlier, the number of movies that get updated every week is determined by the signal quality received by the DMP that week. As subscribers do not observe signal quality directly, we wanted to ensure that there was a clear relationship between signal quality and the amount of updating. Therefore, using the survey data, we ran a logistic regression with the dependent variable being the response to the question whether all 10 movies were updated every week with their received signal quality (available to us via the database) as the explanatory variable. We find that the coefficient on signal quality was

highly significant ( $t$ -stat 3.51). This assured us that higher signal quality was indeed predictive of more frequent updating and the subscribers were noting the updating patterns “correctly.”

Note also that, as mentioned earlier, signal quality and its relationship with movie assortment is only one dimension of overall service quality for the VOD service. The other components are the billing process, instructions for setting up the system, movie selection, and ease of use of on-screen menus, picture quality etc. We do not have data on the quality of these dimensions for our estimation sample (with the exception of the satisfaction survey data from 8% of the subscribers). Thus, we are constrained to using only the signal quality measure. We did use the survey data to understand the notion of service quality for the VOD service in more detail. Generally speaking, the survey respondents are quite satisfied on all dimensions other than movie selection (the average score for each dimension is between 9 and 10 on a 10 point scale). However, the satisfaction level on movie selection has the lowest (6.2). We run a regression of overall satisfaction on all these dimensions of service quality as well as on only movie selection. We find that movie selection explains over 50% of the variance in overall satisfaction. This suggests that even though signal quality (the movie assortment) is not a complete measure of overall service quality, it does play a strong role in determining overall satisfaction with the service.

In summary, our modeling approach exploits five aspects of signal quality that we observe in the data. First, signal quality is exogenous as far as the household is concerned. Second, while the firm can raise average signal quality, it cannot target increases in this quality for a household. Third, there is variation in signal quality across and within households over time. Fourth, there is little spatial correlation in signal quality. Finally, a consumer cannot observe signal quality till she subscribes – hence it is very likely that she will base her expectation of her own service quality on her neighbors’ service quality. Our

hypothesis is that this expectation will most likely be formed as an outcome of contiguous word of mouth communication. We discuss this below and describe the covariates of our adoption model.

### **2.3 Identification of the Contiguous Word of Mouth Effect**

When the VOD service satisfies current subscribers, it is likely that they would recommend it to other potential subscribers. The survey data suggest that, of the households surveyed, 86% reported that they discussed the service with someone they knew, suggesting that there are likely to be word of mouth effects. However, these indirect effects may be confounded with other effects such as those arising from marketing activity. For example, 50% of the survey respondents replied that they heard about the service through TV advertising. Thus we need to control for such confounding factors in order to isolate the word of mouth effect.

A potential manifestation of the above word of mouth effect could be spatial correlation in the adoption pattern, i.e., a household living close to one that has previously adopted is more likely to also adopt the service. However, an alternative explanation for such a finding could be that adoption patterns are spatially correlated due to the presence of some unobserved common geographic characteristics besides observable factors such as income, etc. If this were indeed the case, we would see evidence for adoption in geographic clusters.

We therefore check to see if adoption patterns can be explained by temporal variation (in advertising) and cross-sectional variation (with geographic fixed effects). We estimated a household level hazard model (with various baseline specifications) with time to adoption as the dependent variable and advertising and 128 geography-specific dummy variables based on zip code. For the adoption model with advertising and area dummies, we find that only 6 dummy variables are significant. In addition, the BIC value does not improve when

geographic (dummy) variables are added relative to a model with only advertising effects. While we recognize that geographic fixed effects specified on a finer spatial definition may better control for unobservables (we discuss how we deal with issue below), our results do seem to suggest that individual level adoption behavior cannot be explained only by common geographic characteristics (at least at the zip code level).

Thus, it is possible that word of mouth effects could explain adoption behavior. Previous research, e.g., Richins (1983), has also documented the relationship between product performance and word of mouth, especially for poor product performance. Our approach to test for the presence of these effects is to infer it from two sources. The first source is the presence of other adopters in a potential subscriber’s “neighborhood.” The second source is the realized service quality received by the adopters in the neighborhood.

