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ABSTRACT

Uses and gratifications research has suggested that television consumption may be motivated by the gratifications held by the audience member him/herself (Levy & Windahl, 1985). As such, individuals may engage in television viewing with the hope that specific viewing may satisfy their gratifications and needs. Certain programs may be appealing because they "entertain," and/or "provide information" and thus, satisfy those needs in the individual. This study focused on the gratifications and motivations behind late night talk show viewing and examined whether certain motivations (those that were more instrumental) played an important role in generating media outcomes. Specifically, this research looked at the relationship between late night talk show viewing motives and, parasocial interaction as a media consequence. Exposure levels and the concept of perceived host self-disclosure were also studied and their association to the above relationship examined.

viii
A questionnaire was designed to measure various variables including, talk show exposure, television viewing motives, perceived host self-disclosure, familiarity, attention to program, parasocial interaction, and demographic information. The survey was administered to 432 college students.

Findings indicated that there are three main reasons why students watch late night talk shows, all of which are instrumental and goal-directed in nature. Information, Entertainment and Relaxation were those motives most commonly cited. In addition, parasocial interaction was found to be related to instrumental motives for late night talk show viewing. Results also indicated associations between perceived host self-disclosure, familiarity, and parasocial interaction.

The assumptions made in this investigation and the conclusions drawn provide important and relevant information for uses and gratifications research. This study emphasized the audience as an active agent in television consumption by revealing a positive relationship between instrumental motives and parasocial interaction. Such a result strengthens the domain of uses and gratifications research and provides
important answers for future research. Suggestions for other future research are included.
Chapter 1

Rationale

1.1 Research Questions

This study examined late night talk shows, specifically, their appeal to the members of their viewing audience. Within the uses and gratifications perspective, the audience is seen as "active" and, as such, inevitably plays a major role in maintaining the popularity of such shows as Arsenio Hall, David Letterman, Johnny Carson, Rick Dees, and others. This research centered on audience behavior and examined the reasons behind the choice for viewing late night talk shows.

It examined the following questions about late night talk show viewing: What motivates people to watch late night talk shows? Which is more prevalent, instrumental or ritualized viewing? Is late night talk show exposure higher for instrumental reasons than for ritualistic reasons? I am also interested in parasocial interaction, or the perceived interpersonal
relationship between an audience member and a media personality. Are instrumental or ritualized viewers more likely to be personally involved with a late night talk show host?

To answer these questions, this study presumes the audience actively selects and thus participates in making these shows a success. For this reason, the survey sought to determine why the audience chose to view these programs and what gratifications these shows seem to provide. Specifically, I am interested in first, the motivations behind late night talk show viewing and second, whether certain motivations, coupled with perceptions about late night talk show hosts, are associated with parasocial interaction.

The theoretical background for this study builds on uses and gratifications research. Central to uses and gratifications research is the concept of motivation. Certain programs appeal to certain individuals with the promise of gratifying their needs. Individuals, thus, will select specific programming based on the gratifications sought. Rubin (1984) has suggested that viewing motives define two basic uses of television: one referring to a more habitual and less
active or ritualized television use and the other, a more goal-oriented and active instrumental use.

The intent of this study was to examine audience motivation and instrumental and ritualized uses of late night talk shows. The first goal of this study was to discover the gratifications sought by viewing late night talk shows, specifically, to identify ritualistic and instrumental patterns of motivation. The second goal was to examine the relationship between viewing motivations and late night talk show exposure levels. The third goal was to test the prediction that different viewing motivations and exposure levels, coupled with perceived host self-disclosure as a characteristic of late night talk show programming, will be related to parasocial interaction.

A survey was administered consisting of pre-existing scales measuring five key concepts: late night talk show viewing motives, perceived host self-disclosure, attention, familiarity, and parasocial interaction with favorite late night talk show host (Clatterbuck, 1979; Jourard, 1971; Rubin, 1981, 1983; Rubin & Perse, 1987b; Wexels, 1976). Each of these concepts will be reviewed in this research.
1.2 Significance

This study is of interest to me because I have always been amazed at the popularity of the late night talk shows, such as David Letterman, among college students. Events that occurred during the hour of entertainment these shows provided are frequently mentioned during casual conversations for some time after, regardless of context. It is surprising to notice just how involved some viewers are and how "intimate" they become with these performers.

Today, David Letterman enters some U.S. households on a first name basis, referred to as "Dave," and Arsenio Hall creates an image and style that is supported and personalized through universal hand gestures by those who watch his performances. These behaviors, done as a form of respect, trust, and loyalty to these performers, may provide late night talk show programming with the unique ability to foster personal involvement. How have these shows led such a large, educated population to develop such an "interpersonal" relationship with the performer? With television viewing as prevalent as it is in our society, it is
important to understand the nature of the audience experience. A program genre that can have such an effect on segments of the viewing population is certainly worth investigating.

