UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY IN TELEVISION STREAMING-RELATED MOTIVATIONS AND PARASOCIAL BEHAVIORS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

CASEY YETTER
Norman, Oklahoma
2023

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/337622

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY IN TELEVISION STREAMING-RELATED MOTIVATIONS AND PARASOCIAL BEHAVIORS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE

GAYLORD COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Cynthia Frisby, Chair

Dr. David Craig

Dr. Ralph Beliveau

Dr. Howard Crowson

© Copyright by CASEY YETTER 2023
All Rights Reserved.

Dedication

To my parents Robert and Laurie Yetter and my brother Shelby Yetter,

Thank you for being the pillars of my life and for always being there to support me through every step of my academic journey. You have been the driving force behind my success, and I owe everything I have achieved to your unwavering love and guidance.

Mom, your unconditional love and endless sacrifices have been the foundation of my life. Your encouragement and support have given me the strength to persevere through difficult times. Your faith in me has given me the confidence to pursue my dreams, and I am forever grateful for your constant support.

Dad, your wisdom and guidance have been invaluable to me. You have always believed in me and pushed me to strive for excellence. You have taught me to be compassionate, hardworking, and resilient, and I am grateful for all the lessons you have instilled in me.

Together, you have provided me with a loving and supportive home, filled with warmth, laughter, and encouragement. Your unwavering love has been the backbone of my life, and I am fortunate to have you both as my parents.

I would also like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my brother Shelby Yetter, for being my constant companion and confidant and I am fortunate to have you as my sibling.

This dissertation is dedicated to y'all, as a small token of my appreciation for all that you have done for me. I could not have done this without you, and I hope to make you proud with my achievements.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to my dissertation committee for their guidance and support throughout my academic journey. Without their valuable input, this work would not have been possible. I am deeply indebted to each of them for their time, effort, and expertise.

I would especially like to thank Dr. David Craig, with whom I worked with throughout my doctoral work. His dedication to academic excellence, tireless effort, and unwavering support have been instrumental in shaping my academic and professional goals. I would like to express my gratitude to him for his patience, encouragement, and understanding. His unwavering support and constructive feedback have helped me to navigate the challenges of academic life with confidence and determination.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Cynthia Frisby, whose insightful comments and constructive feedback helped me improve the quality of my research. She challenged me to think critically, and I am grateful for the time and effort she invested in my academic growth.

Additionally, I want to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Ralph Beliveau and Dr. Howard Crowson, who served on my committee and provided valuable feedback. Their expertise and support were invaluable, and I am grateful for the time and energy they invested in my success.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unwavering support and encouragement throughout this process. Their love and encouragement kept me motivated, and I am grateful for their presence in my life. Your contributions have made a lasting impact on me, and I will always be grateful for the opportunity to learn from you.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Introduction 1

Purpose Statement 1

Overview of Research Questions 1

Variables of Interest 2

Significance of Study 3

Structure of the Dissertation 4

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 6

Introduction 6

Streaming Video on Demand 7

Uses and Gratifications 8

Parasocial Behaviors 10

Measuring Parasocial Behaviors 13

HEXACO 15
- Limitations of the Big Five Model 15
- Honesty-Humility 17
- Emotionality 18
- Extraversion 19
- Agreeableness (Versus Anger) 20
- Conscientiousness 21
- Openness to Experience 22

Research Questions 22

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 25

Introduction 25

Research Design 25

Research Population and Sample 26

Research Procedure 27

Data Analysis 28

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS 29

Introduction 29

HEXACO and Motivations to watch SVOD 29

HEXACO and Parasocial Behaviors 34

Parasocial Behaviors and Motivations to watch SVOD 36

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 38

Key Findings: 38

HEXACO and SVOD Motivations 39

HEXACO and Parasocial Behaviors 41

Parasocial Behaviors and SVOD Motivations 43

Theoretical Implications 44

Practical Implications 45

Limitations 46

Future Research 46

Conclusion 48

REFERENCES 49

APPENDIX 1: SCALES USED IN SURVEY 55

List of Tables

Table 1. Gratifications of media technology 10

Table 2. Factors and corresponding facets of HEXACO 17

Table 3. Correlation Matrix 35

Table 4. Regression analysis 35

Table 5. Regression results for each motivation 37

Abstract

This paper explores the relationship between personality traits and motivations for using streaming video on demand (SVOD) services. The study aims to fill a gap in the literature on the individual differences and uses and gratifications of SVOD consumption by integrating the HEXACO personality factors and facets of motivations for using SVOD services. The study finds that all HEXACO factors are significant predictors of SVOD motivations overall, with honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, and agreeableness predicting the majority of the 16 SVOD motivations. The findings provide fresh information about how people perceive, are motivated by, and intend to utilize internet streaming technologies to view recorded movies, television shows, and live broadcasts, and identify if people with certain personality traits are more or less likely to use SVOD for certain motivations. The study contributes to the body of academic literature on the streaming industry, which has become increasingly split off into niche services with narrow-casted content.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Streaming video on demand (SVOD) has rapidly changed the way audiences consume television. Technological changes offer increasing amounts of choice to audiences and have shifted television into a new era. This new era of television includes numerous streaming services that are becoming more and more segmented. While television companies have always made an effort to understand their audiences, the segmentation of streaming services and audiences have introduced a challenge to companies in understanding an ever-complex audience segment. Streaming services offer a unique look for scholars to understand parasocial behaviors developed as a result of changing television consumption.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to investigate the motivations for viewing SVOD and how audiences' personality factors affect both the motivations and the parasocial behaviors while streaming. More specifically, this research aims to explore how motivations for viewing SVOD are different than that found in traditional television motivations research. This research also aims to further the understanding of audiences by investigating personality factors associated with engaging in parasocial behaviors.

Overview of Research Questions

This research is guided by the following research questions. These lines of inquiry will be explored in the next chapter.

RQ1: To what extent will HEXACO factors be related to SVOD motivations?

RQ2: To what extent will HEXACO factors be related to parasocial behaviors?

RQ3: To what extent do parasocial behaviors influence SVOD motivations?

Variables of Interest

Previous research has established that audiences create emotional connections with television characters (Horton & Wohl, 1956; Rubin et al., 1985; Rubin & Perse, 1987; Giles, 2002). *Parasocial relationships* are when audiences feel as if they are a personal acquaintance of a fictional character (Giles, 2002). Typically, parasocial relationships have been studied using non-fiction television personalities like news anchors (Rubin et al., 1985) and athletes (Sun, 2010) but this research is primarily interested in parasocial relationships with fictional characters as most SVOD is fictional in nature.

The *motivations to view television* have also been widely explored by Rubin (1983, 1991) and further by other scholars looking at specifically internet mediated television and new media technologies (Ruggiero, 2000; Stafford et al., 2004; Sundar & Limperos, 2013; Tefertiller & Sheehan, 2019). This research will explore 16 possible motivations for using new media technology as theorized by Sundar and Limperos (2013): realism, coolness, novelty, being there, agency-enhancement, community building, bandwagon, filtering/tailoring, ownness, interaction, activity, responsiveness, dynamic control, browsing/variety-seeking, scaffolds/navigation aids, play/fun.

Personality factors are enduring dispositional qualities that sets people apart from each other (Hogan, 1991). This research is interested in identifying which personality traits correlate with different levels of parasocial behaviors and motivations to view SVOD. Using the HEXACO model of personality developed by Lee and Ashton (2008), this research will measure the six factors of personality: honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Additionally, the 16 possible gratifications of

new media technology asserted by Sundar and Limperos (2013) will be measured and parasocial interactions will be measured using an adapted scale from Rubin and Perse (1987).

This research uses quantitative survey methodology to understand the salient motivations to watch television, audience personality factors, and parasocial behaviors. Survey research has the ability to measure many respondents at once which aids in generalizability across audiences (Wimmer & Dominick, 2014).

Significance of Study

The rise of digitally distributed programs in the last 25 years has shifted the meaning of television. Nielsen, the leading firm in television ratings, found that the average American adult spends 11.5 hours per day connected to media and at least five of those hours are spent consuming television (Nielsen, 2019). More recently, Nielsen reported that in July 2022, streaming viewership (34.8%) exceeded broadcast (21.6%) and cable viewing (34.4%) for the first time with audiences watching an average of 190.9 billion minutes of content per week, which is more than audiences were watching during the COVID-19 lockdown period of 2020 and 2021. Total TV usage was steady from June and July, which indicates audiences are shifting their television consumption to streaming platforms (Nielsen, 2022).

From a scholarly standpoint, there is no research exploring the relationship between personality and motivations to view television or new media. Additionally, there is no research linking personality factors to parasocial behaviors. Given that creating parasocial relationships is an emotionally charged process of creating connections with characters outside the physical world, the dispositional quality of personality should be explored. While emotion is an important aspect of personality, it is just one component among many others, such as cognition, motivation, and social behavior. Personality is important because it shapes how individuals perceive and

interact with the world around them. It influences how they think, feel, and behave, and it can have significant implications for their relationships, work, and overall well-being.

From an industry standpoint, these findings will aid in understanding their audiences and how they interact with characters in television programs, especially as streaming services become more segmented into specific genres. Additionally, this research will add to the understanding of personality and how it effects parasocial behaviors and motivations to watch streaming television. Further investigation into the relationship between personality and media consumption could provide valuable insights into how to tailor media content and advertising to specific personality types, as well as how to design media interventions for individuals with specific psychological needs. Moreover, understanding the link between personality and parasocial behavior could help media producers create more engaging and meaningful content, ultimately leading to more loyal and dedicated fan bases.

Structure of the Dissertation

This research aims to analyze audience personality factors, SVOD motivations, and parasocial behaviors by evaluating existing literature and conducting primary research to better understand audiences. The process is presented in several chapters as follows:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction: This chapter is an overview of the study which provides the purpose of the study as well as a brief introduction to the research questions, the variables of interest and the significance of the study.
- Chapter 2 – Literature Review: Beginning with the history of television and streaming video on demand, this chapter provides a history of uses and gratifications research as it pertains to television and SVOD, an outline of past and current literature on parasocial behaviors and a discussion of the difficulties past researchers have had measuring

parasocial behaviors. This chapter then introduces the HEXACO scale and traces the use of personality in media research. Finally, the research questions and hypotheses are outlined at the end the chapter.