Since we do not directly observe that the current subscribers communicate with other potential subscribers, we make two assumptions to capture the role of word of mouth in the adoption (activation) model.

First, we assume that every current and past subscriber in a geographic “band” (circle) around each potential subscriber communicates with the potential subscriber. Since geographically close neighbors are more likely have interactions than others, using such “band” is a common practice in the social interaction literature (see Conley and Topa 2007 for details). We choose the band to be a circle of 0.5 mile radius centered at a potential subscriber’s residential location. As discussed earlier, we find that signals are spatially uncorrelated in this band. 0.5 miles is also about 7-8 minute walking distance and a one-minute driving distance thus making facilitating interaction.<sup>5</sup> We count the number of neighbors who have already activated the service within the band. Using this band, we find

---

<sup>5</sup> In a subsequent section, we also show that the model that uses a 0.5 mile radius fits the data better than models that assume a 0.3 and 0.8 mile radius.

that at the time of activation, the mean number of existing customers for a potential subscriber is 2.52 (with a standard deviation of 4.22).

Second, we assume that a current subscriber's recommendation to others is a function of her usage-weighted signal up to the previous period. The advantage of using such a formulation is that it captures the dynamics of signal quality within the household and also reflects a potential recommendation based on actual use of the VOD service. The average usage weighted signal is 1.023 (with a standard deviation of 0.75). For a given potential subscriber, the overall contiguous word of mouth effect is a simple average of all the usage-weighted signal quality received by all the current subscribers in her neighborhood. This average allows for both cross-sectional and temporal variation in the quality of signal received in a potential subscriber's neighborhood of potential subscribers. Based on these two assumptions, we can test whether a potential subscriber's decision to subscribe was influenced by the contiguous word of mouth. The necessary condition for the existence of a contiguous word of mouth effect is that the time to adoption is influenced by the number of neighbors who have adopted. The sufficient condition is that this adoption time is also a function of the average signal received in the neighborhood.

Another way to think about this is to look at the general identification issues in estimating causal word of mouth effects in non-experimental data (for a detailed discussion of these problems in the marketing context, see Nair et al. 2006 and Hartman et al. 2008). Given that signal quality is exogenous (and not spatially correlated), our sufficient condition helps rule out "endogenous group formation" (the fact that people who locate together may have common tastes) and "correlated unobservables" (factors common to the neighborhood or social network that are unobserved by the researcher) as well as other factors (e.g., sample selection etc.) that could give rise to spurious word of mouth effects. The intuition is that if the contiguous word of mouth effect is driven by endogenous group

formation and/or correlated unobservables, then signal quality should have no effect on an individual subscriber’s adoption decision. Our data and approach also help us handle two other issues with regards to identifying contiguous word of mouth. The first of these is “reference group determination” i.e., the social network must be formed independent of the behavior under consideration. In our case, it is unlikely that households choose to locate in physical neighborhoods in anticipation of their adopting the DirectMovie service. The second is the issue of “simultaneity” or whether a group member influences another group member or vice versa does not apply in our case as adoption imposes a temporal ordering (i.e., a household can only be affected by a neighbor after s/he adopts the service).

### **3. Model and Specification**

We first outline our model structure and then describe the model specification.

#### **3.1 Model Structure**

For each subscriber, we model the time to adopt using a hazard model with both time-varying and time invariant covariates.

We model the time to adopt using the discrete time proportional hazard model (PHM) first proposed by Cox (1972). This model consists of two parts: the baseline hazard, which captures the intrinsic temporal pattern, and the covariate function that captures the influence of covariates on the baseline hazard. We choose the log-logistic (Seetharaman and Chintagunta 2003) as the baseline hazard based on two criteria. First, the log-logistic form allows an inverse U-shape of the baseline hazard that resembles the overall shape of the empirical hazard of our data. Other baseline hazard choices (e.g., exponential and Erlang-2) are restrictive in that they either show no duration dependence or impose a strictly increasing or decreasing pattern for the baseline hazard. Second, the model assuming a log-

logistic baseline hazard fit the data better than some competing specifications (details provided later).