Analyzing audience involvement with late night talk shows has heuristic value. My research emphasizes the audience’s active relationship with late night talk show viewing by examining these shows in relation to the concept of audience motivation. If my hypothesis, that parasocial interaction will be predicted by higher levels of instrumental television viewing and an increased perception of host self-disclosure by the audience, is supported, the scholars of uses and gratifications research will be provided with more empirical evidence of the "active" nature of the audience experience. Such research will strengthen the basic tenets of uses and gratifications research and help support the utility of this perspective as a domain of interest in communication research.

Not only does this research have significance within the communication research community but it also produces insight that may be useful in a more practical sense. In order for a program to succeed, it must
appeal to the audience. If it has no special qualities or if it fails to provide what the audience is looking for, it will not maintain viewer attention. This is an important issue to recognize, for it is the program producer’s ability to adapt to his/her audience that determines whether a program will succeed or fail.
Chapter 2

Theoretical Background

2.1 Uses and Gratifications

This study is grounded in the uses and gratifications perspective of mass communication research. Complementing traditional effects research in many ways, uses and gratifications went on to support newer areas of theoretical development. At its core, the perspective examines human communication behavior. People have biological or psychological needs that, combined with various societal influences, lead them to react or respond in certain ways (Rosengren, 1974). In mass communication, such needs or motivations influence patterns of media use. In the uses and gratifications perspective, the audience is seen as actively selecting and interpreting media content. Uses and gratification research, then defines media and content choice on the selective and intentional nature of the audience.

Uses and gratifications is an audience-centered
approach to the study of mass communication. As such, it suggests that "media use is motivated by needs and goals that are defined by (the) audience members themselves" (Levy & Windahl, 1985, p. 110). Uses and gratifications research focuses on the origins of individual needs and their ability to generate expectations of the mass media to satisfy these needs (gratifications sought) (Palmgreen et al., 1985). Thus, uses and gratifications research holds the basic assumption that "audience members are motivated in their selection of media channels and content types by various . . . need-related gratifications" (Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1979, p. 156). That is, individuals engage in media consumption to satisfy certain gratifications.

"An active message-seeking and message selecting, goal-directed model of human behavior" (Rubin, 1981, p. 142) is the core functional element of this paradigm. Uses and gratifications research focuses on viewing motives and media consumption in terms of exposure level, types of content attended to, and the relationship between viewer and media and/or content choice (Katz, Gurevitch & Haas, 1973; Levy & Windahl, 1984; Rubin, 1979, 1981, 1983).
The assumption of the "active audience" is a major difference between uses and gratifications research and the more traditional effects theories (Levy & Windahl, 1985). Windahl (1981) expresses uses and gratifications research as "what people do with the media" as compared to effects research that looks at "what media do with people" (p. 176). Another difference between uses and gratifications and effects research focuses on outcomes of media use. Uses and gratifications scholars focus on the "consequence of media use" whereas effects researchers discuss "effects of media content" (Windahl, 1981, p. 177).

Uses and gratifications is a perspective that tries to answer the question of what motivates specific media behavior. As such, one of the first goals of uses and gratifications research is to identify the reasons why people use mass media.

Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas (1973), identified three general orientations to media use that were defined by audience motivation: (a) the surveillance or cognitive orientation, explaining that audiences tend to select information concerning the society around them; (b) the diversion orientation, whereby audience members seek
media consumption to divert them from the pressures and/or trials of daily life; and (c) the personal identity orientation, which signifies ways to use the media to add something to the audience member's own life or situation. Thus, specific types of programs would appeal if they satisfied those motivations mentioned. For example, the cognitive orientation would "facilitate information gain" (p. 18) as in newscasts, while diversion orientations, that favor entertainment materials, and personal identity may not view much television at all. It is important to understand specific motivation because the study of viewing motivations would provide the most promising lead to understanding the rewards of entertainment (Kubey & Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

A second goal of uses and gratifications is to predict exposure levels. Greenberg (1974) and Rubin (1979) found a positive relationship between strength of identification with most viewing motivations and amount of television viewing. Strong correlations were found between amount of viewing and viewing to pass time, viewing for companionship, and viewing for entertainment motivations. In addition, Kippax and
Murray (1980) found that perceived gratifications satisfied by five different media generally were positively related to exposure to the five media. One of Levy and Windahl's (1984) most important findings was that the more audience members were motivated to view television news and the more they perceived various types of gratification from the program, the more active they were in television news consumption.

