

Why do people watch Reality TV soap operas? –

A comparison between the psychological variables Uses & Gratifications, Parasocial Interaction and Identification with reality TV soap media characters and perceived realism

Bachelor theses: Psychology – C&M

Melanie Heering (s0132985)

University of Twente

Enschede, August 2012

1st supervisor:

Dr. A. Heuvelman

2nd supervisor:

Dr. P.A.M. Kommers



Abstract

Several studies examined the general television program choice of audiences and discussed psychological motives such as Uses and Gratifications (U&G), parasocial interaction (PSI) and identification (ID) with media characters. This research focused on soaps within the genre reality TV (RTV) and compared the three psychological variables for watching TV with each other, as was the perceived realism of the programs. A total of 149 participants filled in an online questionnaire about the motives of watching the television programs “Farmer wants a wife” and “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol”. The findings showed U&G motives to be the most explaining motive of watching RTV soaps, followed by PSI and at last ID. Furthermore, perceived realism significantly correlates with the frequency of viewing the program and showed a high accountability for the differences on the compiled scale means of the three psychological variables.

Samenvatting

Verschillende onderzoeken hebben de algemene televisieprogramma-keuze van kijkers geanalyseerd en verschillende kijkmotieven als Uses- and Gratifications (U&G), parasociale interactie (PSI) en identificatie (ID) met media karakters onderzocht. Dit onderzoek richt zich op soaps binnen het genre reality TV (RTV) en vergelijkt naast de drie kijkmotieven onderling ook de waargenomen realiteit van het programma. In totaal hebben 149 deelnemers de online vragenlijst ingevuld over de kijkmotieven van de programma formats “Boer zoekt vrouw” en “Oh Oh Cherso / Tirol”. De bevindingen laten zien dat U&G motieven de meest verklarende waarde hebben voor het kijkgedrag van RTV soaps, gevolgd van PSI en ID. Bovendien is de waargenomen realiteit van de programma's sterk gecorreleerd met de kijkfrequentie en was deze voor een groot deel verantwoordelijk voor de verschillen tussen de samengevoegde gemiddelde waardes van de drie verschillende psychologische variabelen.

1. Introduction

On January 30th, 2011 the reality television program “Boer Zoekt Vrouw¹” got with 5.381.000 viewers again a new record on the Dutch TV and, thus, was 2011 the most watched TV format in the Netherlands (excluding sport programs). On January 30th, 2011 the reality television program “Boer Zoekt Vrouw” broke the Dutch record for the program with 5.381.000 viewers. This format - which originated in England - is only one example of programs in the factual television genre which have been successful worldwide. In Germany for example, non-fictional programs have been getting more and more broadcasting time. At least on the private channels this genre has a broadcasting time fraction between 23,3% (ProSieben) and 32,3% (Sat.1) of the total broadcasting time in 2009 (Krüger, 2010). On RTL (28,4% of the broadcasting time was non-fictional) more than 20,5% of all non-fictional programs belonged to the genre docu-soap or docu-production as “Bauer sucht Frau²”. The 7th season of “Bauer sucht Frau” was seen by 7,71 million viewers in average, thus reached an impressive market share of 23,5% (RTL, 2011).

What are the reasons for the occurrence of this phenomenon? Several studies examined why people watch reality TV formats in general (Giles, 2003; Gleich, 2001; Lundy, Ruth, & Park, 2008; Nabi, Biely, Morgan, & Stitt, 2003; Nabi, Stitt, Halford, & Finnerty, 2006; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007; Reiss & Wiltz, 2004), others addressed the motives to watch soap operas on TV (Cohen, 2001, 2006; Giles, 2003; Rubin & Perse, 1987; Vorderer, 2001). Yet, there is a research gap about why people watch reality TV soap operas. This research paper aims to fill in this gap by investigating which psychological variables could best explain the enjoyment of RTV soap operas.

By doing so, the focus lies most on the successful international reality TV program format of the Dutch version “Farmer wants a wife”, called “Boer zoekt vrouw”, and in Germany “Bauer sucht Frau”. This format is broadcasted in at least twenty-seven countries, including The Netherlands, and Germany, and to name some more Australia, Bulgaria, France, Hungary, South Africa and United States. Furthermore, the successful Dutch reality TV soap format “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol” is included. These formats are chosen for two reasons; their high

¹ Dutch variant of “Farmer wants a wife”

² German variant of “Farmer wants a wife”

viewing rates and the formats lasted at least three seasons. The results of this study could be relevant for academic professors, students, film produces and program directors.

2. Literature Review

Different perspectives about the motives of viewers are found in the literature to explain reality TV consumption in general. Some researchers found the uses & gratifications motives (U&G) the most appropriate concept (Conway & Rubin, 1991; Lundy et al., 2008; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007; Reiss & Wiltz, 2004; Rubin, 2009; Vorderer, 2001), while others adhere to the concept parasocial interactions (PSI) (Conway & Rubin, 1991; Hartmann & Goldhoorn, 2011; Klimmt, Hartmann, & Schramm, 2006; Rubin & Perse, 1987), or the identification (ID) with the media characters (Chory-Assad & Ciccirillo, 2005; Cohen, 2006).

2.1 From Soap operas to Reality TV soaps

This chapter first defines soap operas and the genre RTV. Furthermore the formats “Farmer wants a wife” and “Oh Oh Cherso / Tirol” are described and how these formats can be classified as RTV soaps.

2.1.1 Soap operas (soaps)

Giles (2003) considered three formal features of soaps: 1) personal life is the “core problematic”, 2) they are marked by melodramatic excess, necessary for their emotional impact and 3) a lack of narrative resolution, thereby maintaining their continuous existence. He found that men tend to watch more nonfictional programs than woman. The target audience of soap operas are fourteen to twenty-nine year old people, most of which are female (Gleich, 2001, p. 525). Next to ID, PSI seems the most important reason why people like to watch soaps (Giles, 2003, p. 255f). However, nothing was found in the literature about RTV soaps.

2.1.2 Reality TV (RTV)

According to Nabi et al. (2003) Reality-based TV programming is distinct from major programming, but is not a genre on its own and “lacks a clear definition” (Lundy et al., 2008). Giles (2003) describes RTV “as an umbrella term for audience-participation shows”, which means “talk shows, docu-soaps, fly-on-the-wall documentaries and makeover shows” (Giles, 2003, p. 234). All were classified as entertainment-oriented programs (Hall, 2009, p. 431; Nabi et al., 2003) and were perceived as entertainment (Krüger, 2010).

Different names are used in the literature, varying from “factual television programming”, to “reality based programming”. Some of the characteristics are (Hall, 2009; Lundy et al., 2008, p. 209; Nabi et al., 2003):

- 1) characters are real people (not actors)
- 2) programs are not filmed on a set, but in natural living or working environments
- 3) programs are not scripted
- 4) events are unplanned, but evolve from narrative contexts, and
- 5) the primary purpose is viewer entertainment

The antecedents of factual television were news or sports, and mostly men seemed to be interested, while women were traditionally more interested in fictional television. Since programs for men were traditionally more factual than fictional (e.g. sports), other formats within the genre reality TV seems also to catch the interest of men as well, thus, also in reality TV soap operas (Giles, 2003, p. 256).

2.1.3 Reality TV Soaps “Farmer wants a wife” and “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol”

Both formats, the Dutch and German version of the format of “Farmer wants a wife” and “Oh Oh Cherso / Tirol”, can be classified as a reality TV soap opera as defined by Giles (2003) and Krüger (2010). First, in both formats ordinary people are the actors and their life is the central theme, secondly some melodramatic situations as the emotions of the actors are shown (e.g. the crying of a farmer or different kind of conflicts in Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol are typical) and thirdly, there is no final narrative resolution; maybe every season has got some new actors, but the storyline of both goes on to some extent.

In “Farmer wants a wife” the farmers are filmed most of the time on their own farm, where three selected woman are invited to spend some time on the farm with goal of finding a new spouse. This concept is the same worldwide, thus, also in this study about the Dutch format “Boer zoekt vrouw” as well as the German program “Bauer sucht Frau”. There are only slight differences in the way of presenting. While in the Dutch format the farmers are called only by their first name, in the German version the characters get nicknames by adding a verb before their first name, for instance “Martin – der *treue* Milchbauer” (Engl.: “Martin – the *trustworthy* dairy farmer”).