The baseline hazard ( $h(t, X_t)$ ) for activation is defined as the probability that a potential subscriber subscribes to the service at time  $t$ , given she has not activated the service till that time:

$$h(t, X_t) = h(t) \cdot e^{X_t \beta} = \frac{f(t, X_t)}{1 - F(t, X_t)} = \frac{f(t, X_t)}{S(t, X_t)} \quad (1)$$

Here  $f(t, X_t)$  denotes for the subscriber's probability of activating the service at time  $t$ , and  $S(t, X_t)$  (called the survival function) is for the probability that the subscriber has not yet activated the service. The covariates  $X_t$  (both time-varying and invariant) scale the baseline hazard up or down by multiplying the baseline hazard via  $e^{X_t \beta}$  term. The closed form expressions for the survivor function and probability density function are

$$S(t, X_t) = e^{-\sum_{u=1}^t e^{X_u \beta} \cdot \int_{u-1}^u h(w) dw} \quad (2)$$

$$\Pr(t, X_t) = 1 - e^{-e^{X_t \beta} \int_{t-1}^t h(u) du} \quad (3)$$

where the hazard function has a log-logistic form.

$$h(t) = \frac{\gamma \alpha (\gamma t)^{\alpha-1}}{1 + (\gamma t)^\alpha} \quad (4)$$

Given this probability density function and survivor function, we construct the likelihood function for a household  $i$  as

$$L_i = \prod_{v=1}^T \left( \Pr(v, X_{iv})^{\delta_{iv}} [1 - \Pr(v, X_{iv})]^{1-\delta_{iv}} \right)^{X_{iv}} \quad (5)$$

where  $\delta_{iv}$  is an indicator variable which takes the value 1 if the subscriber  $i$  activates the

service at time  $\nu$  and 0 otherwise.  $\chi_{i\nu}$  takes the value 1 if the subscriber  $i$  has not activated the service in the past and 0 otherwise.

To account for the unobserved heterogeneity across consumers in the baseline hazard, and subscribers' sensitivities to covariates, we use a mass point distribution for these parameters and then estimate the supports and probability masses for the distribution from the data (Heckman and Singer 1984, Kamakura and Russell 1989). The corresponding likelihood function can be written as follows.

$$L = \prod_{i=1}^N \left( \sum_{s=1}^S L_{i|s} \pi_s \right) \quad (6)$$

Where  $N$  denotes the total number of subscribers,  $S$  is the total number of mass points,  $L_{i|s}$  is the likelihood function of a household given that it is associated with mass point  $s$  and  $\pi_s$  refers to the probability mass associated with mass point or segment  $s$ . We use maximum likelihood methods for estimation.

### 3.2 Model Specification

We now describe the specification for the model (a detailed list of all the explanatory variables can be found in Table 4). As described earlier, activation of the service could be a function of marketing activity by the firm, word of mouth effects or household demographics. For marketing activity, we include the aggregate level of conventional TV and DRTV advertising as time varying covariates. For contiguous word of mouth, we include the main effect of number of neighbors ( $Neighbor_{i,t}$ ) and the interaction effect between number of neighbors and the square root of neighbors' usage weighted signal

quality ( $qual_{i,t}$ ). A significant coefficient for the latter term represents the sufficient condition (as described earlier) for the identification of the contiguous word of mouth effect.<sup>6</sup>

$$X_i\beta = \mu \cdot Neighbor_{i,t} + \rho \cdot Neighbor_{i,t} \cdot \sqrt{qual_{i,t}} + \sum_{j=1}^J \tau_j \cdot demo_{i,j} \quad (7)$$

The use of the square root function has the attractive properties that it allows for an overall non-linear (with diminishing returns) contiguous word of mouth effect.<sup>7</sup> Note that the parameters  $\mu$  and  $\rho$  reflect both the amount of interaction as well as the effectiveness of these interactions. In other words, we cannot distinguish between a subset of neighbors having more effective interactions and all the neighbors having less effective interactions.