Along these same lines, the third goal of uses and gratifications research considers audience members' choice of particular media for consumption. Investigations have shown a correlation between gratifications sought and media choice (Palmgreen et al., 1980; Rubin, 1981, 1983). Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974) argued that there may be a "division of labor" among media. They argued that attributes specific or common to various types of media provide insight into the reasons why audiences use those media. For example, books represent a technology and information function similar to newspapers, yet they are also similar to film in their aesthetic function. Radio has aspects of technology, information, and entertainment functions and provides content similar to
television, yet it also shares similarities to newspapers in its realistic orientation of information.

Thus, similar needs can be satisfied by the same media. In other words, books and film seem to serve self-fulfillment and self-gratification needs and seem to "connect individuals to themselves" (p. 26), while newspaper, radio, and television "connect individuals to society" (p. 26). In addition, television is used less for escape or diversionary needs than other media.

Research has also found that viewing motives were related to program choice. Rubin (1981), for example, found that viewing television for informational reasons was positively correlated to watching talk-interview programs. Rubin and Rubin (1982) stated that daytime serials and game shows were associated with motivations to seek companionship, relaxation, arousal, habit, and passing the time, and, again, that television news, documentary magazines, and talk shows were associated with information-seeking.
2.2 Ritualistic and Instrumental Television Use

Rubin (1983, 1984) described television viewing motives in terms of two concepts: instrumental or goal-directed use and ritualized or habitual use. Windahl (1981) agreed that "individuals tend toward one of (these) two types of viewing" (p. 176).

Ritualized use is not specific to content and merely reflects a strong association with the medium itself, thus incorporating "relaxation," "passing time," and "companionship" as nonspecific, diversionary television use.

On the other hand, "instrumental" motives are more active and purposeful. Audience members are seen as "participants" in television viewing, selecting content based on the intended utility of the program. For example, media use for information, entertainment/guests, and non-time consuming reasons would be considered instrumental in the sense that something would be gained by viewing. Instrumental viewing, then is strongly associated with program content and as such, is highly purposive and intentional. Thus, viewing is a function of different program content and
the characteristics of the audience itself.

Uses and gratifications research has identified a variety of motives that reflect the active nature of the reasons people watch television. The two primary types of television use, instrumental and ritualized, reflect a relationship between different program content and the audience it attracts (Abelman, 1987). Recently, research has shown that ritualistic and instrumental uses also describe audience activity.

2.3 Audience Activity

One of the assumptions of uses and gratifications is that people actively select and use media content. Over the years, much debate has centered on this notion of "audience activity." Several scholars (Elliott, 1974; Gerbner & Gross, 1976) hold that audiences are more passive in their media use, driven by media scheduling and programming, rather than viewing motives.

Uses and gratifications research, however, argues that individual personalities, characteristics, backgrounds, social roles, and the needs that spring
from each these factors, all influence how people use and respond to the media (Palmgreen et al., 1985). They see the audience as "active" while maintaining that this "activity" varies depending on individuals and their use of the media. Uses and gratifications scholars look at audience behavior as the source of media use influencing specific media effects. Blumler (1979) suggested that a heuristic way to solve disagreements about audience activity is to consider it as a variable. Consequently, uses and gratifications today acknowledges the audience can be "variably active" in selecting and using media content.

Research has shown that the instrumental and ritualistic dichotomy of media use can be described in terms of audience activity. Instrumental television use reflects media consumption for "direct, substantive, intrinsic value(s) for the receiver" (Cutler & Danowski, 1980, p. 269). As such, audiences are active in their media use, selecting and interpreting content based on satisfying some gratification. Media viewing is goal-directed, intentional, and focusing on media content to provide some utility. Audiences may be motivated to select
certain programs in order to gain knowledge or understanding and reduce uncertainty in personal lives.

Ritualized television use, on the other hand, provides extrinsic values from media consumption. The audience is seen as passive, habitually watching television regardless of content. The gratifications received are not a result of media content but of participating in the communication process generally (Cutler & Danowski, 1980). The audience is seen as motivated to use media, thus incorporating aspects of intentionality; however, content is unimportant, indicating that selectivity and utility do not confront the ritualized viewer.

Rubin and Perse (1987b) examined news viewing orientations and found that instrumental use "focused on news content and was marked by information- and exciting entertainment-seeking viewing motives" (p. 247). In addition, intentionality, defined as "the state of mind with which an act is done," (Webster's Dictionary, 1979) as well as greater attention to the news, were aspects of instrumental use.

Rubin and Perse (1987a) examined involvement in relation to specific motives for viewing soap operas
and found that cognitive and behavioral involvement with soap operas were related to instrumental soap opera viewing motives.