- Chapter 3 – Methodology: This chapter outlines the methods used to conduct the study and test the research questions. This chapter includes research design, an overview of the research population and sample and the research procedure.
- Chapter 4 – Results and Analysis: This chapter explores the statistical results for each of the research questions starting with the impact of personality on motivations for watching SVOD, then the impact of personality on parasocial behaviors and finally ending with the influence of parasocial behaviors on motivations to watch SVOD.
- Chapter 5 – Discussion and Conclusion: This chapter explains the results and discusses implications for theory and practice. Limitations and future research directions are also discussed.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter explains the relevant literature starting with a brief history of television. Streaming video on demand is discussed before moving into how research has explored the motivations to watch television and new media gratifications. Next is a review of the research on parasocial behaviors and how to properly measure audiences' tendency to partake in parasocial relationships. This chapter ends with an overview of HEXACO personality factors and research questions and hypotheses.

Introduction

One way television history can be traced is by looking at technological innovations that profoundly altered the television landscape (Pearson, 2011; Jenner, 2016). Pearson (2011) used these technological advances to split television into four major time periods at the time of her publication. Beginning with TVI, which ran from the mid 1950s to the early 1980's, television was characterized by channel scarcity and the three-network era of mass audiences. In the early 1980s, the invention of technologies like the VCR and remote controls shifted the television era into TVII which led to channel and network expansion, and the introduction of satellite television. The shift from TVII to TVIII in the late 1990s is marked by the rise of the use of internet. Digital distribution platforms created a 'television on demand' lifestyle for many audiences. Audiences were also becoming increasingly fragmented due to the amount of content available for consumption.

Jenner (2018) argues that technological advances including the internet distribution style of Netflix have changed television enough to justify identifying the entrance into TVIV, the latest era of television. She argues that smaller audience segmentation has shifted mass media to niche media, where content is even more customized to narrow groups. She notes that Netflix,

one of the streamers on the forefront of change, has "established shifted models of release schedules, on the one hand by making entire seasons of content available at once, and on the other hand, maybe more importantly, also making original content available on the same date internationally" (Jenner, 2018, p. 14). These changes offer increasing amounts of choice to audiences and have shifted television into a new era.

Streaming Video on Demand

While television on demand has been around since the early 1990s, the proliferation of internet distribution and the industry shift to digital television has created a television landscape focused on programming for the internet audience. No longer are programs made for traditional television and the syndication route, but instead, for the streaming audience who will watch how they want, when they want (Dixon, 2013; Jenner, 2018).

Netflix started out as an online DVD rental company and became the world's most popular streaming service by harnessing internet distribution and strategic agreements with traditional television companies. After delivering its billionth DVD in 2007, Netflix shifted their entire business model to streaming video on demand (SVOD), By 2013, Netflix was streaming its first original content, *House of Cards* which was met with critical acclaim and went on to be nominated for 56 Emmys, winning 7 during its six-season run. In the time since, Netflix has become synonymous with quality content (Lindsey, 2016).

Hulu, which launched around the same time as Netflix shifted to SVOD, has also shifted into original content despite being best known for their next-day streaming of primetime television. This is unlike Netflix which generally doesn't get new episodes until the entire season is finished airing on traditional television. Hulu's first original series, *Battleground*, was not received with nearly the same enthusiasm as *House of Cards* and only lasted one season in 2012.

Traditional television companies are shifting their business models to put an emphasis on their streaming platforms. The historic 'big three' television networks each have their own streaming service where their content goes after airing on traditional television (CBS has CBS All Access, NBC has Peacock and is a partial owner of Hulu and ABC has ABC Online and is also a partial owner of Hulu). Increasingly, they are also producing content direct to their streaming platforms, which often require a paid monthly subscription to view, similar to the Netflix model. Since the time when Jenner (2018) argued for the TVIV era, the streaming industry has become increasingly split off into niche services with narrow-casted content.

Uses and Gratifications

Uses and gratifications theory was originally explained by Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1973) and is grounded in five basic assumptions: the audience is active, media selection is inherently goal-oriented, the audience is aware of these goals when engaging with media, social and psychological factors mediate communication behavior, and media compete with other sources of need satisfaction. In other words, uses and gratifications theory suggests that audiences are actively consuming media and are aware of how their media choices meet their specific needs. In 2009, Rubin simplified the assumptions by writing, "uses and gratifications sees communication influences as being socially and psychologically constrained and affected by individual differences and choice" (p. 538).

Rubin (1983) used the uses and gratifications approach to explore motivations of watching television. Ultimately, he concluded that five motivations were salient among television viewers: pass-time/habit, information, entertainment, companionship, and escape. He went on to explore whether psychological variables explain and predict television viewing motivations (Rubin, 1991). Using an updated version of television motives with 6 factors (adding

relaxation and status enhancement and dropping companionship) he found that parasocial interaction helped explain the most viewing motives. He concluded that parasocial interactions are a primary component of viewing intention and selection. Further, he concluded that anxiety was linked with the status-enhancement, escape, and pass-time motives and that sensation seeking helped explain the pass-time and escape motives.

Starting as early as 2000, researchers started to call for an updated version of uses and gratifications as it pertained to internet-based activities (Ruggiero, 2000). Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) examined uses and gratifications of the internet and found five primary motives: information seeking, interpersonal utility, pass-time, convenience, and entertainment.

Stafford et al. (2004) looked at the motivations to use the internet in a time when the internet was gaining popularity. Similar to studies of television at the time, Stafford et al. (2004) found both process and content gratifications. Notably, this research identified a social gratification not yet explored. This gratification includes variables like chatting, friends, and interaction. Looking specifically at streaming television, Tefertiller and Sheehan (2019) found five motivational factors for viewing. Starting with 27 motivations, they factor-analyzed the data and found stress management, relaxing entertainment, habitual viewing, information seeking, and social interaction to be the salient factors for viewing television in the post-network age. Although Tefertiller & Sheehan (2019) identified motivations for the post-network television age, they relied on the original Rubin (1981, 1983) motivations rather than an updated version which was refined for the nuances of newer media (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). The current research will utilize the 16 possible gratifications from new media technology asserted by Sundar and Limperos (2013).

Sundar & Limperos (2013) divided the gratifications into four technological affordances: modality, agency, interactivity, and navigability. These classes are listed with the appropriate gratifications in Table 1. “Modality refers to the different methods of presentation (e.g., audio or pictures) of media content, appealing to different aspects of the human perceptual system (e.g., hearing, seeing)” (Sundar & Limperos, p. 512, 2013). Agency affordances allow us to be agents and sources of our own information, as opposed to the gatekeeping of traditional media. Specifically, agency-enhancement allows users to assert their own identity and have a say in the content. Interactivity speaks to the real-time nature of new media, allowing users to make changes to content. Specifically, dynamic control allows users to be in control of their interactions with the interface. Finally, the navigability affordance references how users move through the medium. Scaffolding/navigation aids refers to the way users interact with an interface. While these affordances are for all new media, this research explores this model in relation to television’s new era of streaming.

Table 1
Gratifications of media technology

Technological Affordance	**Gratifications**
Modality	realism, coolness, novelty, being there
Agency	Agency-enhancement, community building, filtering/tailoring, ownness
Interactivity	Interaction, activity, responsiveness, dynamic control
Navigability	Browsing/variety-seeking, scaffolds/navigation aids, play/fun

(Sundar & Limperos, 2013)

Parasocial Behaviors

Parasocial experiences have been studied since at least the 1950s when Horton and Wohl (1956) first proposed the idea of parasocial interactions and parasocial relationships. In their seminal work, they did little to draw a distinction between parasocial interactions and relationships. After publication, the ideas sat dormant, not being researched for 15 years (Liebers

& Schramm, 2019). When researchers shifted their thinking to ask, ‘what do people do with media’, parasocial relationships and interactions came back to the forefront of research, with over 250 studies being published between 1956 and 2015 (Liebers & Schramm, 2019). Because of the lack of clarification between parasocial relationships and interactions, research for many years discussed the two interchangeably. More recently, researchers have begun to separate the distinct phenomena.

In an inventory of 60 years of parasocial research, Liebers & Schramm (2019) summarize the different kinds of parasocial responses of audiences to media characters as parasocial phenomena. Parasocial interactions are “often used to explain a connection felt with a media character that exists primarily during the actual consumption of the media content” (Hartmann & Goldhoorn, 2011). The time period in which the parasocial activity happens is the main distinction between parasocial interactions and parasocial relationships. Parasocial interactions happen specifically while watching the media content. Often, research has specified that the media persona needs to talk directly to the audience, like a newscaster or a fictional character who ‘breaks the fourth wall’, a common phrase referencing when television personalities speak directly to or acknowledge the audience. More recent research has begun to look at parasocial phenomena with strictly fictional characters who do not speak directly to the audience. Audiences still respond to fictional characters despite the fictional characters not speaking directly to them. Think about when someone yells at the screen when watching a scary movie, begging the characters not to separate when the monster is after them. These interactions happen despite the characters never acknowledging the audience or speaking directly to them. When comparing parasocial interactions to real social interactions, Horton and Wohl (1956) assume

them to be similar with the exception that parasocial interactions lack the mutuality whereas real conversations are bidirectional.

Parasocial relationships are much longer lasting. Enduring is a word often associated with parasocial relationships. These relationships last beyond the consumption of the media text (Dibble et al., 2016). Similar to real social relationships, several interactions begin to create a relationship between the audience and media characters. Giles (2002) looked at parasocial relationships among audiences that felt isolated. He compared students at a university who took only online classes versus students who took in-person classes to distinguish between isolation levels (This was done well before COVID forced everyone, not just students, online). He found a similar sense of isolation in both groups but overall, parasocial relationships with characters predicted the satisfaction of relatedness needs across both groups. In other words, people were able to relate to characters on television and movies, which lowered their sense of isolation via relatedness. Additionally, parasocial relationships with media characters "can mimic the dynamics often observed in interpersonal relationships" (Sherrick et al., 2022). Sherrick et al. (2022) then concluded that people with lower levels of social interaction may turn to media content to fulfill the needs usually met through social interaction. Research has also looked at what happens when parasocial relationships are broken, or parasocial breakups with fictional characters (Eyal & Cohen, 2006). This happens when a character is written off the show, killed off the show, or even when fans stop consuming the show despite the show continuing on without them. These types of break-ups mimic interpersonal breakups and audiences typically move on to other parasocial relationships similar to how they move on interpersonally after a break-up, moving from one narrative to another. Often the narratives consumed by one audience member have something in common, be it genre or narrative elements. This is easily seen in

minority fandom groups who watch any program with lesbian relationships depicted. When *The 100* killed off one half of the main lesbian relationship, many fans stopped watching and moved on to *Killing Eve* which also depicted a similar relationship dynamic. While there is also something to be said about the representation issues of LGBT+ characters, this shows how fans move from one narrative to another, seeking out what they can poach for their own parasocial reasons or fan activities.