In “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol” a group of young people are sent on vacation for a few weeks. In the first and third season they were sent to the Greek Island Hersonissos (Dutch:

Chersonisos), for the second season they were sent to the ski-region Tirol in Austria. There they were followed by cameras while partying and earning money as they were assigned jobs.

2.2 Perceived realism (RTV and general)

Hall (2009) defined perception of realism as “1) factuality or the degree to which a text is understood to accurately portray specific real-world events or people, and 2) realism as real world similarity, or whether what is portrayed in a text is like what the audience would expect to find in the real world” (Hall, 2009, p. 424). Although, reality TV programming is often presented as non-scripted and complete nonfictional, reality-based TV programming is viewed as only moderately real (Nabi et al., 2003, p. 303).

Different researches found several correlations between the perceived realism of a program and the U&G motives, as well as between PSI and ID. For example Hall and Bracken (2011) found significant correlations between realism and three out of four empathy dimensions, as part of PSI, (perspective taking: $r = .20, p < 0.01$; fantasy empathy: $r = .15, p < .01$; empathic concern: $r = .24, p < .01$).

2.3 Uses and Gratifications Motives (U&G)

In this paragraph first a definition of the U&G perspective is presented, next the belonging sub-dimensions are mentioned followed by a few findings about the predicting value of U&G on program consumption and rating of a program.

Rubin (2009) stresses the new U&G perspective in media research, referring to Fischer (1987) he defines the U&G perspective as a “psychological communication perspective ..., shifting the focus from the direct and undue influence of the media on passive and isolated individuals to active audience members using the media” (Rubin, 2009, p. 148). RTV formats holds different gratifications compared to fictive television formats for the viewers (Nabi et al., 2006; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007).

There are several concepts that belonging to the U&G perspective. In literature the following sub-dimensions are used frequently: *Reality entertainment* (watching because of its reality character), *relaxation / escapism* (coping with own life reality), *pass time*, *companionship* (to feel not alone), *social interaction* (e.g. have something to do with other people) *voyeurism* (enjoying a peek into others life) and *downward social comparison* (to feel better after having seen the characters) (Nabi et al., 2003; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007; Vorderer, 2001).

Between these constructs there are different findings about their predictive value on amount of program consumption and valuation of the program. For example, Nabi et al. (2006) demonstrated that voyeurism is with $M = 3.46$ and $p < 0.05$, one of the most predictive sub-dimension of viewing RTV (Nabi et al., 2006; Rubin & Perse, 1987), while others could not confirm this findings for voyeurism (Baruh, 2010; Nabi et al., 2003; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007; Reiss & Wiltz, 2004), but Baruh (2010) found voyeurism motives correlated with watching fictional programs ($\beta = .18$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, voyeurism is a quite controversial sub-dimension which is discussed often and, therefore, interesting to measure.

In conclusion, there are controversial findings about the U&G perspective and its sub-dimensions as a predictor for viewing RTV or program rating. Other factors also could be important, such as the format itself (Nabi et al., 2006), the RTV viewing frequency and program rating (or pleasure experience) (Nabi et al., 2003) and there was a positive correlation found by Papacharissi and Mendelson (2007) between reality entertainment (as sub-dimension of U&G) and perceived realism.

2.4 Parasocial interaction (PSI)

After describing the concept of PSI and the difference with parasocial relationship (PSR), this paragraph describes the sub-dimension of PSI and mentions some important correlations with perceived realism.

The concept parasocial interaction, first mentioned by Horton & Wohl (1956), was later redefined by Cohen (2009) as “the emotions, thoughts, and actions (i.e., speech) that occur during exposure to a media performer and that are geared toward a performer” (Cohen, p. 227). PSI is perceived as an “immediate, personal, and reciprocal” relationship (Hartmann & Goldhoorn, 2011, p. 1105; Horton & Strauss, 1957), and is received by the viewer as similar to real life social interaction (Hartmann & Goldhoorn, 2011). The concept is broadly researched across media like radio, books and television, notably with fictional soap characters, although it is not fully developed on a theoretical level (Giles, 2002) and there is a shortage of literature about PSI and the genre RTV.

Some authors stressed the difference between PSI (the one-sided process of perception during media exposure) and parasocial relationship (PSR) (the cross-situational relationship with a media person, with affective components, first mentioned by Horton and Strauss (1957))

(Klimmt et al., 2006, p. 293; Schramm & Hartmann, 2008). This article makes interchangeable use of both terms.

Different dimensions are a part of the concept PSI. Auter and Palmgreen (2000) pointed out the following four sub-dimensions: identification with a media character, interest in the media character, group identification/ interaction and media character problem solve ability. Reiss and Wiltz (2004) observed amongst other sub-dimensions also the dimensions sexual attraction (or romantic desire for sex) and social contact (people like to talk about) as important factors for the consuming of RTV.

PSI is correlated with factors as the amount of TV viewing and the perceived realism. According to Rubin and Perse (1987, p. 250) perceived realism predicts parasocial interaction. This is also supported by Auter and Palmgreen (2000) (identify scale: $r = .25, p < .01$). Thus, if RTV is perceived as relatively real, measures of PSI should be high. Furthermore, Conway & Rubin (1991) confirmed that PSI is significantly correlated with TV viewing in general. Higher TV viewing is related to the perceived realism, which also correlates significantly with PSI ($r = .26, p < .01$) as written about by Auter and Palmgreen (2000) and supported by Giles (2002).

To summarize, the amount of general TV viewing and the perceived realism is closely related to the measured values on the PSI scales.

2.5 Identification (ID)

The first part of this paragraph compares ID with PSI. Next, the sub-dimensions of ID are described, followed by past findings of their impact on watching TV programs.

Cohen (2006) defines identification as “an imaginative process in which we adopt a character’s point of view and develop an empathic understanding of his or her plight and motivations” (Cohen, p. 194). In the literature the concept of identification seems not to be clearly separated from PSI. For example, Tian and Hoffner (2010, p. 261) found significant correlations between those concepts. Other authors even uses identification as a sub-dimension of PSI (Auter & Palmgreen, 2000; Giles, 2002).

Giles (2002) attempted to make a clear distinction between the two concepts; he referred to Rosengren & Windahl (1972) and stated “PSI could be identified when a viewer interacted with a media figure, but did not identify with the figure”. In other words, for ID the viewer needs to be absorbed into the program and loose himself in the process of identifying with a

character, while for a relationship a conscious self is needed (Cohen, 2001). In this way identification with media characters is a different type of reaction to media; it is “to become one” with a media character.

There are four dimensions of identification defined by Cohen (2001): empathy, cognitive sharing of perspectives (also called cognitive-emotional ID), motivational sharing of goals and absorption. Other sub-dimensions are *social comparison* (Baruh, 2010; Gleich, 2001), *cognitive-emotional ID* (Chory-Assad & Ciccirillo, 2005; Cohen, 2001; Godlewski & Perse, 2010) and *similarity ID* (Auter & Palmgreen, 2000; Chory-Assad & Ciccirillo, 2005; Tian & Hoffner, 2010).

Support for the ID motive as a variable to watch RTV was found by different authors. According to Cohen (2006), the most important predictor of ID is similarity and homophile with the TV characters or the situations in which the characters are placed. Reiss & Wiltz (2004) found the joy “self-importance” (motive: status) to have a significant effect on the enjoyment of RTV. This could be because ordinary people are an important factor why people watch reality TV programs, as the audience “see people like themselves, and fantasize that they could gain celebrity status by being on television” (Reiss & Wiltz, 2004, p. 374). Furthermore, self-realization or personal enhancement (working on the own identity), is correlated to the need for entertainment (Vorderer, 2001). As a result, RTV viewers are expected to show a high ID with the characters and since ID is correlated with enjoyment, high ID values should result in a high program rating.

On the other hand, since the situation and the characters are not expected to be exactly the same as the viewers (i.e. educational level of the characters, which is somewhat lower in “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol), only viewers with a somewhat lower educational level are expected to watch the format because they could more identify with them. If they watch the format, but can not identify with the characters, another factor (e.g. U&G motives) has to be the reason for watching. Furthermore, Baruh (2010) showed social comparison as a factor for watching fictional TV, but did not find significant support for RTV ($\beta = .07$, ns). Thus, the concept of ID with RTV characters seems questionable reason for watching RTV soaps.