For demographics ( $demo_{i,j}$ ), we use the distance to the nearest (electronics) retail store, distance to the nearest DVD rental store, the distance to the nearest mall (using Google Local, we found 24 malls around Jacksonville, 21 around Salt Lake City and 11 around Spokane), and census tract level demographics. The distance to the nearest (electronics) retail store would represent the degree of access to the retail shop where consumers can see the demonstration of the service and can activate the service. The distance to the nearest rental shop and to the nearest shopping mall is used to model other shopping/renting/movie viewing options. As census tract demographics may not capture all differences across the three markets, we include market specific fixed effects.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

Table 3 shows the estimation results. As noted previously, we use a mass point or latent segment approach to account for household heterogeneity. We find significant heterogeneity in the estimated baseline hazard and the effect of covariates. Using the BIC fit criterion, we

---

<sup>6</sup> Note the equation (7) does not contain the main effect of service quality for *that subscriber*. This is because the realized service quality for a subscriber is unobservable to that subscriber until she adopts the service.

<sup>7</sup> We also compared the fit of a model with a linear signal quality formulation with the fit using the square root formulation and found that the latter fit the data better on fit and predictive ability both in and out of sample.

chose the three “segment” solution. Each column shows the segment specific parameters associated with the baseline hazard and time covariates. The parameters for the (pooled) demographic variables are listed in the last column.

We classify each subscriber into one of three segments using the maximum posterior probability rule (Kamakura and Russell 1989). The demographics of these three segments are described in Table 4. Segment 1, with smallest mass (8%), has the lowest mean annual income (\$62,469) and highest African-American ratio (9.1%). In contrast, Segment 2, with 52% of the mass, has the highest income (\$64,606) and lowest African-American ratio (6.9%). The demographics for Segment 3, with the mass at 40%, are between those of Segment 1 and Segment 2.

We find that the estimated activation baseline hazard is different across the segments. The activation hazard associated with the Segment 1 is increasing over time and Segment 2 is decreasing in a convex fashion over time. The baseline hazard associated with Segment 3 has an inverse U-shape. The magnitude of the hazard for Segment 3 is also slightly higher than for the other segments.

We now turn to the effect of the covariates on the hazard. As can be seen from Table 3, the contiguous word of mouth effect as represented by the main effect and the interaction is significant only for Segment 1 (with 8% of the mass). In other words, a potential subscriber’s adoption behavior in this segment is significantly affected by the number of neighbors who are adopters and the average usage-weighted signal quality (realized by these adopters).

We now examine this effect in more detail. As can be seen from the table, the main effect of neighbors is negative while the interaction effect with the square root of the signal quality is positive. Thus, adoption by an additional neighbor does not always lead to an increase in the adoption probability of a focal household. The determination of whether the

adoption by a neighbor decreases or increases the probability of adoption for the focal household is based on the usage weighted signal quality received by the adopter. Specifically, for usage weighted signal levels that are higher than 1.51 (on a 0 to 2.4 scale), the adoption probability for the focal household goes up while it goes down for all usage weighted signal levels below this number. Interestingly enough, this effect is also asymmetric below this “breakeven” level of signal quality. This can be illustrated by looking at the extremes – when the signal quality is at its lowest level (zero), the hazard rate drops by 59% but when it is at its maximum (2.4), the hazard rate only goes up by 26%. For the firm, it may also be helpful to quantify the change in hazard relative to the average signal quality delivered (as the firm has the ability to change the average quality). Thus, a 50% increase in the signal quality relative to the mean leads to an increase in hazard of 15% while a 50% decrease in the signal quality leads to a 31% decrease in the hazard rate.

These results are consistent with the theory that predicts that contiguous word of mouth would have a positive effect on others’ behaviors if the customers’ satisfaction levels (based on product quality) are above a certain threshold and have a larger negative effect when consumers’ satisfaction levels are below that same threshold. The presence of the larger negative effect has been variously attributed to expectations disconfirmation (Oliver 1980), proclivity (Anderson 1998), prospect theory (Kahneman and Tversky 1979), higher diagnosticity of negative information (Herr, Kardes and Kim 1991) and the more contagious nature of negative information, especially when both positive and negative information is present (Rozin and Ryzman 2001). With our data, we cannot test for which mechanism is operating here – thus, our findings must be seen as providing a confirmation of the effect in a field setting.