Measuring Parasocial Behaviors

Measuring these concepts has proven to be difficult, especially in the early days of parasocial research. Despite conflating parasocial interactions and parasocial relationships, the quasi-standard PSI-scale created by Rubin et al. (1985) and the shorter version created by Rubin & Perse (1987) were used in 95 publications between 1956 and 2015 (Liebers & Schramm, 2019). While claiming to measure parasocial interactions, it includes items such as 'I think my favorite newscaster is like an old friend' which is actually measuring parasocial relationships (Giles, 2002). The scale also contains items that actually do measure parasocial interaction. For example: 'when my favorite newscaster reports a story, he or she seems to understand the kinds of things I want to know' and 'I feel sorry for my favorite newscaster when he or she makes a mistake' and 'I sometimes make remarks to my favorite newscaster during the program'. These items much more clearly measure interaction rather than relationships. Combining all the discussed items into one scale conflates parasocial interactions with parasocial relationships.

Dibble et al. (2016) clarify the difference between parasocial interactions and parasocial relationships. "While parasocial interaction is restricted to the viewing episode, a parasocial relationship can extend beyond any single viewing episode" (Dibble et al., 2016, p. 21).

Notably, while parasocial interactions have been studied and their scale has been modified, parasocial relationships still lack a verified measurement scale that distinguishes between interactions and relationships.

Various scales have been adapted from the original Rubin et al. (1985) and Rubin and Perse (1987) scales. Liebers and Schramm noted the Audience-Persona Interaction Scale (Auter & Palmgreen, 2000) was used in 11 publications and the PSI-Process Scale (Schramm & Hartmann, 2008) was used in 8 publications. These are different than adapting the original scales to match the research at hand (for example, changing newscaster to television performer). Notably, the PSI-Process scale developed by Schramm & Hartmann (2008) captures items used to measure the cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses. Cognitive response items include 'I carefully followed the behavior of PERSONA' which measures attention allocation and 'occasionally I wondered if PERSONA was similar to me or not' which measures the construction of relations between persona and self. The affective response most closely aligns with the understanding of parasocial relationships using items like 'sometimes I really loved PERSONA for what s/he did' which measures sympathy. The behavioral response aligns more with the understanding of parasocial interactions using measures like 'occasionally, I said something to PERSONA on impulse'.

Methodologically, most parasocial phenomena research is done quantitatively (81.3%), and mostly using surveys (64.4%) (Liebers & Schramm, 2019). Between 1956 and 2015 of the more than 250 studies on parasocial phenomena published, only 13.7% of papers used qualitative methods and even fewer combined quantitative and qualitative for a mixed methods approach (5%) (Liebers & Schramm, 2019). Future research should aim to understand parasocial phenomena outside of using surveys that are dated and pre-internet. The consumption of media

has changed, even in the last five years. Despite all this, the original Rubin and Perse (1985) and the shortened 1987 version are still the most predominant ways to measure parasocial behaviors.

HEXACO

The dispositional domain approach to personality psychology is used to identify and measure how individuals differ from one another in the most important ways (Timmermans & Sparks, 2017). “Personality traits or dispositions can be conceptualized either as internal causal properties that determine an individual’s outward behavioral manifestations or as purely descriptive summaries of an individual’s overt behavior” (Timmermans & Sparks, 2017, p. 1). Personality taxonomies like the Big Five and HEXACO were developed to quantitatively measure and study personality in a standardized way that facilitates the accumulation and communication of empirical findings (Timmermans & Sparks, 2017). The HEXACO personality inventory assesses six major dimensions of personality and this research will relate those dimensions to streaming motivations and parasocial behaviors.

Limitations of the Big Five Model

The Big Five Model of personality has its roots in a study that found16 personality factors (Digman, 1990). Goldberg further reduced these factors to five factors: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience, which became known as the Big Five Model (Goldberg, 1993). Further research validated and tested the reliability of the model which is still considered one of the primary ways of measuring personality (Digman, 1990; Oshio et al., 2018).

HEXACO was developed as an alternative to The Big Five, or five-factor model (FFM) of personality (Ashton & Lee, 2001). HEXACO reorganizes the FFM into a six-factor model. Ashton and Lee (2001) first proposed HEXACO as a better model for personality using three

arguments and have argued for the model over several research studies (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2008; Ashton & Lee, 2009). First, they summarize studies of personality structure in various languages and cultures and conclude that six factors emerge rather than the traditional five, and that the HEXACO model corresponds to those factors. This use of lexical studies to examine personality structure influenced the six-factor model. They then argue that HEXACO predicts personality phenomena better than the FFM and explains phenomena not addressed by the FFM including the distinct separation of honesty-humility and agreeableness (Ashton & Lee, 2007). Finally, they argue that separating out some of the FFM personality factors into their HEXACO factors better capture personality and individual differences. The six HEXACO model factors are honesty-humility (H), emotionality (E), extraversion (X), agreeableness (A), conscientiousness (C), and openness to experience (O).

HEXACO has been described as a reorganization of the Big Five model (Ashton et al., 2014). Notably, HEXACO added the honesty-humility factor after international studies found it lacking from the FFM (Thielman, et al., 2017). Extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience remain largely the same as their FFM counterparts while honesty-humility, agreeableness, and emotionality do not have factors similar to the FFM factors; "instead, these three dimensions incorporate the variance associated with Big Five agreeableness and neuroticism (versus emotional stability) factors as well as additional variance not captured within the classic Big Five" (Ashton, et al., 2014, p. 140). Additionally, Ashton and Lee (2014) noted that several investigations into the two models that the HEXACO model better predicted honesty-humility than the FFM across both self-reported measures and observer reports of personality (pp. 146-147).

Each factor is linked with several facets (Ashton & Lee, 2007) as outlined in Table 2. These facets each correspond with their factors and have been validated by other researchers. Additionally, these facets more clearly define the HEXACO factors.

Table 2
Factors and corresponding facets of HEXACO

Factor	**Facets**
Honesty-Humility	sincerity, fairness, greed-avoidance, modesty
Emotionality	fearfulness, anxiety, dependence, sentimentality
Extraversion	social self-esteem, social boldness, sociability, liveliness
Agreeableness (versus Anger)	forgiveness, gentleness, flexibility, patience
Conscientiousness	organization, diligence, perfectionism, prudence
Openness to Experience	aesthetic appreciation, inquisitiveness, creativity, unconventionality

Honesty-Humility

Respondents with very high honesty-humility scores "avoid manipulating others for personal gain, feel little temptation to break rules, are uninterested in lavish wealth and luxuries, and feel no special entitlement to elevated social status." Respondent with very low scores in honesty-humility "will flatter others to get what they want, are inclined to break rules for personal profit, are motivated by material gain, and feel a strong sense of self-importance" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Sincerity is described as the tendency to be genuine in interpersonal relationships. High scorers are unwilling to manipulate others while low scorers pretend to like others to gain status and material goods (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Fairness measures the tendency to avoid corruption and fraud. High scored indicate a person is unwilling to take advantage of others or society while low scorers are willing to cheat and steal to gain something (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Greed-avoidance assesses "a tendency to be uninterested in possessing lavish wealth, luxury goods, and signs of high social status" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). High scorers are not motivated by wealth or social

status while low scorers want to enjoy and display their wealth and privilege (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Finally, modesty measures the tendency to be both modest and unassuming. High scorers view themselves as ordinary people with no claim to special treatment while low scorers view themselves as superior and entitled to privilege (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Emotionality

People with very high emotionality scores "experience fear of physical dangers, experience anxiety in response to life's stresses, feel a need for emotional support from others, and feel empathy and sentimental attachments with others. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale are not deterred by the prospect of physical harm, feel little worry even in stressful situations, have little need to share their concerns with others, and feel emotionally detached from others" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.)

The facets of emotionality are fearfulness, anxiety, dependence, and sentimentality. Fearfulness, as the name suggests, measures the tendency to experience fear. High scorers are inclined to avoid physical harm while low scorers feel little fear of injury and are tough, brave, and insensitive to physical pain (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Anxiety assesses the tendency to worry. High scorers become preoccupied by relatively minor problems while low scorers feel little stress in response to difficult situations(Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Dependence is described as one's need for emotional support from others. High scorers "want to share their difficulties with others who will provide encouragement and comfort" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.) while low scorers are self-assured and able to deal with problems without help or advice (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Finally, sentimentality measures the tendency to feel strong emotional bonds with others. "Low scorers feel little emotion when saying good-bye or in reaction to the concerns of others, whereas high

scorers feel strong emotional attachments and an empathic sensitivity to the feelings of others" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Extraversion

Very high extraversion level respondents tend to "feel positively about themselves, feel confident when leading or addressing groups of people, enjoy social gatherings and interactions, and experience positive feelings of enthusiasm and energy" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Very low scores on extraversion indicate respondents "consider themselves unpopular, feel awkward when they are the center of social attention, are indifferent to social activities, and feel less lively and optimistic than others do" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

The facets of Extraversion are social self-esteem, social boldness, sociability, and liveliness. The scale for social self-esteem measures "the tendency to have positive self-regard, particularly in social contexts" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). High social self-esteem scores indicate a person is generally satisfied with themselves and thinks they have likable qualities while low scorers tend to have a sense of personal worthlessness and view themselves as unpopular. Social boldness describes one's comfort or confidence within social situations. High scorers approach strangers willingly and speak up within group settings. Low scorers are shy and awkward in leadership positions or when public speaking (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Sociability assesses the tendency to enjoy conversation, social interaction, and parties. High scorers enjoy talking, visiting, and celebrating with others while low scorers prefer solitary activities. Finally, liveliness assesses "one's typical enthusiasm and energy. Low scorers tend not to feel especially cheerful or dynamic, whereas high scorers usually experience a sense of optimism and high spirits" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Agreeableness (Versus Anger)

Agreeableness scores that are very high suggest respondents "forgive the wrongs that they suffered, are lenient in judging others, are willing to compromise and cooperate with others, and can easily control their temper" while very low scores suggest respondents "hold grudges against those who have harmed them, are rather critical of others' shortcomings, are stubborn in defending their point of view, and feel anger readily in response to mistreatment" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Facets that make up the agreeableness factor include forgivingness, gentleness, flexibility, and patience. Forgivingness is described as the willingness to feel trust and liking toward those who may have caused them harm. "Low scorers tend to "hold a grudge" against those who have offended them, whereas high scorers are usually ready to trust others again and to re-establish friendly relations after having been treated badly" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Gentleness assesses the tendency to be "mild and lenient in dealings with other people. Low scorers tend to be critical in their evaluations of others, whereas high scorers are reluctant to judge others harshly" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Flexibility is the willingness to cooperate and compromise with others. High scorers avoid arguments and accommodate suggestions from others, even if they are unreasonable while low scorers are stubborn and argumentative (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Finally, patience measures the "tendency to remain calm rather than become angry." (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Low scorers have shorter tempers whereas high scorers "have a high threshold for feelings and expressing anger" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Ashton et al. (2014) note that both honesty-humility and agreeableness have to do with the individual differences in cooperation. "High levels of H represent a tendency to cooperate with another person even when one could successfully exploit that individual, whereas high

levels of A represent a tendency to cooperate with another person even when that individual appears to be somewhat exploitative (or, equivalently, not fully cooperative)" (Ashton et al., 2014, p. 144). They further explain that these two factors are likely to score in the same direction (high H/high A and low H/low A).