To conclude, it is expected to find a positive correlation between PSI and ID. Yet, the author does not expect to find significant support for ID as the only explaining variable for the viewing frequency or program rating of RTV programs.

3. Research questions and hypotheses

The discussed literature supports the U&G perspective as the probably most important psychological variable for watching RTV, although there is some discussion about the impact of PSI and ID. Thus, in line with the review of the literature the following research questions were defined:

Research question one - Which psychological factor explains the viewing of RTV soaps most: U&G motives, PSI or ID?

H1a: The average scores on the U&G motives scales are higher than on the scales for PSI, while the average scores on PSI are higher than the scores on ID.

H1b: The psychological variables U&G, PSI and ID, have different effects on the program rating.

Research question two - Which influence has perceived realism in the research findings?

H2a: The perceived realism is higher than 3.5 (average of the scale).

H2b: The more often a program is seen, the more real it is perceived.

H2c: Perceived realism is significantly correlated to the findings on the psychological variables.

4. Method & instrumentation

4.1 Participants

The sample included 149 adults, whereof 93 filled in the whole questionnaire and thus, were counted as valid. Out of the valid responses 46.2% were female (n = 43) and 51.6% male (n = 48). The sample mean age was 30.2 years ($SD=10.79$) and 77.4% (n = 113) of the participants filled in the Dutch version, 22.6% the German version (n = 33). Most respondents were working (28.8%, n = 42), 17.1% students (n = 25) or were working students (n = 19, 13%). The gross of participants are or were students at the university (n = 50, 34.0%).

Most respondents knew at least one of the three presented programs (n = 123). Out of this group 41% answered the questionnaire about the program “Boer zoekt vrouw” (n = 60), and 27% (n = 40) chose “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol” (both are Dutch formats and only presented in the

Dutch questionnaire) and 15.8% (n = 23) answered for “Bauer sucht Frau” (German format, the only format presented in the German questionnaire).

4.2 Procedure

Data was collected in June and July 2012 and were gathered via self-report online questionnaires. The survey took 10-20 minutes to complete and was provided in two languages; the Dutch audience got a Dutch questionnaire while the German audience got the German version.

Participants were asked to participate by advertising the questionnaire on social media sites (i.e. facebook, twitter and hyves) and the community³ of the fan page of “Boer zoekt vrouw”, provided by the KRO. “Oh Oh Cherso/ Tirol” did not had an official fan community. Furthermore, participants were contacted by email, wherein the receivers were asked to invite their friends and family as well. This would enhance the personal chance to win a voucher of an online warehouse. Participation in this study was voluntary.

4.3 Measurement

The questionnaire was developed based on scales found as useful in the past for the measurement of psychological variables and media motives (Conway & Rubin, 1991, p. 450). The scales U&G viewing motives, PSI and ID with media characters were measured by a 7 point Likert scale, where higher values represent a higher agreement with the items.

Additionally questions about their knowledge of the programs, watch-frequency, program rating (from 1 to 10, where higher values represent a higher rating), their favorite RTV character, perceived realism (seven-point-Likert scale), and the general TV viewing was included next to demographic questions about gender, age, education and working status.

All scales were translated from English to Dutch and German, except from the PSI scale by Hartmann & Goldhoorn (2011), which already used a validated Dutch version, and thus, only needed to be translated to German. To reach a better fit with the RTV soap context, some items were slightly adapted.

³ http://community.kro.nl/boer_zoekt_vrouw/default.aspx

4.3.1 U&G Motives

Motives as U&G are measured by the scale of Papachassi & Mendelson (2007, p. 362), who's original items already were successfully used by different authors (Conway & Rubin, 1991; Godlewski & Perse, 2010; Rubin, Perse, & Powell, 1985). Unless otherwise noted, all U&G sub-scales were adapted from Godlewski and Perse (2010).

Six items were added to measure *reality entertainment*. Items included statements like “I watch the RTV soaps because it is enjoyable” or “because it's exiting”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .79$, $M = 4.54$, $SD = 1.25$).

Relaxation was measured with four statements as “I watch it because it gives me something to occupy my time” and “So I can forget about school, work, or other things”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .81$, $M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.43$).

Four items were included to measure *habitual pass time*. After scale reliability analyses only three items were significant correlated at a $p < 0.01$ level, thus only the three highly correlating items were taken into account for further analyses and compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .69$, $M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.45$). An example of the statements is “it's a habit, just something that I do”.

Companionship was measured by three statements as “it makes me feel less lonely” or “so I won't have to be alone”. All three items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .87$, $M = 1.78$, $SD = 1.14$).

Three items were replied to measure *social interaction*. Items included statements like „So I can be with other family or friends” and “so I can talk with other people about what's on TV”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .78$, $M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.55$).

Because of the conflicting findings about *voyeurism*, this sub-dimension was measured by items from different authors. First, the two-item statements used by Godlewski and Perse (2010) (called here voyerismUG) ($\alpha = .50$), second the five inter-correlating items by Nabi et al. (2003) are included (three items, called voyerism, $\alpha = .81$ and two items called voyerismBM, $\alpha = .62$). Example of the statements: “I find the characters attractive” and “when I watch that program, I get to see a side of people that I wouldn't normally get to see”. Items of these different scales differed much in inter-correlation, thus only the three item scale “voyeurism” by Nabi et al. (2003) was taken into account for further analysis. These three items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .81$, $M = 1.78$, $SD = 1.14$).

Downward social comparison, only used by Nabi et al. (2003), was measured with the two items “I feel better about myself after watching the people on that program” and “My problems don’t seem so bad after I see what happens in the lives of the people on that program”. Both items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .70$, $M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.51$).

4.2.2 Parasocial interaction

To measure parasocial interaction the original Dutch scale used by Hartmann and Goldhoorn (2011) was requested and used here.

Ten items measured *PSR* by statements like “Mijn favoriete soap karakter (FSK) zorgt ervoor dat ik me op mijn gemak voel, alsof ik bij een vriend(in) ben⁴” and “Ik zou mijn FSK missen als hij/zij op vakantie is⁵”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .87$, $M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.15$).

PSI-process was measured by twelve items, for example by “Ik volg het gedrag van mijn FSK nauwkeurig⁶” and “soms hou ik echt van mijn FSK om wat zij/hij doet⁷”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.96$).

Attractiveness consists out of physical- (“naar mijn mening ziet mijn FSK er erg goed uit⁸”), character- (“Ik bewonder mijn FSK om zijn/haar karakter⁹”), and task-attractiveness (“Ik denk dat mijn FSK een erg succesvol persoon is¹⁰”) and was measured by a total of eight items. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .87$, $M = 2.93$, $SD = 1.28$).

4.2.3 Identification

Identification was measured by two slightly aligned sub-scales. *Cognitive-emotional ID* was measured by the ten items adapted from Cohen (2001), by items like “while viewing program X, I felt as if I was part of the action” and “I think I have a good understanding of character X”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .94$, $M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.39$).

⁴ Engl: “My favorite soap character (FSC) makes me feel comfortable, like I am with a friend.”

⁵ Engl: “I would miss my FSC if he/she was on vacation.”

⁶ Engl: “I follow the behavior of my FSC carefully.”

⁷ Engl: “Sometimes I really love my FSC for what he/she does.”

⁸ Engl: “I think my FSC looks great.”

⁹ Engl: “I admire my FSC for his/her character.”

¹⁰ Engl: “I think my FSC is a successful person.”

To measure *similarity ID* seven-items like “my favor soap character reminds me of myself” and “I seem to have the same beliefs or attitudes as my favor soap character” adapted from Auter and Palmgreen (2000) were used. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .95$, $M = 1.99$, $SD = 1.32$).

4.2.4 Perceived realism

Perceived realism was measured by nine items adapted from Green (2004) like “the dialogue in the narrative is realistic and believable” and “the setting for the narrative just doesn’t seem real”. All items were compiled into a mean index ($\alpha = .71$, $M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.91$).

4.2.5 Control variables

TV exposure (How often have you seen the chosen program?) was equated in five possibilities from “watched less than a few minutes” (n = 3, valid 2.5%), “watched a few minutes to a whole episode” (n = 6, valid 5.0%) , “watched between the 2 and 4 episodes” (n = 22, valid 18.2%) and “watched equal to or more than 5 episodes” (n = 90, valid 74.4%).