Advertising also helps in customer acquisition. A \$10,000 increase in network TV advertising spending and a 10 point increase in Gross Rating Points (GRP) delivered via

DRTV increases a potential subscriber's monthly adoption probability by 0% and 6.1%, 27.5% and 2.79% and 6.7% and 0% for Segments 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Although about 60% of consumers activated the service via the phone and/or the Internet, activation behavior is affected significantly by distance to the nearest consumer electronics retailer. When a subscriber lives 1 mile farther from the nearest retailer the monthly activation rate decreases by 1.8%. Consumers who have easier access to the retailer might activate the service with lower uncertainty by seeing the display of the service in the retailer. In terms of demographics, we find that households in census tracts with higher mean annual income are more likely to adopt. For every additional \$10,000 in a household's mean annual income, the adoption probability increases by 5%. Finally, we do not find market specific fixed effects on activation as both the Salt Lake City and Spokane fixed effects are not significantly different from zero (Table 3).

In summary, we find that contiguous word of mouth affects about 8% of the subscribers with respect to their activation behavior.<sup>8</sup> Interestingly, when consumers were asked in the survey, "Before you signed up for the service, where did you see or hear about the service?" 8% of them replied in the affirmative. We also carried a simple analysis where we plotted the adoption timing of all consumers in the sample when contiguous word of mouth effect is based on the highest possible signal quality as opposed to the lowest possible signal quality. We find that the adoption time is reduced by about 55 days on average (or about 16%). Note that this number represents an upper bound of the indirect effect. Finally, the contiguous word of mouth effect acts as a double-edged sword as it is asymmetric in nature with the negative effect at the lowest level of signal quality being more than twice the positive effect at the highest level of quality.

---

<sup>8</sup> While it may seem that the size of the segment influenced by contiguous word of mouth is "small" relative to the other segments, this may be due to the fact that the duration of our data is limited – we only have thirteen months of data post launch.

## 4.1 Alternative Specifications

We also investigated alternative specifications with different specifications for the baseline hazard and the choice of the band distance.

For the baseline hazard, we compare three different specifications – the log-logistic, the Exponential and the Erlang-2. The results of the comparison are in Table 5. From the table, see that the log-logistic has the best fit and does the best on prediction. Note, that for the out-of-sample fit, we first re-estimated the model holding out 385 customers (about 10% of the sample). We then used these estimates to predict the adoption probabilities of these “holdout” customers. We therefore chose the log-logistic baseline hazard. Figures 3a and 3b illustrate the in and out of sample predictions over time (using the model estimates).

We also explored the fit of our model as a function of the choice of the geographic band for interactions in our model. We looked at the BIC for the range of 0.3 miles to 0.8 miles (in 0.1 mile increments). We found the BIC to be 17722.9 for 0.5 miles, 17726.3 for 0.3 miles and 17733.7 for 0.8 miles. Hence 0.5 miles appears to be the appropriate choice based on model fit.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper contributes to the service marketing and social networking literature by showing the existence and quantifying the effect of indirect effects of signal quality of a VOD service on new customer acquisition using behavioral data. We use a unique dataset describing the launch of a new high-tech, entertainment product (a video on demand type service). For this technology, signal quality (a component of overall service quality) is exogenously determined, objectively measured and spatially uncorrelated. This information is coupled with location and neighborhood information for each subscriber.

These features allow us to resolve the typical challenges of determining causal social network effect. Our identification strategy for the contiguous word of mouth effects is based

on the main effect of neighbors *and* the interaction between the number of neighbors and their realized signal quality. The interaction terms implies that if a focal household has more neighbors with higher (lower) signal quality, it will lead to a higher (lower) probability of adoption. Specifically, the use of this interaction terms allows us to control for correlated unobservables and endogenous group formation. We also control for other factors such as advertising, demographics and proximity to retail in order to isolate the contiguous word of mouth effect.

We find that contiguous word of mouth affects about 8% of the subscribers with respect to their activation behavior. However, this effect acts as a double-edged sword as it is asymmetric in nature with the negative effect at the lowest level of signal quality being more than twice the positive effect at the highest level of quality.