Ritualistic use of news programs, however, "focused less on the (news) content than on exposure to the medium; it was marked by watching out of habit or to fill time" (p. 247). Ritualistic use is associated with low levels of intentional and selective viewing behaviors and higher levels of co-viewing distractions (Rubin & Perse, 1987b). This seems to indicate a negative relationship between ritualized television use and attention. As well, habitual viewers do not regard television to be realistic (Rubin, 1981), which may affect involvement and exposure levels negatively.

Abelman (1987), while examining religious programming, found that some regular viewers of this type of programming appear to be selective and purposive information-seekers. As with secular television, such instrumental use is evident with exposure to informational programming, such as news and talk shows, and bible studies within religious fare. Ritualized used in religious programming also occurred and was associated with a strong religious belief that
encouraged consistent use of the medium out of habit, regardless of religious content.

2.4 Uses and Gratifications and Viewing Outcomes

As mentioned previously, uses and gratifications research has been concerned primarily with viewing motive patterns, media/content selection, and exposure levels. However, uses and gratifications is becoming more interested in viewing motives and media consequences. Windahl (1981) proposed that different motives should be associated with different types of media effects or outcomes. It is important to note here that these outcomes stem from gratifications that one satisfies or does not satisfy. Gratifications obtained in relation to gratifications sought provides one means for examining a variety of media outcomes.

Windahl (1981) argued that specific media use may have the effect of preventing or reducing the number of other activities one may engage in and, as a consequence, reducing interpersonal interaction. In addition, reliance on one type of program content, such as entertainment, may mean the nonuse of other types of
content, such as those providing information. He argued that political ignorance may be the overall outcome or effect of such media use.

Windahl (1981) also stresses the psychological effects of media use such as dependency and parasocial interaction. These may lead to larger social consequences such as expanding the already large knowledge gap. On the societal level, media use may have an effect of "homogenizing" its audiences because of its universal reach.

Blumler (1979), however, argued that audience activity is an important intervening variable in media effects. More recent research has found that instrumental television use, which incorporates goal-directed viewing motives and more evidence of audience activity, has helped explain different effects of the media.

Gantz (1978), for example, found that watching news for instrumental reasons and attention are linked to news recall. Rubin and Perse (1987a) found that greater viewing attention and intention, as aspects instrumental soap opera use (as opposed to ritualized) were linked to thinking and talking about soaps after
viewing. Parasocial interaction, or the audience’s perceived interpersonal relationship with a media personality, has been linked to instrumental television use of local news (Rubin, Perse, & Powell, 1985) and soap operas (Rubin & Perse, 1987b).

Levy and Windahl (1984) have speculated that since instrumental television use is purposive and selective in nature, it requires cognitive processing of media content. This would suggest that highly active audiences who select content based on its utility, would engage in more cognitive processing of information than habitual viewers who watch regardless of content and utility.

In general, research suggests that media effects related to program content should be linked to instrumental use for several reasons. First, instrumental use is related to higher exposure to specific media and/or content. Second, because instrumental viewing is more active, it is related to greater attention to program content and increased cognitive processing so as to facilitate interaction with others about media content (Rubin & Perse, 1987a). In addition, Levy and Windahl (1984) observed that
more active individuals received more gratification from their media use.

2.5 Parasocial Interaction

Parasocial interaction may be an outcome of television viewing. Parasocial interaction is defined as "a perceived interpersonal relationship on the part of a television viewer with a mass media persona" (Perse & Rubin, 1989, p. 59) Although the parasocial relationship is vicarious, it is based to some extent on those elements that enhance interpersonal relationships: frequency of interaction (exposure level), length of acquaintance (viewing length), and feeling that one "knows" the other. As Horton and Wohl (1956) stated, parasocial interaction is made possible when the television performer mimics interpersonal behavior by acting informally and allowing viewers to forget the action is taking place in a television studio.

Due to the fact that parasocial interaction is a pseudo "friendship," relationship development theories may help to explain it. Altman and Taylor (1973), for
example, pointed out that the more interaction between people that occurs, the more intimate those people become. People may naturally feel "friendlier" to those that they have been in contact with for longer periods of time. Thus, exposure may influence the development of parasocial interaction (Horton & Wohl, 1956).

In addition, Berger’s (1987) Uncertainty Reduction Theory states that as people interact, they reveal information about themselves, therefore reducing uncertainty. Hence, relationships grow. Consistent with the expectation, Perse and Rubin (1989) found that exposure to soap operas was related to knowledge about favorite soap opera character. Both exposure level and confidence in knowledge were related to parasocial interaction (Horton & Wohl, 1956).

Parasocial interaction is an important phenomenon to study for several reasons. First, parasocial interaction may increase the likelihood of long-term effects (Rubin & Perse, 1987a) because of its association with repeat exposure and content and/or program memory. Second, parasocial interaction might signal that viewers are more involved with the program
(Horton & Wohl, 1956). Involvement is associated with cognitive processes that lead to information storage and promote long-term memory of program content that aid recall and memory. Krugman (1966) defines involvement as "direct personal experience" (p. 583) during viewing. Thus, parasocial interaction may be an effect stemming from the audience's ability to perceive, attend, retain, and become involved with media content.