TV affinity (“How much do you watch TV on an average day?”) was split in weekdays (Monday till Thursday) and weekend days (Friday till Sunday) and equated in 6 possibilities:

Table 1 – TV affinity

	< 1 hour	1 – 2 hours	2 – 3 hours	3 – 4 hours	4 – 5 hours	> 5 hours
Midweek day	N = 19; 20.7 %	N = 32; 34.8 %	N = 22; 23.9 %	N = 9; 9.8 %	N = 4; 4.3 %	N = 6; 6.5 %
Weekend day	N = 15; 17.2 %	N = 25; 26.9 %	N = 24; 25.8 %	N = 18; 19.4 %	N = 6; 6.5 %	N = 4; 4.3%

Program rating was measured by a scale from 1 to 10, where higher number represents a higher valuation of the program. “Farmer wants a wife” was on average not rated significant higher (n = 108, $M = 6.81$, $SD = 2.13$) than “Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol” (n = 69, $M = 5.55$, $SD = 1.83$).

5. Results

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test proved a normal distribution of all scale values. Thus, the usage of parametric tests is valid.

5.1 Research question one

Hypotheses H1a: „*The mean scores on the U&G motives scales and the sub-scales are higher than on the scales and sub-scales of PSI and ID*“, could be confirmed.

As expected, the highest mean scores were found on the U&G gratifications scales ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .79$), followed by the scores on the PSI scales ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 1.01$) and the lowest scores were measured on the ID scale ($M = 2.26$, $SD = 1.16$). The paired differences of the variables U&G & PSI ($M = 0.72$, $SD = .82$), PSI & ID ($M = 0.36$, $SD = .69$), and U&G & ID ($M = 1.07$, $SD = .93$) were all significant at $p < .001$. In other words, viewers watched RTV soaps because of U&G motives, than of PSI, and even less because they could identify with the characters of the RTV soaps.

With regression analysis the predictive values of the psychological variables on the program rating was measured. Here, the compiled means on the U&G scale explained 18.5% (adjusted R^2) the variance in the program rating ($F(1, 91) = 21.8$, $p < 0.001$). Compared to PSI, which explains 13.8% of the variance on the rating, with $F(1, 67) = 11.9$, $p < .001$ and ID, which explains 11.7% of the variance, $F(1, 75) = 11.1$, $p < .001$. The means on the three psychological variables together explained 17.9% of the rating variance, with $F(3,63) = 5.8$, $p < 0.001$. In other words, the values of the U&G could explain most of the differences between the program ratings, followed by values found with the PSI scales then ID scales.

Hypotheses H1b: “*The psychological variables U&G, PSI and ID, have different effects on the program rating*“, could be confirmed.

With regression analysis the subscales were examined on their accountability of program rating variance.

Uses & Gratifications in sub-dimensions

Regression analysis results for *reality entertainment* showed a significant effect on the program rating; $F(1,102) = 118.4$; $p < .001$, thus explained 53.3% of the variance.

The construct U&G, *relaxation* explained 33.1 % of the program rating variance, $F(1,101) = 51.5$; $p < .001$.

With 9.4% the sub-dimension *habitual pass time* counted for the program rating variance, with $F(1,95) = 10.95$; $p < .001$.

Companionship explained less than $< 1.0\%$ of the program rating variance, and there was no significant regression found, $F(1,95) = 0.109$; $p = 0.74$ (ns).. The same counts for *social interaction*, as it explained less than 1.0% of the program rating variance, $F(1,95) = 1.31$; $p < .25$ (ns).

Voyeurism explained 21.6% of the program rating variance; $F(1,91) = 26.4$, $p < .001$.

With 9.6% of the rating variance and $F(1,91) = 10.8$, $p < .001$ *downward-social comparison* was accountable.

On the whole, within the U&G perspective the sub-dimensions reality entertainment, relaxation and voyeurism are the most important factors for the prediction of the RTV program rating.

Parasocial interaction

The values on the sub-scale for *PSI* could explain 17.3% of the valuation variance, with $F(1,73) = 16.5$, $p < .001$, while *parasocial-processes* with 2.5% on $F(1,77)$, $p < .09$ was not significant, as well as the quite low accountability of *attractiveness* of 8.3% , but well significant on $F(1,77)$, $p < .01$.

Identification

Cognitive-emotional ID with $F(1,75) = 18.7$, $p < .001$ explained 18.9% of the variance in program valuation, while *similarity ID* was not significant ($p = .15$), $F(1,75) = 2.1$ and explained only 1.4% of the variance in program rating.

To conclude, also if the scores on the subscale *PSI* as well as *cognitive emotional ID* explained part of the variance on the program rating, the U&G sub-dimensions reality entertainment, relaxation and voyeurism explained most of the variance.

Control variables

Gender was not significantly correlated with neither the rating on the program, the program choice, watch-frequency, nor with the scores on the subscales, except for *parasocial-processes* ($r = .26$, $p < .05$; female: $n = 32$, $M = 2.36$, $SD = .91$; male: $n = 40$, $M = 2.86$, $SD = .93$).

Viewing frequency of the program was found to be significantly positively correlated with program value ($r = .56$, $p < .01$), and the number of hours spent watching TV on weekdays ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and in the weekend ($r = .31$, $p < .01$). Thus, viewing frequency is accountable for 31.4% of the variance in program value ($F(1,119) = 55.8$).

Significant correlations were found between the *program choice* (BZV, OhOh and BSF) and several sub-dimensions of U&G (e.g. relaxation, pass time, voyeurism) and all scales of PSI and ID (see appendix for more detailed correlations). Thus, the program format seems also to be important in comparison to what Nabi et al. (2003) found.

Since the U&G sub-dimensions relaxation and voyeurism accounts most for the differences in RTV viewing and valuation, these two were analyzed in more detail here: BZV (n = 46, $M = 4.6$, $SD = 1.29$) had significant higher values on the *relaxation* scale than OhOh ($p < .001$; n = 36, $M = 3.6$, $SD = 1.15$) and BSF ($p < 0.01$; n = 21, $M = 3.5$, $SD = 1.80$), while the differences between OhOh and BSF were not significant ($p = 0.81$). On the *voyeurism* scale the programs had the following differences: BZV (n = 41, $M = 5.0$, $SD = 1.21$) got significantly higher scores ($p < 0.001$) on the scale than OhOh (n = 33, $M = 3.4$, $SD = 1.49$) and BSF (N = 19, $M = 3.7$, $SD = 1.44$). The differences between OhOh and BSF were not significant ($p = .52$).

There was a significant correlation found between FAV and all three subscales of PSI ($.001 < p < .05$). Most often the RTV soap character BZV Gijsbert (n = 14, 15.4% valid) was chosen. Followed by OhOh Matsoe Matsoe (n = 12, 13.2% valid), BZV Frank (n = 7, 7.7% valid) and OhOh Jokertje (n = 5, 5.5% valid). But due to too much different FAV choices, no more detailed significant correlation between character and the PSI subscales could be found.

5.2 Research question two

In order to examine research question two, “*Which influence has perceived realism on the research findings?*”, the following hypotheses are tested.

Hypotheses H2a: „*The perceived realism is higher than 3.5 (average of the scale)*“, could not be confirmed.

With a t-test for one group the scores on the realism scale were tested and results showed no significant higher means than $M = 3.5$ ($p = .43$ two-tailed, mean difference = .08) in the whole group. Only if differentiated between groups by viewing frequency of the chosen program, there were a significant difference found between “more than 5 times” and perceived realism higher than $M = 3.5$ (N = 58, $M = 3.75$, $SD = .57$, $p < .01$).

Hypotheses H2b: “*The more often a program is seen, the more real it is perceived*“, could be confirmed.

Regression analysis shows that, the more often viewers have seen their chosen program, the more real it is perceived with $F(1, 75) = 8.93$, adjusted $R^2 = .094$, $p < .01$, thus, 9.4% of the perceived realism findings are accountable to viewing frequency.

Hypotheses H2c: “*perceived realism is significant correlated to the findings on the psychological variables*“, could be confirmed.

Perceived realism was correlated with U&G scores ($r = .56$, $p < .001$), PSI scores ($r = .59$, $p < .001$) and ID ($r = .55$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, regression analysis concluded that perceived realism is accountable for 28.9% of the variance on U&G scores ($F(1, 73) = 31.14$, adjusted $R^2 = .29$, $p < .001$); for 31.5 % of the variance on the PSI scores ($F(1, 63) = 28.95$, adjusted $R^2 = .31$, $p < .001$); and for 34.4% on the variance on the ID scores ($F(1, 73) = 39.77$, adjusted $R^2 = .34$, $p < .001$).