Our research has some limitations. First, the nature of the service and our data make it hard to identify ex-ante the actual potential population for this service. Thus, we cannot quantify the effects of the change in service quality on individual non-subscribers. This may also result in an upward bias in some of our estimates. However, it should be noted that this is a general problem for new products when the target population is unrestricted.<sup>9</sup> Also, as mentioned earlier, the lack of data precludes us from examining the other dimensions of service quality and their effect on adoption behavior via the contiguous word of mouth effect. Lack of data also precludes us from looking at heterogeneity in matching preferences as we do not observe all the movie titles stored in the DMP for all households. Finally, while we have supplemented our data with demographics at the census

---

<sup>9</sup> To investigate this in more detail, we carried out an analysis (not reported here) to examine the effect of signal quality on the number of acquired subscribers in a census tract (while controlling for the total number of households in each tract). Our results indicate that signal quality has a positive and significant effect, suggesting that our results may be robust to the inclusion on non-adopters.

tract level, we do not have detailed demographic information at the household level. We hope that future research will be able to address these limitations.

## References

Anderson, Eugene W. (1998), "Customer Satisfaction and Word of Mouth," *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, August, 5-17.

Bell, David R. and Sangyoung Song (2007), "Social Contagion and Trial on the Internet: Evidence from Online Grocery Retailing," *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 5, 361-400.

Conley, Timothy G. and Giorgio Topa (2002), "Socio-Economic Distance and Spatial Patterns in Unemployment," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 17(4), (July-Aug), 303-327.

Conley, Timothy G. and Giorgio Topa (2007), "Estimating Dynamic Local Interactions Models," *Journal of Econometrics*, 140(1), 282-303.

Cox, D. R. (1972), "Regression Models and Life Tables," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Ser. B, 34, 187-220.

Hartmann, Wesley R., Puneet Manchanda, Harikesh Nair, Matthew Bothner, Peter Dodds, David Godes, Kartik Hosanagar and Catherine Tucker (2008), "Modeling Social Interactions: Identification, Empirical Methods and Policy Implications," *Marketing Letters*, 19, 287-304.

Heckman and Singer (1984), "A Method for Minimizing the Impact of Distributional Assumption in Econometric Models for Duration Data," *Econometrica*, 52, 271-318.

Herr, Paul. M., Frank R. Kardes and John Kim (1991), "Effects of Word-of-Mouth and Product-Attribute Information on Persuasion: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Perspective", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (March), 454-462.

Kahneman, Daniel and Amos Tversky (1979), "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk," *Econometrica*, Vol. 47, 2 (March), 263-292.

Kamakura, Wagner A. and Gary J. Russell (1989), "A Probabilistic Choice Model for Market Segmentation and Elasticity Structure," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (November), 379-90.

Manchanda, Puneet, Ying Xie and Nara Youn (2008), "The Role of Targeted Communication and Contagion in New Product Adoption," *Marketing Science*, 27 (6), 950-961.

Nair, Harikesh, Puneet Manchanda and Tulikaa Bhatia (2006), "Asymmetric Social Interactions in Physician Prescription Behavior: The Role of Opinion Leaders," *Journal of Marketing Research*, forthcoming.

Oliver, Richard L. (1980), "A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17 (November), 460-469.

Rozin, Paul and Edward B. Royzman (2001), "Negativity Bias, Negativity Dominance, and Contagion," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(4), 296-320.

Richins, Marsha L. (1983), "Negative Word of Mouth by Dissatisfied Consumers: A Pilot Study," *Journal of Marketing*, 47, 68-78.

Seetharaman, P.B. and Chintagunta, P. K. (2003), "The Proportional Hazard Model for Purchase Timing: A Comparison of Alternative Specifications," *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 21(3), 368-382.