Parasocial interaction has usually been studied within the uses and gratifications perspective. This research has noted that parasocial interaction is related to some viewing motives. Recent research indicates that parasocial interaction is associated with instrumental reasons for watching local news and soap operas (Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b). Rubin and Perse (1987a) suggest that because instrumental viewing motives were linked to greater attention when watching and perceived realism of program content, instrumental viewers are more likely to form vicarious relationships with television personalities. In addition, parasocial interaction, as an aspect of involvement, has been associated with news viewing behaviors that indicate
high cognitive involvement (Perse, 1990b). The relation between motivation and involvement, then, may only hold for instrumental viewers.

Thus, this would seem to suggest that instrumental motives are related to parasocial involvement. Ritualistic uses of media would not be related to parasocial interaction. Ritualized use is more concerned with the medium rather than content, and content provides the means for parasocial behavior to exist.

So, uses and gratifications research suggests that instrumental television viewing motives, as opposed to ritualistic viewing motives, should be associated with parasocial interaction. Viewing motives, however, may only partially explain parasocial interaction. Because parasocial interaction is a pseudo-friendship, relationship development theories may also contribute to understanding parasocial interaction. Specifically, I am interested in how self-disclosure as an information source and program or host familiarity relates to parasocial interaction.
2.6 Perceived Host Self-Disclosure and Familiarity

According to Uncertainty Reduction Theory, "individuals actively seek information to reduce uncertainty" (Berger & Calabrese, 1975, p. 62). When utilizing uncertainty reduction in interpersonal relationships, Berger (1975) demonstrated how information exchanged early in interactions can foster predictions about unknown attributes of the other (proactive attributions) and explanations of subsequent conduct during ongoing interactions (retroactive attributions) (p. 35).

It is through observations of communicative conduct that predictions and explanations are derived (Berger, 1987). Thus, communication and uncertainty (prediction) are negatively related.

Berger and Calabrese (1975) suggest that "relationships are expected to develop as individuals increase their ability to predict the other's behavior" (p. 62). This can be derived by using self-disclosure as a means to provide "personal" information in order to become better acquainted. The concept of self-disclosure is defined as the action of revealing personal information about oneself. Frequent exposure to a television personality may aid familiarity.
Uncertainty Reduction Theory also holds that lower levels of uncertainty increase relationship involvement. Thus, familiarity with a media personality may be associated with parasocial interaction. As in interpersonal communication, decreasing the amount of uncertainty in certain types of programming may lead to greater familiarity and pseudo-friendships.

Little research has been done on the influence of performer self-disclosure and parasocial interaction. But, there are several indications that self-disclosure and familiarity may be related to parasocial interaction.

Some mass communication research has considered how familiarity influences the effects of media use. News research shows that those news consumers with more prior knowledge are more likely to learn from the news (Robinson & Levy, 1986). And, interpersonal communication research suggests a relationship between familiarity and parasocial interaction could exist.

Research done on the role of self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships suggests that self-disclosure should enhance relationships. According to
Berger (1979) and Uncertainly Reduction Theory, there are three strategies one may use to reduce uncertainty. One strategy, known as the "interactive strategy," includes interrogation, self-disclosure, and deception detection" (p. 62). Perceived self-disclosure by the talk show host, then, may reduce uncertainty between the audience members and the performer, and in turn, increase performer familiarity and parasocial interaction. In addition, Altman and Taylor (1973) argue that the degree of intimacy is positively related to amount of time spent interacting and amount of time interacting is often related to the extent of self-disclosure.

Other interpersonal communication approaches support this connection. Goffman (1967), for example, observed that for effective face-saving communication one must

first become aware of the interpretations that others may have placed upon his acts and the interpretations that he ought perhaps to place upon theirs (p. 13).

He continues to say that this "perceptiveness" is an understanding of "what's going on . . . . It involves the integration of meanings of self in relation to another" (p. 13).
Uncertainty Reduction Theory, then, suggests that reducing uncertainty (with a performer) through observing information exchange would enable audiences to predict that performer's behavior. Prediction is an aspect of familiarity (Berger, 1975). Performer predictability, as generated through self-disclosure, should increase the likelihood that audiences would be more familiar with the show and, subsequently have parasocial relationships with the host. In this study, then, higher levels of self-disclosure should be related to parasocial interaction in instrumental viewers.