6. Conclusion and Discussion

This research shows U&G motives as the most explaining psychological variable for watching RTV soaps. In more detail, the constructs reality entertainment, relaxation and to somewhat less extend voyeurism motives are the reasons for watching RTV soaps. Furthermore, RTV soaps are not watched because viewers have the same attributions as the characters (SimID), but because they think they understand what the characters are going through or they feel part of the action (CogEmID). The latter is comparable with PSR.

Voyeurism, as an widely and controversial discussed construct, was found to be a significant predicting variable for program rating. Although, since different scales as found in the literature were used here, only one of the three scales seems reliable. Gleich's (2001) findings that women watch RTV more often because of voyerism, could not be confirmed in this research. Consequently, the results should be interpreted with caution because of possible other influential factors. Additionally, there is a need for a beter theoretical basis of the construct voyeurism.

As expected, the rating of a program correlates positively with the scores on the U&G motive scales. In the same way as found in past research, there was also a correlation found between PSI and the rating of the program.

According to Gleich (2001) more woman than men are watching soap operas. In this study slightly more men participated in the study and no significant gender differences were found.

As Giles (2003, p. 256) stated, perhaps indeed more men get interested in RTV soaps because of its factual television character, since men traditionally seemed to be interested more in factual television (e.g. sports or news) in the past.

In this study the participated group with a mean age of 30,16 ($SD=10,79$) is slightly older but close to what Gleich (2001) stated the target group of soap operas are (between 14 and 29 years old).

As Nabi et al. (2003) stresses, this research showed evidence for the importance of program format rather than genre. As the comparisons of the formats shows, there were differences in rating as well as other factors found between the programs.

Overall, the RTV soaps are watched because of their specific provided gratifications and thus, are in line with what past research has found to be the motives of watching reality TV programs in general. Further research is needed to compare RTV soaps with fictional TV soaps in more detail.

7. Implications for television producers

There is a twofold of suggestions for program producers. First, keep the perceived realism of probably new RTV soaps high, and second, enhance the possibility for PSI and ID of viewers to the media characters.

In order to get higher program rates, and accordingly, higher watch frequencies, it is advised to keep the perceived realism high. This is because regression analysis showed a positive relationship between perceived realism and program rating ($F(1,75) = 5.96$, adjusted $R^2 = .07$, $p < .05$). This could be done by making sure that people know it is a non-scripted program, for example by mentioning that in advertisements, discussions about the realism on social media (i.e. facebook and twitter), or ask actors and other personnel to write blogs on the internet about the realism of the program. Yet, more research is needed to test these methods for their usability and reliability.

By providing more possibilities for ID and PSI, program producers could make the RTV programs more like a common fictional soap (e.g. cast the same characters in more than just one season, therefore they will become more like regular friends and thus hold a greater chance for parasocial relationships) and make extensive use of the internet (e.g. set up internet communities concerning the program in question). Personal information about the media

characters can enhance this connection. (maar ik snap niet hoe die met de volgende zin te maken heeft??) For example, for the program OhOh no official well administered fan page could be found in contrary to BZV; KRO has got a very well administered official fan page with a many users. This may be one of the reasons why for the program BZV showed significant higher PSI (M of difference = .58, SD of difference = .27, $p < .05$ two tailed), and ID (M of difference = .82, SD of difference = .30, $p < .01$ two tailed). This difference was also shown between BZV and BSF, which had a fan page that was used scarcely (for PSI: M of difference = 1.23, SD of difference = .29, $p < .001$ two tailed; for ID: M of difference = 1.17, SD of difference = .36, $p < .01$ two tailed). As one example, it was very difficult on the Oh Oh and BSF fan page to get to know the age of all media characters. Although, needs to be done to confirm the relationship of making use of the fan pages and higher ID or PSI with media characters.

To conclude, program directors are advised to expand the non-fictional character of the RTV soaps, and furthermore, to set up a broad platform (i.e. on the internet) for a fan community to enhance the possibility of PSI and ID with media characters.

8. Limitations

Since the respondents are perhaps not representative for the program viewers' population, all findings need to be interpreted with caution. Here more students answered the questionnaire, which might not be representative for the general viewer population of RTV soaps. Although here no significant differences between working status and program valuation or between the three psychological variables and working status were found, it might be the case in a bigger, more representative sample. Further research is needed to examine this influence.

Different scale items issues might happen. For example there might be influences because of the fact of translation of the items from English to Dutch and German.

The format of FWW as a dating soap might be more appreciated by singles than by married viewers. Thus, since the marital status was not included in this study, especially simID might be different between singles and married viewers. It is advisable to include marital status in further research.

The placement of this research in time could have been better chosen. The last season of both programs was broadcasted a while ago, thus perhaps the memories of the respondents are less

accurate, which might influence the findings of notably ID and PSI. The new season of BZV had just started with the cast for new wives, but a regular episode of the new season had not aired yet. Thus, the findings for PSI might be affected, since PSI needs time to develop (Cohen, 2001). Maybe a better point of time could have been after the third or fourth episode for a much stronger correlation between PSI and ID with RTV viewing.

Furthermore PSI depends on the types of media figures. Thus, there will probably be a difference between the chosen characters and the accountability for variance of PSI found here (Green, 2004). Since there was a significant correlation found between PSI and character choice, but there were too many different characters, thus too little viewers chose for the same character, the findings of Green (2004) could not be replicated with this research design.

9. Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors of this research, Dr. Ard Heuvelman and Dr. Piet Kommers, for their always very fast and valuable guidance and advice about all my questions during this research project.

Besides, I would like to thank my friends Heleen, Jeroen, Jutta, Kyra, Maike, Patricia and Robertjan for their answers on my questions, critical feedback, tips and support with translational issues.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my family and friends, especially Erika, Tina and Monika, for their never ending trust in my abilities and their emotional as well as financial support during the whole time of my bachelor study.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my friends, for broadcasting my questionnaire on facebook, Twitter and by email.

10. References

- Auter, P. J., & Palmgreen, P. (2000). Development and validation of a parasocial interaction measure: The audience-persona interaction scale. *Communication Research Reports, 17*, 79-89.
- Baruh, L. (2010). Mediated Voyeurism and the Guilty Pleasure of Consuming Reality Television. *Media Psychology, 13*, 201-221.
- Chory-Assad, R. M., & Ciccirillo, V. (2005). Empathy and Affective Orientation as Predictors of Identification with Television Characters. *Communication Research Reports, 22*(2), 151-156.
- Cohen, J. (2001). Defining Identification: A Theoretical Look at the Identification of Audiences With Media Characters. *Mass Communication and Society, 4*(3), 245-264.
- Cohen, J. (2006). Audience Identification with Media Characters. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Psychology of Entertainment* (pp. 183 - 198). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. (2009). Mediated Relationships and Media Effects. In R. L. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Media Processes and Effects* (pp. 223-236). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications
- Conway, J. C., & Rubin, A. M. (1991). Psychological Predictors of Television Viewing Motivation. *Communication Research, 18*(4), 443-463.
- Giles, D. C. (2002). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychol., 4*(3), 279-304.
- Giles, D. C. (2003). *Media Psychology*. Mahwah, New Jersey: London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gleich, U. (2001). Populäre Unterhaltungsformate im Fernsehen und ihre Bedeutung für die Zuschauer - Forschungsüberblick zu Nutzungsmotiven, Funktionen und Wirkungen von Soap Operas, Talkshows und Reality-TV. *Media Perspektiven, 10*, 524-532.
- Godlewski, L. R., & Perse, E. M. (2010). Audience Activity and Reality Television: Identification, Online Activity and Satisfaction. *Communication Quarterly, 58*(2), 148-169.
- Green, M. C. (2004). Transportation Into Narrative Worlds: The Role of Prior Knowledge and Perceived Realism. *Discourse Processes, 38*(2), 247-266.
- Hall, A. E. (2009). Perceptions of Media Realism and Reality TV. In R. L. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Media Processes and Effects* (pp. 423-438). Los Angeles, CA etc.: Sage Publications
- Hall, A. E., & Bracken, C. C. (2011). "I Really Liked That Movie". Testing the Relationship Between Trait Empathy, Transportation, Perceived Realism, and Movie Enjoyment. *Journal of Media Psychology, 23*(2), 90-99.
- Hartmann, T., & Goldhoorn, C. (2011). Horton and Wohl Revisited: Exploring Viewer's Experience of Parasocial Interaction. *Journal of Communication, 61*, 1104-1121.
- Horton, D., & Strauss, A. (1957). Interaction in audience-participation shows. *American Journal of Sociology, 579-587*.
- Horton, D., & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass Communication and Para-Social Interaction. *Psychiatry, 19*, 215-229.
- Klimmt, C., Hartmann, T., & Schramm, H. (2006). Parasocial Interactions and Relationships. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Psychology of Entertainment* (pp. 291 - 314). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Krüger, U. M. (2010). Factual Entertainment - Fernsehunterhaltung im Wandel. *Media Perspektiven, 4*, 158-181.
- Lundy, L. K., Ruth, A. M., & Park, T. D. (2008). Simple Irresistible: Reality TV Consumption Patterns. *Communication Quarterly, 56*(2), 208-225.
- Nabi, R. L., Biely, E. N., Morgan, S. J., & Stitt, C. R. (2003). Reality-based television programming and the psychology of its appeal. *Media Psychol., 5*(4), 303-330.
- Nabi, R. L., Stitt, C. R., Halford, J., & Finnerty, K. L. (2006). Emotional and Cognitive Predictors of the Enjoyment of Reality-Based and Fictional Television Programming: An Elaboration of the Uses and Gratifications Perspective. *Media Psychology, 8*, 421-447.