**Table 1: Penetration ratio by market**

	Jacksonville	Salt Lake City	Spokane
Total Population	1,080,925	1,764,891	448,533
Total Number of subscribers	2,147	2,061	559
Complete observations	1,608	1,574	469
Penetration ratio	0.20%	0.12%	0.13%

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics**

Variables	Obs	Mean	S.D.
Actv_date (days)	3650	140.2	108.8
Signal Quality	3650	1.66	0.52
Usage (total rentals)	3650	26.97	25.3
Longitude	3650	-99.27	15.75
Latitude	3650	37.01	6.37
Dist_retail (miles)	3650	3.64	3.11
Dist_rental (miles)	3650	1.53	1.53
Dist_mall (miles)	3650	3.80	3.49
Income**	3650	6.37	2.49
Age**	3650	31.76	5.61
Cable**	3650	0.19	0.1
Internet**	3650	0.17	0.03
Education**	3650	0.13	0.06
Single**	3650	0.19	0.06
Child**	3650	0.65	0.27
Teenager**	3650	0.51	0.23
Old**	3650	0.17	0.07
Black**	3650	0.07	0.14

\*\* Demographic information is based on 2002 Census Tract level

Income	Mean Income level (\$10,000)
Age	Mean age of population
Cable	the proportion of population with Cables
Internet	the proportion of population with Internet access
Education	the proportion of population with at least 4 year's college degree
Single	the proportion of population of single (never married)
Child	the number of children (under 13) given household
Teenager	the number of teenagers (14 to 24) given household
Old	the proportion of population over 55
Black	the proportion of population of black (non Hispanic)

**Table 3: Parameter Estimates**

	Seg1		Seg2		Seg3		Demo	
	Est.	S.E.	Est.	S.E.	Est.	S.E.	Est.	S.E.
log(Alpha)	<b>3.274</b>	0.216	<b>-1.449</b>	0.24	<b>1.162</b>	0.115		
log(Gamma)	<b>-2.501</b>	0.033	<b>-4.705</b>	1.596	<b>-1.772</b>	0.093		
Neighbor	<b>-0.894</b>	0.368	0.137	0.099	-0.085	0.088		
Nei*sqrt(qual)	<b>0.727</b>	0.304	-0.09	0.084	0.104	0.075		
Ad (\$100,000)	<b>2.743</b>	0.989	<b>0.612</b>	0.066	0.045	0.048		
DRTV (1,000GRP)	1.715	1.057	<b>6.684</b>	0.423	<b>2.794</b>	0.485		
Dist_retail (mile)							<b>-0.018</b>	0.008
Dist_mall (mile)							0.008	0.007
Dist_rental (mile)							0.011	0.016
Income (\$10,000)							<b>0.05</b>	0.009
Single (%)							-0.001	0.471
Child (# per HH)							0.165	0.137
Old (over 55,%)							0.486	0.455
Black (%)							-0.065	0.166
SLC							-0.07	0.063
SPK							-0.118	0.07
proportion	0.08		0.52		0.40			


**Table 4: Demographics by segment**

Variables	Seg1	Seg2	Seg3
Jacksonville (JSV)	0.38	0.47	0.45
Salt Lake City (SLC)	0.47	0.41	0.45
Spokane (SPK)	0.10	0.13	0.13
Dist_retail (mile)	3.70	3.65	3.60
Dist_rental (mile)	1.47	1.57	1.48
Dist_mall (mile)	3.55	3.90	3.70
Signal Quality	1.710	1.654	1.594
Income (\$)	62,469	64,605	62,510
Single (%)	0.20	0.19	0.20
Child (# per HH)	0.65	0.64	0.66
Old (over 55, %)	0.17	0.17	0.17
Black ratio (%)	0.09	0.07	0.07
# HH in segment	336	2,005	1,309


**Table 5: Comparison of various baseline hazard specifications**

	Log-logistic	Exponential	Erlang2
LL	-8,714.1	-8,776.2	-8,777.7
BIC	17,722.9	17,817.6	17,820.7
In sample fit, MAPE	0.075	0.188	0.175
Out of sample fit, MAPE	0.28	0.543	0.818


**Figure 1: Signal quality distribution**



**Figure 2: Signal Quality Pattern (Jacksonville)**



**Figure 3a: In-sample model fit**



**Figure 3b: Out-of-sample model fit**