It is important to note here that parasocial interaction and performer familiarity, in terms of host self-disclosure, are only associated with instrumental viewers. Instrumental viewers, because they are more active and more attentive to program content, reduce uncertainty by attending to performer self-disclosure. Levy and Windahl (1984) suggest that more instrumental viewers, as compared to ritualized viewers, engage in fewer co-viewing distractions, thus encouraging active attention and recall.
2.7 Late Night Talk Shows

Late night talk shows can be defined as entertainment programming that provides interesting interviews for late night viewers. There are several important components of late night talk shows. Specifically, these include the host, the guests, and the audience. The host, as a mediator between the guests and the audience, provides the comic background through his/her monologue and interaction with the guests. The guests provide information and entertainment value. With their mass appeal, attained through stardom, bizarre performances, or out-of-the-ordinary lifestyles, guests help maintain a relaxed, exciting, and entertaining environment. Lastly, the audience, both viewing and in the studio, provides the feedback and encouragement that makes these shows so successful. It is through the "interactions" with the audience that vicarious interpersonal relationships are formed. It is the interdependence of these three components that make late night talk show programming so important to uses and gratifications research.
The reason behind using talk shows as the focus of this research is because talk shows, specifically late night talk shows, are prevalent in our society and present various characteristics that should be related to parasocial interaction. Host self-disclosure, program format predictability, and camera techniques such as close-ups, all aid in transforming a staged interaction into a "spontaneous" mediated interaction directed at each member of the viewing audience. Talk show programming provides viewers with the ability to observe characters interacting socially. This "personal" touch associated with the late night talk show format is the prime target for such research. It is these elements, among others, which can help bring the audience closer to the performer or performance, thus eliciting parasocial relationships.

This research examined how audience perceptions of a given unique quality of late night talk show programming, namely that of host self-disclosure, combined with instrumental motivations, are related positively to parasocial interaction.

In late night talk shows, self-disclosure by the host may enable the viewer to get an idea of what and
how the host thinks and become aware of his/her opinions concerning various topics. Attention to host self-disclosure should be related to familiarity for it enables the audience to feel as though they have gotten to know the "real" person on stage in addition to the personality he/she exhibits as a actor/actress.

Finally, late night talk shows should include both instrumental and ritual patterns of use. Many view for habitual reasons, to pass the time, to sleep by, or for more instrumental reasons such as entertainment, relaxation, information, the guests, etc. In essence, late night talk shows provide an opportunity to study the differences between such motives and the different outcomes with which they are associated.

2.8 The Study

This study focused on late night talk shows from a uses and gratifications perspective. First, it examined such shows in relation to audience activity. Do specific audience motivations predict exposure to late night talk shows? To answer this, I looked at what motivates people to watch these programs. Specific
motivations were analyzed and then examined in terms of instrumental and ritualized media use. It is important to recognize that uses and gratification research focuses on audience behavior and thus, a proper point of departure for most relevant research should begin with questions concerning the degree, variety, and nature of individual motives for viewing media.

In addition, this study focused on the association between viewer motives and exposure level. Do specific motives increase or decrease exposure to late night talk shows? In order to increase the validity of research dealing with media effects such as involvement, especially parasocial interaction, duration of exposure should be investigated. Parasocial interaction should be positively related to length of exposure in that the more acquainted one is with a persona, the more intimate that relationship may become.

Once viewer motive patterns have been analyzed and related to exposure levels, the different types of motivations, those of instrumental and ritualized, were looked at respectively in terms of parasocial interaction. Viewing motives were examined and their
ability to predict parasocial interaction analyzed. In addition, perceived host self-disclosure, as an important characteristic of late night talk show programming, was examined to see if, along with instrumental viewer motives, they were associated positively with parasocial interaction.

Because several studies have suggested that attention to program content is necessary for media outcomes (Chaffee & Schleuder, 1986), attention to talk show programming should be positively related with parasocial interaction. My hypothesis, then, is that parasocial interaction with a favorite late night talk show host will be predicted by:

(a) higher levels of program exposure,
(b) higher levels of instrumental late night talk show viewing motives,
(c) lower levels of ritualistic late night talk show viewing motives,
(d) higher levels of perceived host self-disclosure,
(e) more familiarity with the host and,
(f) more attention to program content.
Chapter 3

Methods

3.1 Study Description

The theoretical background for this study stemmed from the ideas of uses and gratifications research. Five concepts derived from uses and gratifications used in this study were viewing motives, perceived performer self-disclosure, familiarity, attention to program, and parasocial interaction.

A survey was used to test the study's hypotheses and gain knowledge of college students' perceptions of why they watch late night talk shows. Surveys are the typical method used in the uses and gratifications perspective because the focus of much of the research is self-reported audience behavior. Surveys can provide descriptive information and identify associations that will test my hypothesis.