Conscientiousness

Respondents with very high conscientiousness scores "organize their time and their physical surroundings, work in a disciplined way toward their goals, strive for accuracy and perfection in their tasks, and deliberate carefully when making decisions" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Very low scores indicate respondents "tend to be unconcerned with orderly surroundings or schedules, avoid difficult tasks or challenging goals, are satisfied with work that contains some errors, and make decisions on impulse or with little reflection" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Conscientiousness is made up of organization, diligence, perfectionism, and prudence. Organization, as the name suggests, measures the tendency to seek order, especially in physical surroundings. High scorers tend to be tidy and prefer structure while low scorers tend to be sloppy and haphazard. Diligence "assesses a tendency to work hard. Low scorers have little self-discipline and are not strongly motivated to achieve, whereas high scorers have a strong "work ethic" and are willing to exert themselves" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Perfectionism assesses the tendency to be thorough and detail oriented. High scorers are careful to check for mistakes and improvements while low scorers tolerate errors in work and neglect details (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Lastly, prudence is the "tendency to deliberate carefully to avoid and to inhibit impulses. Low scorers act on impulse and tend not to consider consequences, whereas high scorers consider their options carefully and tend to be cautious and self-controlled" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Openness to Experience

Finally, very high openness to experience scores suggest respondents become absorbed in the beauty of art and nature, are inquisitive about various domains of knowledge, use their imagination freely in everyday life, and take an interest in unusual ideas or people. Conversely, "persons with very low scores on this scale are rather unimpressed by most works of art, feel little intellectual curiosity, avoid creative pursuits, and feel little attraction toward ideas that may seem radical or unconventional" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Aesthetic appreciation, inquisitiveness, creativity, and unconventionality make up openness to experience. Aesthetic appreciation is one's enjoyment of beauty in art and nature. High scorers have a strong appreciation of art and natural wonders while low scorers do not. Inquisitiveness is the "tendency to seek information about, and experience with, the natural and human world. Low scorers have little curiosity about the natural or social sciences, whereas high scorers read widely and are interested in travel" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Creativity measures one's "preference for innovation and experiment. Low scorers have little inclination for original though whereas high scorers are receptive to ideas that might seem strange or radical" (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Research Questions

To start to identify the individual differences among audiences, personality factors will be measured and analyzed with SVOD motivations. The purpose of the following research question and hypotheses are to identify if people with certain personality traits are more or less likely to use SVOD for certain motivations. There is no research on personality and uses and gratifications, therefore this research seeks to explore those potential relationships.

RQ1a: To what extent will honesty-humility be related to SVOD motivations?

RQ1b: To what extent will emotionality be related to SVOD motivations?

RQ1c: To what extent will extraversion be related to SVOD motivations?

RQ1d: To what extent will agreeableness be related to SVOD motivations?

RQ1e: To what extent will conscientiousness be related to SVOD motivations?

RQ1f: To what extent will openness to experience be related to SVOD motivations?

Ashton et al. (2014) found that honesty-humility and agreeableness are complementary aspects of a tendency toward reciprocal altruism (p. 149). It must logically follow that honesty-humility and agreeableness will both lean the same direction. Therefore,

H1a: There will be a similar relationship between honesty-humility and SVOD motivations and agreeableness and salient SVOD motivations.

Similarly, little research has explored parasocial behaviors using personality factors. Tsay and Bodine (2012) explored the Five Factor Model (excluding conscientiousness) and parasocial interactions and found that there was no relationship between extraversion or neuroticism and parasocial interactions.

H2a: Extraversion will have no effect on parasocial behaviors.

They did find that higher levels of agreeableness are negatively associated with parasocial interactions and that the need for inclusion and affection are positively associated with parasocial interaction. Given the similarities between the FFM factor of agreeableness and the HEXACO factor of agreeableness and the tendency for honesty-humility and agreeableness to have similar tendencies it follow that:

H2b: Agreeableness will have a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors.

H2c: Honesty-humility will have a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors.

Tsay and Bodine (2012) excluded conscientiousness due to "conflicting nature of past findings regarding TV viewing" (p. 188). This research will explore this relationship in the present context.

RQ2a: To what extent will conscientiousness be related to parasocial behaviors?

Tsay and Bodine (2012) found that more open people are less likely to perceive their favorite media personality as intimately close" (p. 195). They explain this finding by explain that parasocial interactions are not rich and stimulating. This research uses the long-lasting parasocial relationship measures and therefore audiences that score highly on openness to experience may find that long-term parasocial relationships are stimulating in a way that simple parasocial interactions are not. Therefore,

H2d: There is a positive relationship between openness to experience and parasocial behaviors.

Emotionality is a factor not included in the FFM, although neuroticism is sometimes labeled negative emotionality. Emotionality and neuroticism both pertain to the anxious and emotional facets of respondents (Thielmann et al., 2022). Tsay and Bodine (2012) did not find a relationship between neuroticism and parasocial interaction.

H2e: Emotionality will have no effect on parasocial behaviors.

In order to further understand motivations to watch SVOD, the relationship between motivations to watch SVOD and parasocial behaviors will be explored.

RQ3: To what extent do parasocial behaviors influence SVOD motivations?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the relevant literature to the study topic. This chapter focuses on the methodological approaches used by this research. The purpose of this study is to investigate the motivations for viewing SVOD and how audiences' personality factors affect both the motivations and the parasocial behaviors while streaming.

Research Design

A survey technique lends itself well to parasocial behavior, personality research and motivations for new media technologies due to the scales that Rubin & Perse (1987), Ashton and Lee (2001), and Sundar and Limperos (2013) developed, respectively. Traditionally, surveys are used to measure parasocial behaviors, personality factors and uses and gratifications.

Sundar and Limperos (2013) proposed 16 gratifications of interactive technology in four classes – modality, agency, interactivity, and navigability. These 16 gratifications are outlined in Table 1. They developed a 57-item scale utilized in this study to measure the motivations to watch SVOD. Rather than the original prompt of "I use communication technology (e.g., Second Life, iPod, Blackboard) because…" respondents were asked to respond to statements that led with "I use streaming services because…". Respondents were asked to express their agreement using a seven item scale (1=strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree).

The 10-item PSI scale from Rubin et al. (1985) will be adapted for this research. The original scale was intended for parasocial relationships with newscasters. Rather than newscasters, this research requires that respondents think about their favorite fictional character. Respondents were asked to express their agreement using a seven item scale (1=strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree).

Finally, HEXACO will be measured using a 60-item scale from Ashton and Lee (2009). This scale was developed by reducing the original 100-item scale down to a more manageable number of items for the sake of time on behalf of the respondents. Respondents were asked to express their agreement using a seven item scale (1=strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree). Both scales have been tested and validated. Each facet of each factor has corresponding items in the questionnaire and are already randomized.

Finally, respondents were asked demographic questions including age, gender, race, education level, employment status, and household income. Additionally, two attention checks were included in order to assess attentiveness of respondents. Anyone who failed either attention check was removed from the sample. The entire survey including the informed consent can be found in Appendix 1. This study has been approved by the University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board.

Research Population and Sample

This research utilized Mechanical Turk to find respondents and use Qualtrics to host the survey. Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) is an online marketplace for having others complete work. Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling (2011) found that an MTurk sample is slightly more diverse than a traditional internet samples and significantly more diverse than college student samples. They found that recruitment is rapid and inexpensive, compensation rates generally do not affect data quality, and the data gathered is at least as reliable as traditional data gathering methods. Rouse (2015) found that survey length and compensation did not affect reliability and that reliability was increased when attention checks were used. Research has found that the pool of MTurk workers is about 7000 active workers at any given time and is mostly American (Stewart et al., 2015).

A total of 499 respondents answered the survey. Due to the length of the survey, attention checks were utilized to weed out respondents who were not thoroughly paying attention to the questionnaire. After removing duplicate responses, failed attention checks, and those who straight-lined (answering survey questions with the same answer repeatedly) the survey, an N of 196 remained. Of these, the average age was 35.9 (SD=10.68). Males made up 65.3% of the sample while females represented 34.7%. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (86.2%) with 4.6% being African American, 2% Latino or Hispanic, 5.6% Native American, 3.6% Asian, .5% Pacific Islander, and .5% prefer not to say. Most respondents hold a bachelor's degree (65.3%) with 9.2% reporting less education than a college degree and 25.5% holding an advanced degree such as master's or doctoral degree. 89.8% of the sample are full time workers and 43.4% make between $40,000 and $60,000 a year.

Research Procedure

Potential respondents on MTurk entered the HIT (a task on MTurk) and saw the instructions for the task. Once they accepted the HIT, they were linked to the survey on Qualtrics. After reading and accepting the informed consent, respondents completed the questionnaire consisting of 125 questions. Once on the last page, they were shown a random 5-digit number that they had to copy and paste both in Qualtrics and in MTurk to verify that they reached the end of the survey. These random numbers were exported to an excel sheet where they were matched with the numbers on MTurk to verify completion and approve the HIT, which paid the respondent. Any users who did not complete the survey or did not have matching numbers were rejected and not paid. Once all allotted responses were collected, the HIT closed automatically.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consists of 16 individual regressions for each of the 16 motivations in RQ1, regressed with the HEXACO factors to identify the impact the personality factors have on the motivations to view SVOD. RQ2 utilizes a regression to assess the impact HEXACO factors have on parasocial behavior scores. Finally, RQ3 also use 16 individual regressions to assess the impact of parasocial behaviors on the motivations to use SVOD.

Chapter 4: Results and Analysis

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the methods for research were described including the research design, the population and sample, and the research questions and hypotheses. This chapter outlines the statistical results of the research questions and answers the hypotheses.

HEXACO and Motivations to watch SVOD

RQ1 asked to what extent HEXACO personality factors are related to SVOD motivations. Each of the 16 Sundar & Limperos motivations were regressed on the HEXACO personality factors and each regression returned a significant effect.