- Papacharissi, Z., & Mendelson, A. L. (2007). An exploratory study of reality appeal: Uses and gratifications of reality TV shows. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(2), 355-370.
- Reiss, S., & Wiltz, J. (2004). Why people watch reality TV. *Media Psychol.*, 6(4), 363-378.
- RTL. (2011, 20.12.2011). Guter Abschluss für "Bauer sucht Frau" - Das ist aus den Paaren der siebten Staffel geworden Retrieved 3 august, 2012, from http://kommunikation.rtl.de/de/pub/aktuell/i33037_1.cfm
- Rubin, A. M. (Ed.). (2009). *Uses and gratifications - An evolving perspective of media effects*. Thousand Oaks, California et al. : Sage Publications, Inc. .
- Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987). Audience Activity and Soap Opera Involvement - A Uses and Effects Investigation. *Human Communication Research*, 14(2), 246-268.
- Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 155-180.
- Schramm, H., & Hartmann, T. (2008). The PSI-Process Scales. A new measure to assess the intensity and breadth of parasocial processes. *Communications*, 33, 385-401.
- Tian, Q., & Hoffner, C. A. (2010). Parasocial Interaction With Liked, Neutral, and Disliked Characters on a Popular TV Series. *Mass Communication & Society*, 13, 250-269.
- Vorderer, P. (2001). It's all entertainment - sure. But what exactly is entertainment? Communication research, media psychology, and the explanation of entertainment experiences. *Poetics*, 29, 247-261.

11. Appendix

Abbreviations

Program related abbreviations

BZV =	the Dutch program format “Boer zoekt vrouw”
BSF =	the German program format “Bauer sucht Frau”
FWW =	the program format “Famer wants a wife”, here representative for the combined measures on BZV and BSF
OhOh =	the Dutch program “Oh Oh Cherso /Tirol”
RTV =	reality TV program genre
Soaps =	soap operas
FAV =	Favorite soap character

Psychological concepts/ perspectives

PSI =	parasocial interaction
ID =	identification with media characters
U&G =	Uses and Gratifications perspective

Scales

REnt =	reality entertainment
Relax =	relaxation
PassTime =	(habitual) pass time
Comp =	companionship
SI =	social interaction
VoyerismUG =	Voyeurism scale by Godlewski and Perse (2010) (excluded)
Voyerism =	voyeurism scale by Nabi et al. (2003)
VoyerismBM =	behavior monitoring by Nabi et al. (2003) (excluded)
DSC =	downward social comparison
PSI =	parasocial interaction
PSProcess =	parasocial processes
PSA.ALL =	Attractiveness scale (physical, character and task attractiveness)
IDcogEm =	cognitive-emotional identification
IDSim =	similarity identification
Real =	perceived realism

Reliability of scales and compiled means correlation

Table 1 – Reliability Measurement Summary

Measures	<i>Items</i>	<i>valid N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Variance</i>	Cronbachs α
U&G Motives					
Reality Entertainment	6	104	4.55	0.49	.79
Relaxation	4	104	3.95	0.18	.81
Habitual Pass Time (deleted1)	3	98	3.13	0.18	.69
Companionship	3	98	1.76	0.12	.87
Social Interaction	3	98	2.83	0.11	.78
Voyerism	3	94	4.14	0.05	.81
Downward Social Comparison	2	94	2.78	0.29	.70
Parasocial Interaction					
Parasocial interaction	10	75	2.57	0.54	.87
Parasocial Processes	12	80	2.60	0.77	.80
Attractiveness	8	80	2.89	0.68	.88
Identification					
Cognitive-emotional ID	10	78	2.49	0.14	.94
Similarity ID	7	78	1.96	0.04	.95
Perceived Realism					
Perceived Realism	9	78	3.54	0.31	.71

Subscales Correlations

Figure 1 - compiled means correlation

Correlations

	M.REnt	M.Relax	M.PassTimeDEL1	M.Comp	M.SI	M.Voyerism	M.DSC	M.PSI	M.PSPProcess	M.PSAALL	M.IDcogEm	M.IDsim	M.Real
M.REnt	1	,593**	-.272**	-.059	,223	,600	,364**	,492**	,140	,266	,522**	,297**	,393**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	104	103	97	97	97	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.Relax		1	-.210	-.035	,089	,442**	,427**	,527**	,299**	,426**	,514**	,305**	,549**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	103	103	97	97	97	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.PassTimeDEL1			1	,409**	,270**	-.293**	,115	-.157	,089	-.089	-.205	,100	,040
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	97	97	97	97	97	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.Comp				1	,453**	-.033	,359**	,399**	,520**	,223	,202	,274	,073
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	97	97	97	97	97	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.SI					1	,304**	,430**	,331**	,237**	,151	,171	,258**	,233**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	97	97	97	97	97	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.Voyerism						1	,463**	,501**	,117	,298**	,569**	,240	,323**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.DSC							1	,534**	,400	,293	,484**	,378**	,506**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	75	79	79	77	77	75
M.PSI								1	,708**	,719**	,781**	,521**	,518**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	69	69	67	67	65
M.PSPProcess									1	,586**	,509**	,480**	,393**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	69	79	79	77	77	75
M.PSAALL										1	,615**	,611**	,460**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	69	79	79	77	77	75
M.IDcogEm											1	,482**	,539**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	67	77	77	77	77	75
M.IDsim												1	,480**
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	67	77	77	77	77	75
M.Real													1
Pearson Correlation													
Sig. (2-tailed)													
N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	65	75	75	75	75	77

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Questionnaire

Hallo,

Fijn dat je mee wilt doen aan dit onderzoek! Alvast hartelijk dank daarvoor. Straks zullen twee tv programma's voorgesteld worden. In de loop van de vragenlijst wil ik je vragen om een van de programma's te kiezen en deze tijdens het invullen in je achterhoofd te houden.

In totaal zal het hele onderzoek ongeveer 15 minuten duren. Schroom trouwens niet om bepaalde antwoorden te geven. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Het enige wat telt is je eigen mening. Bovendien wordt alles anoniem verwerkt.

Onder alle volledig ingevulde vragenlijsten zal ik de prijs verloten. Aan het einde van het onderzoek is er de mogelijkheid om je in te schrijven voor deze loting. Iedereen die, naar verwijzing door jou heeft deelgenomen, vergroot bovendien e kans op de prijs!

Alvast bedankt voor het meedoen.

Melanie Heering

1. Kennis en mening over programma's

Met dit onderzoek wil ik graag jouw persoonlijke mening over onderstaande televisie programma's weten. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Jouw mening telt. Als geen van de vragen precies jouw mening weergeeft, kies dan het antwoord dat het meest in de buurt komt.

Heb je van de programma's "Boer zoekt vrouw" of "Oh Oh Cherso / Tirol" wel eens meer dan een aflevering gezien?