Two pretests aided in designing the study and the questionnaire. The first pre-test, containing
variations of the questions used in the final survey, was prepared as part of a project for an upper level Communication class. The survey, administered over the phone, was conducted using a random sample of New Castle county residents. Those respondents who reported to be viewers of late night talk shows ranged in ages from 17-44. With the aid of this pre-test, I hoped to obtain a more representative sample and help increase the generalizeability of this research. More important, the low level of late night talk show viewers in this pre-test (approximately 23%) justified the use of a college sample. College students were an appropriate sample for this research based on the fact that younger people tend to be viewers of late night talk shows. Results from the pre-test corroborated this fact. Out of the approximately 150 surveys administered, only thirty-five completed the questions on late night talk shows. Based on the demographic information obtained, most of the thirty-five respondent were between the ages of 17-30 years. In the second pre-test, a focus group consisting of students in several Communication classes were asked why they watched late night talk shows. The results,
from both the pre-test and the student focus group, were included in the preparation of the final survey.

The final surveys were handed out during class time in the Spring semester of 1991 and students were asked to return completed surveys during the next class meeting. Seven undergraduate communication classes were used: two classes of Communication 312 (Oral Communication in Business), two classes of Communication 255 (Fundamentals in Communication), Communication 370 (Mass Communication Theory), Communication 301 (Introduction to Communication Inquiry), and Communication 200 (Introduction to Human Communication Systems). In all but one of the courses students were given extra credit for completing the surveys. In one class (Communication 301), participation in such research was required and was included as part of the class curriculum.

The questionnaire took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The questionnaire was designed to measure general television viewing, late night talk show viewing, viewing motives of late night talk shows, perceived levels of audience attention, perceived host self-disclosure, parasocial interaction, and
perceptions of familiarity with a late night talk show host. In addition, demographic information such as age, sex, year in school, and major was obtained. These variables were included for descriptive purposes and, in some instances, were used as control variables. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

3.2 Nature of the Sample

The sample consisted of 432 college students enrolled in five different undergraduate communication classes at the University of Delaware.

3.2.1 Sex

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. The sample was 60.6% (n = 262) female and 38.9% (n = 168) male.

3.2.2 Age

Respondents were asked to indicate their age as of their last birthday. The sample ranged in age from 18-46 years with a mean age of 20.18 years
(SD = 1.94). The median age was 20.00 years.

3.2.3 Class

Respondents were asked to indicate their current class standing from a list provided. If their standing was not mentioned, they were to circle the category "other" and explain. Freshman accounted for 16.7% (n = 72) of the sample, while sophomores, juniors, and seniors accounted for 37.0% (n = 160), 35.9% (n = 155), and 9.7% (n = 42) of the sample respectively. In addition, 0.2% (n = 1) of the sample circled "other" without an explanation and 0.5% (n = 2) of the sample did not list their class standing.

3.2.4 Major

Respondents were asked to write their current major. Results indicated that students were affiliated with 43 different majors although Communication (38.0%, n = 165) and Business (7.0%, n = 31) comprised almost half of the sample. A number of the respondents, however, had not yet selected a major (5.0%, n = 20).
3.3 Television Exposure

General television viewing was measured to describe the sample. Respondents were asked two questions to indicate how much television they had watched the day before and how much they watch on the average weekday in general. Results indicated that respondents watched a mean of 1.75 hours (SD = 1.70) of television the day before while admitting to have watched an average of 2.37 hours (SD = 1.77) on the typical weekday. An average of these two measures was taken and used to form a more reliable measure of daily television viewing. The mean of self-reported daily television viewing for the sample was 2.00 hours (SD = 1.56) and the median was 1.75 hours.

3.4 Late Night Talk Show Exposure

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they watched late night talk shows. Results revealed that 86.3% (n = 373) of the sample said that they watched late night talk shows.
T-tests revealed some differences between the two groups (see Table 3.1). Viewers of late night talk shows tended to watch significantly more television in general ($M = 2.21$) than did non-viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonviewers ($n = 59$)</th>
<th>Viewers ($n = 373$)</th>
<th>$t$-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20.81$</td>
<td>$20.01$</td>
<td>$-2.72^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General television exposure</strong></td>
<td>$1.41$</td>
<td>$2.21$</td>
<td>$4.98^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $^*p < .01$  
$^{**}p < .001$

($M = 1.14$, $t = 4.98$, $p < .001$). Non-viewers tended to be older ($M = 20.81$ years) compared to a mean age of 20.01 years for viewers ($t = -2.72$, $p < .01$). There
was not, however, a significant relationship between gender and watching late night talk shows (see Table 3.2). In addition, there were no differences in major between viewers and non-viewers. Only late night talk show viewers are included in the rest of the analysis.