For realism, results revealed a significant effect between variables: $F(6, 188) = 17.939$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .364. HEXACO factors explained 36.14% of the variance in realism. Honesty-humility (B= -.550), emotionality (B= .497), and agreeableness (B= .473) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Extraversion (B= .417) and conscientiousness (B= -.415) were significant at the $p<.005$ level. Openness to experience was not a significant predictor of realism.

For coolness, a significant effect was found between variables: $F(6, 188) = 21.208$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .404. HEXACO factors explained 40.4% of the variance in coolness. Honesty-humility (B= -.567), emotionality (B= .541), and extraversion (B= .556) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Conscientiousness (B= -.338) was significant at the $p<.01$ level. Agreeableness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of coolness.

For novelty, a significant effect was found between variables: $F(6, 188) = 12.664$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .288. HEXACO factors explained 28.8% of the variance in novelty. Honesty-humility (B= -.543) and emotionality (B= .462) were significant at the $p<.001$ level.

Extraversion (B= .360) was significant at the $p<.005$ level. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were not significant predictors of novelty.

A significant effect was found for being there: $F(6, 188) = 8.023$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .204. HEXACO factors explained 20.4% of the variance in being there. Emotionality (B= .472) was significant at the $p<.001$ level. Extraversion (B= .365) and agreeableness (B= .359), conscientiousness (B= -.415), and openness to experience (B= .311) were significant at the $p<.05$ level. Honesty-humility was the only factor that was not a significant predictor of being there.

A significant effect was found for agency-enhancement: $F(6, 188) = 22.502$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .418. HEXACO factors explained 41.8% of the variance in agency-enhancement. Honesty-humility (B= -.710), emotionality (B=.635), and extraversion (B= .591) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were not significant predictors of agency-enhancement.

For community-building, a significant effect was found: $F(6, 188) = 16.787$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .35. HEXACO factors explained 35% of the variance in community-building. Honesty-humility (B= -.601) and emotionality (B= .735) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Agreeableness (B= .33) was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Extraversion (B= .412) was significant at the $p<.005$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of community-building.

A significant effect was found for bandwagon: $F(6, 188) = 21.931$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .412. HEXACO factors explained 41.2% of the variance in the bandwagon motivation. Honesty-humility (B= -.711), emotionality (B= .642), and extraversion (B= .579) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Agreeableness (B= .376) was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of bandwagon.

For filtering/tailoring, a significant effect was found between variables: $F(6, 188) = 8.218$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .208. HEXACO factors explained 20.8% of the variance in filtering/tailoring. Honesty-humility (B= -.471) and agreeableness (B= .529) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Extraversion (B= .378) was significant at the $p<.005$ level. Emotionality (B= .242) was significant at the P<.05 level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of filtering/tailoring.

A significant effect was found for ownness: $F(6, 188) = 27.426$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .467. HEXACO factors explained 46.7% of the variance in ownness. Honesty-humility (B= -.872), emotionality (B= .373), and extraversion (B= .537) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Agreeableness (B= .357) was significant at the $p<.005$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of ownness.

For interaction, a significant effect was found: $F(6, 188) = 17.465$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .358. HEXACO factors explained 35.8% of the variance in interaction. Honesty-humility (B= -.696), emotionality (B= .497), extraversion, (B= .481), and agreeableness (B= .441) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Conscientiousness, and openness to experience were not significant predictors of interaction.

A significant effect was found for activity: $F(6, 188) = 9.631$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .235. HEXACO factors explained 23.5% of the variance in activity. Honesty-humility (B= -.427), emotionality (B= .466), and agreeableness (B= .559) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Extraversion (B= .294) was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of activity.

For responsiveness, a significant effect was found: $F(6, 188) = 15.534$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .331. HEXACO factors explained 33.1% of the variance in responsiveness. Honesty-

humility (B= -.706) was significant at the $p<.001$ level. Emotionality (B= .354), extraversion, (B= .378) were significant at the $p<.005$ level. Agreeableness (B= .266) was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of interaction.

A significant effect was found for dynamic control: $F(6, 188) = 23{,}002$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .423. HEXACO factors explained 42.3% of the variance in dynamic control. Honesty-humility (B= -.732), emotionality (B= .427), and extraversion (B= .438) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Agreeableness (B= .003) was significant at the $p<.005$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of dynamic control.

For browsing/variety seeking, a significant effect was found: $F(6, 188) = 16.307$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .342. HEXACO factors explained 34.2% of the variance in browsing/variety seeking. Honesty-humility (B= -.365) and emotionality (B= .503) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Extraversion (B= .277), agreeableness, (B= .255), conscientiousness (B= .267), and openness to experience (B= .239) were significant at the $p<.05$ level. Notably, all HEXACO factors had a significant effect on browsing/variety seeking.

A significant effect was found for scaffolding/navigation aids: $F(6, 188) = 24.143$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .435. HEXACO factors explained 43.5% of the variance in scaffolding/navigation aids. Honesty-humility (B= -.488), emotionality (B= .752), and extraversion (B= .475) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Agreeableness (B= .223) was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of activity.

For play/fun, a significant effect was found: $F(6, 188) = 18.222$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .368. HEXACO factors explained 36.8% of the variance in responsiveness. Emotionality (B=

.579), extraversion (B= .388) and openness to experience (B= .374) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Honesty-humility (B= -.288) was significant at the $p<.005$ level and Agreeableness (B= .234) was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Conscientiousness was not significant predictors of play/fun.

Overall, all 16 motivations were significantly predicted by HEXACO personality factors. To answer RQ1a, honesty-humility was a significant predictor of 15 motivations to view SVOD with being there not being predicted by honesty-humility. Overall, honesty-humility influences SVOD motivations to a great extent.

RQ1b and RQ1c asked about emotionality and extraversion as predictors of SVOD motivations. Emotionality and extraversion were significant predictors in all 16 regressions meaning that emotionality and extraversion influences SVOD motivations to an even greater extent than honesty-humility.

RQ1d asked about agreeableness as a predictor of SVOD motivations. Agreeableness was a significant predictor in 13 SVOD motivations. Agency-enhancement, novelty, and coolness motivations did not have agreeableness as a significant predictor.

RQ1e asked about conscientiousness as a predictor of SVOD motivations. Conscientiousness was only a significant predictor in four motivations: realism, browsing/variety seeking, coolness, and being there. Similarly, RQ1f asked about openness to experience which was a significant predictor in three motivations: play/fun, browsing/variety seeking, and being there. Conscientiousness and openness to experience predicted the least amount of SVOD motivations.

H1a predicted there would be a similar relationship between honesty-humility and SVOD relationships and agreeableness and SVOD motivations. This hypothesis was partially supported

as honesty-humility and agreeableness both influence SVOD motivations to a great extent, although, their predictive power was not the same across the board with only the being there motivation not being predicted by honesty-humility whereas it is with agreeableness.

Overall, HEXACO was most influential in the ownness motivation, predicting 47.6% of the regression model. HEXACO factors were least influential in the being there motivation, predicting 20.4% of the regression. Additionally, the relationship between honesty-humility and each significant motivation was negatively associated, meaning that the higher honesty-humility, the lower the motivation score was likely to be. Implications of these results are discussed in the next chapter.

HEXACO and Parasocial Behaviors

The second group of research questions and hypotheses pertained to the influence HEXACO factors have on parasocial behaviors. Parasocial behaviors score was regressed on the six HEXACO factors. Results revealed there was a significant effect between variables: $F(6, 188) = 9.515$, $p<.001$, with an R^2 of .233. HEXACO factors explained 23.3% of the variance in parasocial behavior scores. Honesty-humility (B=-.455), and openness to experience (B=.433) were significant at the $p<.001$ level. Conscientiousness (B= -.293) is negatively associated with parasocial behaviors at the $p<0.5$ level. Emotionality (B= .177), extraversion (B=.229), and agreeableness (B=.217) were not significant.

Table 3
Correlation Matrix

	n	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Parasocial Behavior Score	195	5.18	1.1	-						
2. Honesty-humility	195	3.97	0.761	-0.33*	-					
3. Emotionality	195	4.17	0.622	0.218*	-0.129***	-				
4. Extraversion	195	4.47	0.588	0.148***	0.059	0.043	-			
5. Agreeableness	195	4.23	0.564	0.01	0.336*	-0.045	0.018	-		
6. Conscientiousness	195	4.27	0.749	-0.197****	0.57*	-0.184****	0.333*	0.181**	-	
7. Openness to Experience	195	4.41	0.684	0.177***	0.242*	0.146***	0.377*	0.156***	0.506*	-

Notes: *$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .05$, ****$p < .005$

The relationship between openness to experience and parasocial behaviors was positively and significantly associated. The higher the openness to experience was the higher the parasocial behaviors score was likely to be. Additionally, the relationships between honesty-humility and conscientiousness and parasocial behaviors were negatively and significantly associated. This means the higher honesty-humility or conscientiousness were, the lower parasocial behaviors respondents reported.

Table 4
Regression Analysis

	B	SE	β
Constant	3.595*	.924	-
Honesty-Humility	-.455*	.119	-.315
Emotionality	.177	.120	.100
Extraversion	.229	.133	.122
Agreeableness	.217	.133	.111
Conscientiousness	-.293**	.137	-.199
Openness to experience	.443*	.129	.275

Notes: $N = 195$, $R^2 = .233$, $F\ (6, 188) = 9.515$, $p < .001$, * = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .05$

H2a predicted that extraversion would have no effect on parasocial behaviors. This hypothesis is supported by the data. H2b predicted that agreeableness would have a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors. This hypothesis is not supported by the data. Not only was agreeableness not significant, but it was positively associated with parasocial behaviors in the model (B= .217). H2c predicted that honesty-humility would have a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors. This hypothesis was supported.

RQ2a asked to what extent conscientiousness would be related to parasocial behaviors. This question can be answered using the beta coefficient (B= -293). Again, the higher conscientiousness scores, the lower parasocial behaviors respondents reported, and vice versa. H2d predicted a positive relationship between openness to experience and parasocial behaviors. Openness to experience was significant and positively related to parasocial behaviors, therefore this hypothesis is supported. Finally, H2e predicted emotionality would have no effect on parasocial behaviors. This hypothesis was supported as emotionality was not a significant predictor of parasocial behaviors.

Parasocial Behaviors and Motivations to watch SVOD

RQ3 asked to what extent parasocial behavior scores are related to SVOD motivations. Each of the 16 Sundar & Limperos motivations were regressed on the parasocial behavior scores and each regression returned a significant effect, reported in Table 4. Overall, parasocial behaviors explained the most variance in realism (44.4%), coolness (44%), and scaffolds/navigation aids (43.1%). These results are discussed in the next chapter.