<input type="radio"/>	Ik heb van zowel "Boer zoekt vrouw" als "Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol" meer dan een aflevering bekeken.
<input type="radio"/>	Ik heb alleen van "Boer zoekt vrouw" meer dan een aflevering bekeken.
<input type="radio"/>	Ik heb alleen van "Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol" meer dan een aflevering bekeken.
<input type="radio"/>	Van beide programma's heb ik minder dan een aflevering bekeken.

2. Hoe vaak heb je het programma "X" al gekeken?

<input type="radio"/>	Heb ik al 5 afleveringen of meer gezien
<input type="radio"/>	Heb ik tussen de 2 en 4 afleveringen gezien
<input type="radio"/>	Heb ik een paar minuten tot 1 hele aflevering van gezien.
<input type="radio"/>	Heb ik wel van gehoord, maar nog nooit bekeken.

3. Hoe leuk vind je de programma's?

Geef een cijfer tussen de 1 = "vind ik helemaal niet leuk" en 10 = "vind ik echt leuk"

Boer zoekt vrouw	<input type="radio"/>									
Oh Oh Cherso/Tirol	<input type="radio"/>									

4. Jouw reden om het programma "X" te kijken¹¹

Nu wil ik je vragen voor de rest van deze vragenlijst het programma X in je achterhoofd te houden. Op basis daarvan vraag ik je mening in te vullen. De vragen hieronder gaan over jouw redenen waarom je het programma X kijkt of waarom je het wel eens hebt gekeken.

Met de cijfers kan je aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de uitspraken, waarbij 1 = "helemaal niet mee eens" aangeeft en 7 = "helemaal mee eens".

"Ik kijk graag naar het programma X (omdat)..."

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. ... echte karakters interessanter zijn dan fictieve karakters	<input type="radio"/>						
2. ... het leuker is dan fictieve programma's	<input type="radio"/>						
3. ... ik er gewoon graag naar kijk	<input type="radio"/>						
4. ... het mij amuseert	<input type="radio"/>						
5. ... het mij vermaakt	<input type="radio"/>						
6. ... het opwindend is	<input type="radio"/>						
7. ... het rustgevend is	<input type="radio"/>						
8. ... <i>het de mogelijkheid geeft te ontspannend</i>	<input type="radio"/>						
9. ... het een plezierig rustmoment geeft	<input type="radio"/>						
10. ... ik dan zaken die te maken hebben met school, werk en andere dingen even kan vergeten	<input type="radio"/>						
11. ... het er gewoon is	<input type="radio"/>						
12. ... ik niks anders te doen heb	<input type="radio"/>						
13. ... het me iets geeft om de tijd te vullen	<input type="radio"/>						
14. ... het niks meer dan een gewoonte is	<input type="radio"/>						

¹¹ Item 1 to 6: reality entertainment; item 7 to 10: relaxation; item 11 to 14: Passtime (while item 11 was excluded from further analysis); item 15 to 17: companionship; item 18 to 20: social interaction; item 21 and 22: voyeurismUG (voyeurism UG not included in further analysis).

15. ... het me een minder eenzaam gevoel geeft	<input type="radio"/>						
16. ... ik dan niet alleen hoef te zijn	<input type="radio"/>						
17. ... als er niemand anders is om mee te praten of bij te zijn	<input type="radio"/>						
18. ... ik dan met andere familieleden of vrienden kan zijn	<input type="radio"/>						
19. ... het iets is wat ik met vrienden kan doen	<input type="radio"/>						
20. ... ik dan met andere mensen kan praten over wat er op televisie wordt uitgezonden	<input type="radio"/>						
21. ... ik de karakters aantrekkelijk vind	<input type="radio"/>						
22. ... het programma seksuele aantrekkingskracht heeft	<input type="radio"/>						

5. Je gedachten TIJDENS het kijken van programma X¹²

Met de cijfers kan je aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de uitspraken, waarbij 1 = “helemaal niet mee eens” aangeeft en 7 “helemaal mee eens”.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Als ik het programma kijk, krijg ik het gevoel in het leven van anderen mee te kunnen kijken	<input type="radio"/>						
2. Als ik het programma kijk, krijg ik een kant van mensen te zien die ik normaal niet te zien krijg	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Ik kijk het programma graag omdat je nooit weet wat er gaat gebeuren.	<input type="radio"/>						
4. De personen in het programma zijn er niet zo bewust van dat ze gefilmd worden.	<input type="radio"/>						
5. De mensen in het programma gedragen zich niet anders dan ze zich zouden gedragen als er geen camera's zouden zijn.	<input type="radio"/>						

6. Je gedacht en NA het kijken van programma X¹³

Met de cijfers kan je aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de uitspraken, waarbij 1 = “helemaal niet mee eens” aangeeft en 7 = “helemaal mee eens”.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Ik voel me beter, nadat ik de mensen in het programma heb gezien.	<input type="radio"/>						

¹² Item 1 to 3: voyerism (included in analysis); item 4 and 5 VoyersismBM (excluded from further analysis).

¹³ Downward social comparison

2. Mijn problemen lijken niet zo erg als ik heb gezien wat er in het leven van de mensen in het programma gebeurt.	<input type="radio"/>						
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

7. Je favoriete karakter in programma X

De volgende vragen gaan over je favoriete soap karakter. Hiermee wil ik achterhalen hoe jij je favoriete karakter in "programma X" ziet en wat voor effect zijn of haar aanwezigheid op je heeft.

Zijn er meerdere karakters die je graag ziet, kies dan degene die je het meest bijgebleven is op dit moment. Op de volgende pagina kun je uit de lijst van namen je favoriete karakter kiezen.

Als je de naam niet (zeker) weet, heb je ook de mogelijkheid nog even de foto's en bijhorende namen te zien.

Weet je de naam van je favoriete karakter?

<input type="radio"/>	Ja, ik weet al de naam van mijn favoriete karakter (<i>link naar vraag 8</i>)
<input type="radio"/>	Nee, ik zou graag nog even de foto's willen zien (<i>link naar foto's</i>)

(FOTOS EN NAMEN VAN KARAKTEREN VAN PROGRAMMA X)

8. Wie is jouw favoriet e karakter bij "programma X"?

Om het overzichtelijk te houden, staan hier alleen de meest recente namen in de lijst. Als je iemand anders uit de serie het liefst zag, kun je het laatste vakje kiezen en de naam invullen.

<input type="radio"/>	Karakter A	<input type="radio"/>	Karakter ...
<input type="radio"/>	Karakter B	<input type="radio"/>	Karakter Z
<input type="radio"/>	Karakter C	<input type="radio"/>	Anders, namelijk _____

9. Jouw favoriete karakter (deel 1 van 3)¹⁴

In het vervolg zal de door jou zonet gekozen karakter afgekort worden met "FSK" (= favoriete soap karakter):

Met de cijfers kan je aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de uit spraken, waarbij 1 = "helemaal niet waar" aangeeft en 7 = "helemaal waar".

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Mijn favoriete soap karakter (FSK) zorgt ervoor dat ik me op mijn gemak voel, alsof ik bij een vriend(in) ben	<input type="radio"/>						
2. Ik zie mijn FSK als een natuurlijk, nuchtere persoon	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Ik kijk er naar uit om mijn FSK in de volgende aflevering te zien	<input type="radio"/>						

¹⁴ Parasocial interaction

4. Als mijn FSK in een ander programma zou verschijnen, zou ik dat programma kijken	<input type="radio"/>						
5. Mijn FSK lijkt te begrijpen wat voor dingen ik wil weten	<input type="radio"/>						
6. Als ik een verhaal over mijn FSK in een krant of tijdschrift zou zien, zou ik het lezen.	<input type="radio"/>						
7. Ik zou mijn FSK missen als hij/zij ziek of op vakantie is	<input type="radio"/>						
8. Ik zou mijn FSK in persoon willen ontmoeten	<input type="radio"/>						
9. Ik voel medelijden met mijn FSK wanneer zij/ hij een vergissing maakt	<input type="radio"/>						
10. Ik vind mijn FSK aantrekkelijk	<input type="radio"/>						