Table 5
Regression results for each motivation

	F	R^2	B	SE	β
Realism	154.717	.444	.732	.059	.666
Coolness	152.263	.44	.711	.058	.663
Novelty	121.955	.386	.612	.055	.621
Being there	127.647	.397	.686	.061	.630
Agency-enhancement	116.861	.376	.720	.067	.613
Community building	137.877	.417	.733	.062	.646
Bandwagon	119.793	.382	.719	.066	.618
Filtering/tailoring	80.32	.293	.486	.054	.541
Ownness	118.421	.379	.648	.060	.616
Interaction	100.542	.341	.588	.059	.584
Activity	141.19	.421	.653	.055	.649
Responsiveness	121.246	.385	.618	.056	.620
Dynamic control	135.316	.411	.641	.055	.641
Browsing/variety seeking	71.113	.268	.423	.050	.518
Scaffolds/navigation aids	147.188	.431	.629	.052	.657
Play/fun	103.365	.348	.535	.053	.590

Notes: All regression models were significant at the $p<.001$ level. $n=195$

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

The goal of this study is to understand the significance of the reported findings compared with what we already know about personality, motivations, and use of streaming video on demand. Data obtained in the current research allows scholars and practitioners to understand how people perceive, are motivated by, and intend to utilize internet streaming technologies to view recorded movies, television shows, and live broadcasts. A review of the literature has shown that audiences have become increasingly fragmented due to the amount of content available for consumption and the streaming industry has become increasingly split off into niche services with narrow-casted content. Given the lack of research and based on the author's current understanding, it was considered to be an important study on individual differences, uses and gratifications, and the role these concepts play in audience incentives to use online streaming services. Thus, the overarching goal of the current study is to identify if people with certain personality traits are more or less likely to use SVOD for certain motivations. Key findings and a brief overview of those findings are provided in terms of what was learned about personality and motivations to use SVOD.

Key Findings:

- All HEXACO factors are significant predictors of SVOD motivations overall.
- Honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, and agreeableness predicted the majority of the 16 SVOD motivations.
- Conscientiousness and openness to experience were weak predictors of SVOD motivations.
- Honesty-humility and conscientiousness have a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors.

- Agreeableness and openness to experience have a positive relationship with parasocial behaviors.
- Emotionality and extraversion have no relationship with parasocial behaviors.
- Parasocial behaviors influenced the realism, coolness, and scaffolds/navigation aids motivations more than other motivations to view SVOD.

HEXACO and SVOD Motivations

In this study, the aim was to address a gap in the personality and uses and gratifications of consuming SVOD services literature by mapping HEXACO personality factors and facets of motivations for use of SVOD services. To reach this goal, the current study explored individuals' motivations to use streaming technologies to watch live broadcast programs and/or recorded video content. It differentiates itself from other research, as it integrated valid measures that were drawn from HEXACO (Ashton & Lee, 2009) and uses and gratifications theory (Rubin, 1983). Specifically, this study utilized the 16 possible gratifications obtained from new media technology as proposed by Sundar and Limperos (2013). Data show that all 16 motivations were significantly predicted by at least one HEXACO factor with emotionality and extraversion predicting all 16. People with high emotionality scores are highly emotional and experience fear, anxiety, empathy, and sentimental attachment to others, and feel a need for emotional support from others (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Extraversion deals with self-esteem, confidence in crowds and social situations, and high scorers generally have positive energy. Honesty-humility and agreeableness both predicted a majority of SVOD motivations as well. People with high honesty-humility scores are sincere, fair, honest, and uninterested in wealth, luxuries, and social status (Lee & Ashton, n.d.). Agreeableness deals with people's likelihood to forgive, their gentleness, flexibility, and patience. Agreeable individuals are more likely to seek out connections with

others and enjoy activities that involve collaboration and community building. This can lead them to enjoy watching shows that are emotionally resonant and that feature positive relationships between characters. Their desire to be cooperative may lead them to seek out content that others may enjoy, such as popular shows or movies.

Alternatively, conscientiousness and openness to experience predicted a limited amount of SVOD motivations. Conscientiousness deals with the level of organization, diligence, perfectionism, and prudence people have and it predicted four motivations: realism, browsing/variety seeking, coolness, and being there but browsing/variety seeking was the only positively skewed relationship. Browsing/variety seeking is measured using statements like "[SVOD] allows me to surf for things that I am interested in" and "it allows me to obtain a wide variety of information". These statements align with the tendency to be organized and consider their options carefully among high scorers on conscientiousness (Lee & Ashton, n.d.).

Openness to experience predicted three SVOD motivations: play/fun, browsing/variety seeking, and being there. The lack of significance between openness to experience and the motivations to view SVOD could be because SVOD is no longer considered new and novel. Television has been streaming online for over 20 years and people who value the radical and innovative are less likely to be influenced by technology that is no longer considered innovative. This is also seen in the fact that novelty and coolness were not predicted by openness to experience. Those who value the unconventional are still motivated to watch SVOD for the sense of being there which could speak more to the specific programs they choose to view, rather than the technology itself. These high scorers are also motivated by play/fun which was measured using statements like "I enjoy escaping into a different world" and "it is fun to explore". These

statements align with openness to experience in that high scorers tend to be interested in exploration and have high levels of inquisitiveness.

When exploring the motivations for watching television Rubin (1991) found that anxiety was linked with the status-enhancement, escape, and pass-time motivations. Very high scorers on emotionality are linked with high levels of anxiety and this research supported this by finding that emotionality predicted all 16 motivations of SVOD.

Rubin (1991) also found that sensation seeking helped explain the pass-time and escape motives. Sensation seeking was measured using thrill/adventure-seeking and disinhibition although only the disinhibition statistically explained any of the motivations. Sensation seeking is similar to the extraversion personality factor in that they both deal with enjoying social interaction, parties, and are confident in social situations. HEXACO factors explained the most amount of variance in ownness (46.7%) and scaffolding/navigation aids (43.5%), and dynamic control (42.3%). These motivations are clear indications that personality factors heavily influence the use of new media technologies.

HEXACO and Parasocial Behaviors

Recent research reveals that researchers have shifted uses and gratifications questions to asking ‘what do people do with media?’. It was then that the notion of parasocial relationships and interactions propelled toward the top of the list of research in media effects study. In fact, this research found more than 250 studies being published between 1956 and 2015 (see also Liebers & Schramm, 2019). Research reveals that parasocial relationships with media characters “can mimic the dynamics often observed in interpersonal relationships” (Sherrick et al., 2022). Sherrick et al. (2022) concluded that people with lower levels of social interaction may turn to

media content to fulfill the needs usually met through social interaction. Given this, the next part of this research explored how HEXACO factors influence parasocial behaviors.

Overall, honesty-humility and conscientiousness have a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors. The higher the personality factor, the lower the level of parasocial behavior and vice versa, the lower the level of the personality factor, the higher the level of parasocial behavior the respondents had. Conversely openness to experience had a positive relationship with parasocial behaviors. The level of the openness to experience will change in line with the level of parasocial behaviors, positively or negatively. While emotionality and extraversion both predicted all 16 of the SVOD motivations, the two personality factors have no relationship with parasocial behaviors.

Given that previous research found that the Five Factor Model factors of extraversion and neuroticism had no relationship with parasocial interactions (Bodine, 2012) it is not surprising that this research found similar results. Bodine (2012) also found that agreeableness had a negative relationship with parasocial interaction whereas this research does not support that finding as the relationship was not significant. Tsay and Bodine (2012) excluded conscientiousness from their study given the conflicting nature of past findings. According to the data, there was a negative correlation between conscientiousness and parasocial behaviors. Conscientious individuals are known for their careful deliberation when making decisions, which stands in contrast to the creation of emotional attachment which leads to parasocial relationships. These relationships often develop spontaneously, without any intention or effort on the part of the viewer. This emotional attachment may be less likely to occur in individuals who are more conscientious, as they may be more careful and deliberate in their social interactions. Furthermore, the negative correlation may be explained by the fact that people with higher levels

of conscientiousness may be less likely to engage in behaviors that lead to the development of parasocial relationships, such as excessive media consumption. Honesty-humility also had a negative relationship with parasocial behaviors. Low scorers on honesty-humility ay be more likely to engage in parasocial behaviors because they seek validation and attention from others, even if that validation comes from a one-sided relationship with a media figure. On the other hand, individuals with high scores on honesty-humility tend to prioritize genuine relationships and are less interested in superficial connections. They may not feel the need for external validation and attention from others.

Parasocial Behaviors and SVOD Motivations

Rubin (1991) found that parasocial interactions helped explain information, entertainment, relaxation, and pass-time motivation. This accounted for all but the escape and status enhancement motivations. While the motivations Rubin (1991) used were different than the 16 motivations to use new technology, both sets of motivations were heavily influenced by parasocial behaviors. Similarly, data obtained revealed that parasocial behaviors predicted each of the 16 motivations, explaining the most variance in realism, coolness, and scaffolds/navigation aids. The realism motivation is measured using statements like “I know the content is real and not made up’ ,‘it is like communicating face-to-face’, the experience is very much like real life’, and ‘it lets me see it for myself’. These statements show that respondents who rate them highly are using SVOD to become immersed in the content.

Parasocial behaviors, as revealed in the results of the current study, can be used to supplement real-world interactions (Sherrick et al., 2022) and people who are able to relate to characters on television have a lower sense of isolation (Giles, 2002). The realism motivation to view SVOD speaks to the ease in which parasocial behaviors could occur which explains why it

was the highest motivation explained by parasocial behavior scores. Coolness and scaffolds/navigation aids speak to the technology being used to stream videos. While this is not immediately related to parasocial behaviors, one could argue that the easier the content is to access, the more likely viewers are to watch and become immersed.

Theoretical Implications

Application of HEXACO, parasocial behaviors, and motivations to consume SVOD services in the current study offer a unique opportunity to advance knowledge on their contribution to understanding user gratifications when it comes to using streaming services. First, data provides an empirical study of the HEXACO personality model and its association with consumer SVOD engagement, adding to the body of knowledge on personality traits by examining a novel model—HEXACO—in the context of consumer behavior, with a particular focus on streaming video on demand. The data allows the researcher to demonstrate that certain dimensions of the HEXACO model contribute to motivations to use SVOD services. By exploring the motivations behind consumer engagement with SVOD services, this study also contributes to the broader literature on media consumption and gratification. The findings provide insights into the factors that drive user engagement with streaming services and highlight the importance of personal factors in shaping these behaviors. Second, HEXACO also adds value to the current research on streaming services within the mass communications, marketing, and media literature. HEXACO and data obtained in the current work can be used to aid researchers and marketers that are interested in analyzing empirical work that investigates personality with the video streaming industry. Third, building on published research advances what is known about parasocial behaviors through applying the HEXACO model of personality to further understand consumer engagement with fictional characters. The study highlights the importance

of context-specific research when examining personality traits and consumer behavior. By examining the HEXACO model in the context of SVOD services, this study demonstrates the value of exploring personality traits in relation to specific consumer behaviors, rather than examining personality traits in isolation. This has implications for future research that seeks to explore the role of personality traits in other areas of consumer behavior.

Practical Implications

Additionally, this study provides several managerial implications for SVOD providers. Providers need to know exactly what motivates customers to accept and use SVOD because of its strong user dependence. Understanding personality traits is crucial in predicting user engagement with SVOD services. Practitioners can use the findings of this study to target audiences based on their personality traits, tailoring their marketing and promotional strategies to specific groups of users. By incorporating the HEXACO model into their research, practitioners can gain insights into how different personality traits influence user behavior. By understanding the personality traits that are most closely associated with SVOD motivations, practitioners can develop targets advertising campaigns that are more likely to resonate with their target audience. For example, if they know that people with high levels of agreeableness are more likely to engage in parasocial behaviors, they can create ads that focus on building relationships with the characters and creating a sense of community around the content. The findings highlight the importance of parasocial behaviors in the context of SVOD services. Practitioners can use these findings to design content that promotes parasocial interactions between users and fictional characters, leading to increased engagement and retention rates. Overall, the insights gained from this study can help practitioners improve their understanding of user gratifications and

engagement with streaming services, leading to more effective marketing and promotional strategies, improved user experiences, and increased user retention rates.

Limitations

Despite its contributions, the current work is still in its exploratory stage to understand personality factors and engagement with streaming video on demand services. As with most personality taxonomies, data obtained relied on self-reported questionnaires for all variables including HEXACO. Self-reported personality data could lead to social desirability bias where respondents answer in a way that is not truthful (Grimm, 2010).

Literature on personality indicates that it changes throughout life (Haan et al., 1986) therefore the overall project represents a single moment in time. It is important to understand what takes place throughout the development of the attitude and behavior of these fans of SVOD services. This, for example, could be done by using a longitudinal study on the personality traits that are captured in the HEXACO 60 items. In experimental studies, control groups could be used to capture data that more accurately reflects the effects of the SVOD and HEXACO personalities.

Future Research

The current research is, according to the author's current knowledge, the first study to investigate consumers' continued intention to use streaming services. By providing novel insights into the personality traits that specifically drive engagement with SVOD services among consumers, data obtained in the current work helps to provide research on the factors influencing consumers' continued intention to use streaming services. Exploring relationships among personality, motivations, exposure to specific streaming services and genres, and with larger, more diverse samples and better data quality might also provide important information on how

certain demographic variables might influence the intention to continue using live streaming services. Future research might explore variables not included in the analysis but may affect streaming service usage such as the impact of pricing, customer support, ease of use, and quality of the streaming experience. Additionally, investigating the effect of external factors such as competition from other streaming services, changes in technology, and evolving consumer preferences could be an interesting avenue for future research. Moreover, exploring the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on consumers' streaming behaviors and preferences could be a relevant and timely topic. Further research could also examine the potential differences in personality traits and motivations between subscribers and non-subscribers, as well as the role of social influence in the adoption and continued use of streaming services. It is possible that motivation to use streaming services can be significantly affected by demographic factors. Therefore, future studies might explore the mediating or moderating effect of demographic variables in SVOD use. While this research found significant relationships among variables, different datasets should be used to solidify these results in the landscape of media effects research. Overall, there is much to be explored in this rapidly evolving field, and future research can help shed light on the factors that drive consumers' continued engagement with streaming services.

Additionally, to address the limitations in this study, future research should use a longitudinal approach to negate the fact that personality scores reflect a single moment in time, rather than a long-standing dispositional quality. Self-reported data could be addressed by using an experimental design with a pre- and post- test that measures variables before and after watching SVOD content. While this would still be an imperfect study, it would add to the research on personality and streaming. Alternatively, interview data in addition to survey data

could enrich the findings and add to the understanding of how personality effects SVOD activities.

Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between personality traits and motivations to use Streaming Video on Demand (SVOD) services. The study found that all HEXACO factors were significant predictors of SVOD motivations overall, with Honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, and agreeableness predicting most of the motivations. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were weak predictors. Furthermore, parasocial behaviors influenced the realism, coolness, and scaffolds/navigation aids motivations more than other motivations to view SVOD. The study identified a gap in the literature regarding the personality and uses of SVOD services, and this research helps to fill that gap. These findings provide important insights for both scholars and practitioners in understanding how people perceive and intend to utilize internet streaming technologies. Ultimately, the study sheds light on the role of personality traits in influencing individuals' motivations to use SVOD services.

References

Ashton, M. C. & Lee, K. (2001). A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality, 15*, 327-353.

Ashton, M. C. & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 150-166.

Ashton, M. C. & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment,* 91, 340-345.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K. & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality Factors: A Review of Research and Theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*(2), 139–152.

Auter, P. J. & Palmgreen, P. (2000). Development and validation of a parasocial interaction measure: The audience-persona interaction scale. *Communication Research Reports, 17*(1), 79-89.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2016). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1) 3–5.

Cohen, J. (2001). Defining identification: A theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. *Mass Communication & Society, 4*(3), 245-264.

Dibble, J. L., Hartmann, T., & Rosaen, S. F. (2016). Parasocial interaction and parasocial relationship: Conceptual clarification and a critical assessment of measures. *Human Communication Research, 42*(1), 21-44.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual review of psychology, 41*(1), 417-440.

Dixon, W. W. (2013). *Streaming: Movies, media, and instant access*. University Press of Kentucky.

Eyal, K. & Cohen, J. (2006). When good friends say goodbye: A parasocial breakup study. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 50*(3), 502-523.

Feilitzen, C. & Linné, O. (1975). Identifying with television characters. *Journal of Communication, 25*(4), 51-55.

Giles, D. C. (2002). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychology, 4*, 279-305.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48*, 26–34.

Grimm, P. (2010). Social desirability bias. *Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing.*

Haan, N., Millsap, R., & Hartka, E. (1986). As time goes by: Change and stability in personality over fifty years. *Psychology and Aging, 1*(3), 220-232.

Hartmann, T. & Goldhoorn, C. (2011). Horton and Wohl revisited: Exploring viewers' experience of parasocial interaction. *Journal of Communication, 61*(6), 1104-1121.

Hogan, R. T. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 873–919). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Horton, D. & Wohl, R. R. (1956) Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry, 19*, 215-229.

Hu, M. (2016). The influence of a scandal on parasocial relationship, parasocial interaction, and parasocial breakup. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture,* 5, 217–231.

Jenner, M. (2016). Is this TVIV? On Netflix, TVIII and binge-watching. *New media & society, 18*(2), 257-273.

Jenner, M. (2018). *Netflix and the Re-invention of Television*. Springer.

Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *The public opinion quarterly, 37*(4), 509-523.

Lee, K. & Ashton, M. C. (n.d.) *The HEXACO personality inventory – revised: Scale descriptions.* Retrieved from https://hexaco.org/scaledescriptions

Lee, K. & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1001-1053.

Liebers, N. & Schramm, H. (2019). Parasocial interactions and relationships with media characters–an inventory of 60 years of research. *Communication Research Trends, 38*(2), 4-31.

Lindsey, C. (2016). Questioning Netflix's revolutionary impact: changes in the business and consumption of television. In K. McDonald & D. Smith-Rowsey (Eds.), *The Netflix effect: Technology and entertainment in the 21st century*. (pp. 173-184). Bloomsbury.

Nielsen (2019). *The Nielsen total audience report, Q1 2019.* Retrieved from https://s3.amazonaws.com/media.mediapost.com/uploads/NielsenTotalAudienceReportQ12019.pdf#

Nielsen (2022). Streaming claims largest piece of TV viewing pie in July. Nielsen Corporation. https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2022/streaming-claims-largest-piece-of-tv-viewing-pie-in-july/

Oshio, A., Taku, K., Hirano, M., & Saeed, G. (2018). Resilience and Big Five personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Personality and individual differences*, 127, 54-60.

Papacharissi, Z. & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44*(2), 175-196.

Pearson, R. (2011) Cult television as digital television's cutting edge. In: Bennett J and Strange N (eds) *Television as Digital Media (Console-ing Passions).* Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, pp. 105–131.

Rouse, S. V. (2015). A reliability analysis of Mechanical Turk data. *Computers in Human Behavior, 43*, 304-307.

Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interactions of viewing patterns and motivations. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 27*(1), 37-51.

Rubin. A. M. (1991). Psychological Predictors of Television Viewing Motivation. *Communication Research, 18*(4), 443-463.

Rubin, A. M. (2009). Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In Media effects (pp. 181-200). Routledge.

Rubin, A. M. & Perse, E. M. (1987). Audience activity and soap opera involvement: A uses and effects investigation. *Human Communication Research. 14*, 246-268.

Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research, 12*(2), 155-180.

Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and gratifications theory in the 21st century. *Mass communication & Society, 3*(1), 3-37.

Schramm, H. & Hartmann, T. (2008). The PSI-Process Scales. A new measure to assess the intensity and breadth of parasocial processes. *Communications, 33*(4), 385-401.

Sherrick, B., Hoewe, J., & Ewoldsen, D. R. (2022). Using narrative media to satisfy intrinsic needs: Connecting parasocial relationships, retrospective imaginative involvement, and self-determination theory. *Psychology of Popular Media, 11*(3), 266.

Stafford, T. F., Stafford, M. R., & Schkade, L. L. (2004). Determining uses and gratifications for the Internet. *Decision sciences, 35*(2), 259-288.

Stewart, N., Ungemach, C., Harris, A. J., Bartels, D. M., Newell, B. R., Paolacci, G., & Chandler, J. (2015). *The average laboratory samples a population of 7,300 Amazon Mechanical Turk workers. Judgment and Decision Making, 10*, 479–491.

Sun, T. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of parasocial interaction with sport athletes and identification with sport teams. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 33*(2), 194-217

Sundar, S. S. & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 57*(4), 504-525.

Tefertiller, A. & Sheehan, K. (2019). TV in the streaming age: Motivations, behaviors, and satisfaction of post-network television. *Journal of broadcasting & electronic media, 63*(4), 595-616.