10. Jouw favoriete karakter (deel 2 van 3)¹⁵

Ook hier is je favoriet e soap karakter met "FSK" afgekort. Met de cijfers kan je aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de uit spraken, waarbij 1 = “helemaal niet waar” aangeeft en 7 = “helemaal waar”.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Ik volg het gedrag van mijn FSK nauwkeurig	<input type="radio"/>						
2. Ik denk nauwelijks na over waarom mijn FSK sommige dingen doet.	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Ik blijf me afvragen of ik mensen ken die lijken op mijn FSK	<input type="radio"/>						
4. Ik ben me bewust van aspecten van mijn FSK die ik echt leuk vind of juist niet	<input type="radio"/>						
5. Ik blijf me afvragen hoe dingen zullen ontwikkelen rondom mijn FSK	<input type="radio"/>						
6. Soms vraag ik me af of mijn FSK op mij lijkt of niet	<input type="radio"/>						
7. Soms hou ik echt van mijn FSK om wat zij/hij doet	<input type="radio"/>						
8. Wanneer mijn FSK zich slecht voelt, voel ik me ook slecht en andersom.	<input type="radio"/>						
9. Mijn FSK doet me niks	<input type="radio"/>						
10. Wat mijn FSK ook zegt of doet – ik blijf stil	<input type="radio"/>						
11. Soms zeg ik iets tegen mijn FSK uit een impuls	<input type="radio"/>						
12. Soms heb ik zin om hardop tegen mijn FSK te praten	<input type="radio"/>						

11. Jouw favoriete karakter (deel 3 van 3)¹⁶

¹⁵ Parasocial processes (sup-dimension of PSI)

Ook hier is je favoriete soap karakter met "FSK" afgekort. Met de cijfers kan je aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de uitspraken, waarbij 1 = "helemaal niet waar" aangeeft en 7 = "helemaal waar".

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Naar mijn mening ziet mijn FSK er erg goed uit	<input type="radio"/>						
2. Ik houd niet van de verschijning van mijn FSK	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Ik vind dat mijn FSK er erg aantrekkelijk uitziet	<input type="radio"/>						
4. Mijn FSK heeft veel eigenschappen die ik ook zou willen hebben	<input type="radio"/>						
5. Ik bewonder mijn FSK om zijn/haar karakter	<input type="radio"/>						
6. Ik denk dat mijn FSK altijd alles bereikt wat hij/zij wil bereiken	<input type="radio"/>						
7. Ik denk dat mijn FSK een erg succesvol persoon is	<input type="radio"/>						
8. Ik ben erg geïnteresseerd in de dingen waar mijn FSK mee omgaat	<input type="radio"/>						

12. Je gedachten en gevoelens tijdens het kijken naar je favoriete karakter in "Programma X"¹⁷

Met dit onderdeel wil ik je graag een paar vragen stellen over je belevenis, je gedachten en je gevoelens onder het kijken van "Programma X" en je favoriete soap karakter (=FSK).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Als ik "Boer Zoekt Vrouw" kijk, voelt het alsof ik onderdeel ben van de situatie.	<input type="radio"/>						
2. Als ik "Boer Zoekt Vrouw" kijk, vergeet ik mezelf en word ik volledig meegenomen in het programma.	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Ik kan de situaties in het programma op dezelfde manier als mijn favoriete soap (=FSK) karakter begrijpen.	<input type="radio"/>						
4. Ik denk dat ik mijn FSK goed kan begrijpen.	<input type="radio"/>						
5. Ik probeer te begrijpen waarom mijn FSK doet wat hij of zij doet.	<input type="radio"/>						
6. Als ik het programma kijk, kan ik de emoties voelen van mijn FSK.	<input type="radio"/>						
7. Tijdens het kijken van "Boer Zoekt Vrouw" voelt het alsof ik echt in het hoofd van mijn FSK kan kijken.	<input type="radio"/>						
8. Op essentiële momenten in het programma kan ik precies	<input type="radio"/>						

¹⁶ Attractiveness (sub-dimension of PSI)

¹⁷ Cognitive-emotional ID

voelen wat mijn FSK doormaakt.							
9. Terwijl ik het programma kijk hoop ik dat mijn FSK zijn of haar doelen bereikt.	<input type="radio"/>						

13. Heb je dingen gemeen met je favoriet e soap karakter (=FSK)?¹⁸

Hieronder staan een aantal stellingen, waar je aan kunt geven in hoeverre je het met die stellingen eens bent: 1 = klopt helemaal niet, 7 = klopt helemaal

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Mijn FSK doet me aan mezelf denken.	<input type="radio"/>						
2. Ik heb dezelfde eigenschappen als mijn FSK.	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Ik lijk dezelfde houding te hebben als mijn FSK.	<input type="radio"/>						
4. Ik lijk dezelfde overtuigingen te hebben als mijn FSK.	<input type="radio"/>						
5. Ik heb dezelfde problemen als mijn FSK.	<input type="radio"/>						
6. Ik kan me in mijn FSK inbeelden.	<input type="radio"/>						
7. Ik kan me met mijn FSK identificeren.	<input type="radio"/>						

14. Je inschatting van de realiteit van het programma

Hieronder vind je een paar stellingen over de realiteit van het programma. Hier telt wederom je eigen mening. 1 = helemaal mee oneens; 7 = helemaal mee eens

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. De dialogen in het programma zijn realistisch en geloofwaardig.	<input type="radio"/>						
2. De setting voor het programma komt niet realistisch over.	<input type="radio"/>						
3. Personen in dit programma hebben veel overeenkomsten met mensen die ik ken.	<input type="radio"/>						
4. De manier waarop mensen zich in hun dagelijks leven gedragen is niet erg accuraat weergegeven in het programma.	<input type="radio"/>						
5. De ontwikkelingen in het programma die zijn gebeurd of zouden kunnen gebeuren worden van te voren besproken.	<input type="radio"/>						
6. Het programma laat zien dat de mens zowel de goede als de slechte kanten heeft.	<input type="radio"/>						
7. Ik kan het moeilijk geloven dat de personen in dit programma echt zijn, omdat het basis idee en de omgeving zo ver gezocht zijn.	<input type="radio"/>						
8. Het verhaal behandelt de moeilijke keuzes die mensen in	<input type="radio"/>						

¹⁸ Similarity ID

het echte leven ook moeten maken.							
9. De acties en reacties van de personen zijn geloofwaardig.	<input type="radio"/>						

16. Welk geslacht heb je?

<input type="radio"/>	vrouw
<input type="radio"/>	man

17. Hoe oud ben je op dit moment (in jaren)?

Leeftijd (in jaren)

18. Wat is de hoogste opleiding die je óf afgerond hebt of nu volgt?

<input type="radio"/>	Vmbo
<input type="radio"/>	MBO
<input type="radio"/>	VWO
<input type="radio"/>	HBO
<input type="radio"/>	Universiteit
<input type="radio"/>	andere, namelijk _____

19. Ben je momenteel student / werkzaam?

<input type="radio"/>	werkend
<input type="radio"/>	student
<input type="radio"/>	werkende student
<input type="radio"/>	scholier
<input type="radio"/>	werkende scholier
<input type="radio"/>	(tijdelijk) werkloos
<input type="radio"/>	andere, namelijk _____

20. Hoeveel uur kijk je gemiddeld op een doordeweekse dag (maandag t/m donderdag) naar t v programma's?

Ik bedoel hier op t televisie en/of op een andere wijze, op bijvoorbeeld “uit zending gemist” en “youtube”.

21. Hoeveel uur kijk je gemiddeld op een dag in het weekend (vrijdag t/m zondag) naar t v-programma's?

Ik bedoel hier op televisie en/of op een andere wijze, zoals bijvoorbeeld op “uit zending gemist” en “youtube”.

Dit waren de laatste vragen van het onderzoek. Ik wil je heel hartelijk bedanken voor je medewerking!

Mocht je nog opmerkingen hebben, kan je ze hieronder achterlaten. De e-mail adressen worden eenmalig voor de verloting van de prijs en/of voor het op de hoogte brengen van de resultaten gebruikt en worden niet aan je resultaten gekoppeld.

Met elk persoon, die mede door jou heeft deel genomen aan dit onderzoek, vergroot je je kans op de prijs.

Ben je voor dit onderzoek door iemand geworven?

<input type="radio"/>	nee
<input type="radio"/>	Ja, haar/zijn naam: _____

Wil je aan de loting deelnemen? Vul dan hieronder je naam en e-mailadres in:

Voornaam:	
Achternaam:	
e-mailadres	