Thielmann, I., Hilbig, B. E., Zettler, I. &, Moshagen, M. (2017). On measuring the sixth basic personality dimension: A comparison between HEXACO honesty-humility and big six honesty-propriety. *Assessment, 24*(8), 1024–1036.

Timmermans, E. & Sparks, G. G. (2017). Personality Traits: Influence on media effects. In P. Rössler, C. A. Hoffner, & L. Zoonen (Eds.). *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects* (1st ed.). Wiley.

Thielmann, I., Moshagen, M., Hilbig, B., & Zettler, I. (2021). On the comparability of basic personality models: Meta-analytic correspondence, scope, and orthogonality of the Big Five and HEXACO dimensions. *European Journal of Personality, 36*(6), 870-900.

Tsay, M. & Bodine, B. M. (2012). Exploring parasocial interaction in college students as a multidimensional construct: Do personality, interpersonal need, and television motive predict their relationships with media characters? *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 1*(3), 185-200.

Wimmer, R. & Dominick, J. (2014). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction* (10th edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Appendix 1: Scales used in survey

Dissertation

Start of Block: INFORMED CONSENT

IC **Online Consent to Participate in Research**

Would you like to be involved in research at the University of Oklahoma?
I am Casey Yetter from Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication and I invite you to participate in my research project entitled "The role of personality in SVOD related motivations and parasocial behaviors". This research is being conducted at the University of Oklahoma, via Qualtrics. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a Mechanical Turk User in the United States with a 95% approval rating.
You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.
Please read this document and contact me to ask any questions that you may have BEFORE agreeing to take part in my research.
What is the purpose of this research? The purpose of this research is to identify and explain the association between personality and media effects.
How many participants will be in this research? Around 1000 MTurk Workers.
What will I be asked to do? If you agree to be in this research, you will be asked to complete a short survey. Some survey questions require answers to proceed with the survey.
How long will this take? Your participation will take no more than 30 minutes.
What are the risks and/or benefits if I participate? There are no risks or benefits to participating in this study.
Will I be compensated for participating? You will be compensated $0.75 for completing this survey.
Who will see my information? In research reports, there will be no information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers and the OU Institutional Review Board will have access to the records.
Data are collected via an online survey system that has its own privacy and security policies for keeping your information confidential. Please note no assurance can be made as to the use of the data you provide for purposes other than this research.
What will happen to my data in the future? After removing all identifiers, we might share your data with other researchers or use it in future research without obtaining additional consent from you.
Do I have to participate? No. If you do not participate, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the research. If you decide to participate, you don't have to answer any question and can stop participating at any time.
Who do I contact with questions, concerns or complaints? If you have questions, concerns or complaints about the research or have experienced a research-related injury, contact me yetter@ou.edu. Alternatively, you may contact the Faculty Sponsor, c.frisby@ou.edu.
You can also contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu if you have questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than the researcher(s) or if you cannot reach the researcher(s).

Please print this document for your records. By providing information to the researcher(s), I am agreeing to participate in this research.

This research has been approved by the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus IRB.

IRB Number: 15147 **Approval date:** 1/18/2023

- ○ I agree to participate (1)
- ○ I do not wish to participate (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Online Consent to Participate in Research Would you like to be involved in research at the Unive... = I do not wish to participate

End of Block: INFORMED CONSENT

Start of Block: Sundar & Limperos Motivations for SVOD

Realism Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement. I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I know the content is real and not made up. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is like communicating face-to-face. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The experience is very much like real life. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It lets me see it for myself. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Coolness Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They are unique. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They are distinctive. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They are stylish. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Novelty Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They are new. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The technology is innovative. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The interface is different. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The experience is unusual. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Being There Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They help me immerse myself in places that I cannot physically experience. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They create the experience of being present in distant environments. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel like I am able to experience things without actually being there. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Agency-Enhancement Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
It allows me to have my say. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows me to assert my identity. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows me to send my thoughts to many. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It gives me the power to broadcast to my followers. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Community Building Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
It can connect with others. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows me to expand my social network. (17)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It makes me realize that I am part of a community. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows me to build social capital. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Bandwagon Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They allow me to review opinions of others before I make decisions. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It comforts me to know the thoughts and opinions of others. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They allow me to compare my opinions with those of others. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Filtering/tailoring Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
It allows me to set my preferences. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I can avoid viewing things that I do not want to see. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It allows me to sort through information and share it with others. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Ownness Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Once I use it, I feel like it is mine. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They feature content that I feel is a true reflection of myself. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They allow me to customize so that I can make it my own. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Interaction Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I expect to interact with the system. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I can perform a number of tasks. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I can specify my needs and preferences on an ongoing basis. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Activity Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I feel active when I use it. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is not a passive interaction. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I get to do a lot of things on it. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Responsiveness Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
It is responsive to my commands. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It responds well to my requests. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It can anticipate my needs. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Dynamic Control Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They give me control. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They allow me to be in charge. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am able to control my interaction with the interface. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am able to influence how they look. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am able to influence how they work. (17)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Browsing/variety-see Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They allow me to obtain a wide variety of information (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They help me to skim and check out various links. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They allow me to surf for things that I am interested in. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They allow me to browse freely. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Scaffolding/nav aids Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
The interface helps me every step of the way. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The device is easy to use and explore. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They allow me to link to other pieces of information. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They offer a number of visual aids for more effective use. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They will double check me before watching graphic/risky content. (17)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Play/Fun Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

I use streaming services because...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
They are fun to explore. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
They let me play. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy escaping into a different world. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Sundar & Limperos Motivations for SVOD

Start of Block: HEXACO

HEX1 Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I plan ahead and organize things to avoid scrambling at the last minute. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I often push myself hard when trying to achieve a goal. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I rarely express my opinions in group meetings. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

HEX2 Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I sometimes can't help worrying about little things. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Having a lot of money is not especially important to me. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I make decisions based on the feeling the moment rather than on careful thought. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

HEX3 Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
People think of me as someone who has a quick temper. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel like crying when I see other people crying. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Select Disagree for this response. (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget". (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel that I am an unpopular person. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

HEX4 Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I tend to be lenient in judging other people. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I worry a lot less than most people do. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

People have often told me that I have a good imagination. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The first thing that I always do in a new place is make friends. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

HEX5 Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I like people who have unconventional views. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I want people to know that I am an important person of high status. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
People often call me a perfectionist. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

HEX6 Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I find it boring to discuss philosophy. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

PSI Please indicate your level of agreement on the following statements

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
My favorite character makes me feel comfortable, as if I am with a friend. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I see my favorite character as a natural, down-to-earth person. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I look forward to watching my favorite character on the next episode. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If my favorite character appeared on another TV program, I would watch that program. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

My favorite character seems to understand the kinds of things I want to know. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I saw a story about my favorite character, I would read it. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I miss seeing my favorite character when they are not in an episode. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Please select somewhat disagree for this question. (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would like to meet my favorite character in person. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel sorry for my favorite character when he or she makes a mistake. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I find my favorite character to be attractive. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: PSI Scale

Start of Block: Frequency of Streaming

Q21 How many subscription streaming services do you have access to?

- ○ 0 (1)
- ○ 1-2 (2)
- ○ 3-4 (3)
- ○ 5-6 (4)
- ○ 7+ (5)

Q52 On average, how much time do you spend a week watching streaming services?

- ○ 2 hours or less (1)
- ○ 3-6 hours (2)
- ○ 7-10 hours (3)
- ○ 11-14 hours (4)
- ○ 15 or more hours (5)

Q20 How many subscription streaming services have you used in the last month?

- ○ 0 (1)
- ○ 1-2 (2)
- ○ 3-4 (3)
- ○ 5-6 (4)
- ○ 7+ (5)

Q24 How many streaming services do you expect to use one year from now?

- ○ 0 (1)
- ○ 1-2 (2)
- ○ 3-4 (3)
- ○ 5-6 (4)
- ○ 7+ (5)

Q22 What are the primary reasons you subscribe to streaming services?

- [ ] Broad range of shows and movies (1)
- [ ] New original content not available elsewhere (2)
- [ ] Previously released content not available elsewhere (3)
- [ ] Free trial or discounted rate (4)
- [ ] Ad-free viewing experience (5)
- [ ] Shows and movies appropriate for children (6)
- [ ] Bundled with other services (7)

Q23 What are the primary reasons you would cancel your subscription to streaming services?

- [ ] Too expensive (1)
- [ ] Free trial or discount ended (2)
- [ ] Finished watching the content that led me to subscribe (3)
- [ ] Content I liked disappeared from the platform (4)
- [ ] Replaced with a new paid subscription service (5)
- [ ] Access content via a free/ad-supported streaming service (6)
- [ ] No live sports to watch (7)
- [ ] Lack of new content I am interested in (8)

End of Block: Frequency of Streaming

Start of Block: Demographic

*

Q14 How old are you in years?

_____

Q12 What gender do you identify as?

- ○ Male (1)
- ○ Female (2)
- ○ Other (3)
- ○ Prefer not to answer (4)

Q16 What ethnicity do you identify as? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Caucasian (1)
- ☐ African American (2)
- ☐ Latino or Hispanic (3)
- ☐ Native American (4)
- ☐ Asian (5)
- ☐ Pacific Islander (6)
- ☐ Prefer not to say (8)
- ☐ Other (9) _____

Q20 What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- ○ Less than high school degree (1)
- ○ High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) (2)
- ○ Some college but no degree (3)
- ○ Associate degree in college (2-year) (4)
- ○ Bachelor's degree in college (4-year) (5)
- ○ Master's degree (6)
- ○ Doctoral degree (7)
- ○ Professional degree (JD, MD) (8)



Q18 Which statement best describes your current employment status?

- ○ Working (paid employee) (1)
- ○ Working (self-employed) (2)
- ○ Not working (temporary layoff from a job) (3)
- ○ Not working (looking for work) (4)
- ○ Not working (retired) (5)
- ○ Not working (disabled) (6)
- ○ Not working (other) (7) _____
- ○ Prefer not to answer (8)

Q20 What is your current household income?

- ○ $0 - $20,000 (1)
- ○ $20,001 - $40,000 (2)
- ○ $40,001 - $60,000 (3)
- ○ $60,001 - $80,000 (4)
- ○ $80,001 - $100,000 (5)
- ○ $100,001+ (6)

End of Block: Demographic

Start of Block: MTURK #

Q21 Please copy and paste this number into MTurk **AND** into the text box below. You also must click the arrow to submit the survey and receive credit for your submission. **Do not put your MTurk ID below or your task will be rejected.**

${rand://int/10000:99999}

_____

End of Block: MTURK #