Table 3.2
Crosstabulations Between Sex And Talk Show Exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewer</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40.4%)</td>
<td>(59.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-viewer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.5%)</td>
<td>(69.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 373
$x^2 (N = 430) = 2.11, \ p > .15$

3.5 Late Night Talk Show Viewing

Viewers were asked to indicate, from a list provided, the specific late night talk show(s) they
watched by circling the number of days per week they watched. David Letterman and Arsenio Hall were the most popular with viewers of David Letterman watching The David Letterman Show an average of 2.00 times per week ($SD = 1.13$) and viewers of Arsenio Hall watching The Arsenio Hall Show an average of 1.92 times per week ($SD = 1.08$). Viewers of Johnny Carson watched Johnny Carson an average of 1.39 times per week ($SD = 0.80$), while viewers of Rick Dees watched The Rick Dees Show an average of 1.52 times per week ($SD = 0.89$), viewers of Howard Stern watched the Howard Stern Show an average of 1.30 times per week ($SD = 0.68$) and viewers of Byron Allen, Bob Costas, and Jay Leno watched their respective shows an average of 1.00 ($SD = 0.00$), 1.00 ($SD = 0.00$), and 1.33 ($SD = 0.58$) times per week. Percent of viewers and mean number of times viewers watched their shows per week are presented in Table 3.3. The length of time people had been watching their favorite late night talk show ranged from 1-15 years. The viewing mean was 3.53 years ($SD = 2.13$) and the median was 3.00 years.
Table 3.3

Late Night Talk Show Episodes Viewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of viewers</th>
<th>Mean # of times viewers watched per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266 (71.3%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 (75.3%)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 (48.3%)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (.1%)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (.0%)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (.0%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (.0%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (.0%)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 373
3.6 Late Night Talk Show Viewing Motives

Late night talk show viewers were presented with 22 5-point Likert scale statements reflecting various motives for watching late night talk shows. They were asked to compare their own reasons for watching these shows and indicate whether the survey statement was "Exactly" (-coded 5) through "Not at all" (coded 1) like their own reason. Most of the statements were derived from pre-existing lists of television viewing motives (e.g., Rubin, 1984); however, several statements were created from earlier pre-tests administered to college students. The statements on the questionnaire included viewing motives such as habit, pass time, entertainment, information, relaxation, escape, and companionship. The items and their means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.4.
Table 3.4
Late Night Talk Show Viewing Motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I watch late night talk shows because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To learn about issues affecting people like me</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. So I can pass the information I've learned on to other people</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. So I can talk with others about what is going on</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because it helps me learn things about myself and others</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Because I have nothing better to do</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because it passes the time away (particularly when I am bored)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I do not want to go to bed</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANIONSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. So I can be with others who are watching</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because it is something to do with friends</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. So I won't have to be alone</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I watch late night talk shows because: | M   | SD  |
---|-----|-----|
**ENTERTAINMENT**
1. Because it is enjoyable         | 4.96 | 0.80 |
2. Because the host makes me laugh | 3.84 | 0.90 |
3. Because it entertains me        | 3.80 | 0.82 |
4. Because it is exciting          | 2.86 | 0.82 |
5. Because the guests make me laugh| 3.37 | 0.84 |
6. Because I like the guests       | 3.56 | 0.82 |

**RELAXATION**
1. Because it allows me to unwind  | 3.01 | 1.07 |
2. Because it relaxes me           | 3.09 | 1.02 |

**HABIT**
1. Just because it is on           | 2.89 | 1.18 |
2. Because it is a habit, just something to do | 2.04 | 1.04 |

**ESCAPE**
1. So I can forget about work or other things | 2.79 | 1.12 |
2. So I can get away from the family or others | 1.75 | 0.87 |
3.7 Late Night Talk Show Attention

Respondents were given statements reflecting how much attention they paid while they watched late night talk shows. They were asked to answer how often they typically did the behaviors mentioned in the statements when they watched late night talk shows by circling whether they do it "always" (coded 5) through "never" (coded 1). Seven attention statements were taken from Rubin et al., (1985) and Cegala (1981) and included as part of the questionnaire. However, two of the statements ("I watch my favorite late night talk show from beginning to end", and "I often make comments to others about the program while I am watching my favorite late night talk show") were discarded because they reduced the reliability of the scale. The items, means, and standard deviations of the five remaining statements are presented in Table 3.5. To create an attention scale, item scores were averaged. The overall scale mean was 3.16 ($SD = 0.62$) and the median was 3.20. Reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.86.
Table 3.5

Late Night Talk Show Viewer Attention Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1.</td>
<td>I am often thinking about something else when I am watching my favorite late night talk show</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.</td>
<td>I often miss what is happening on the program when I watch my favorite late night talk show</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3.</td>
<td>My mind often wanders when I watch my favorite late night talk show</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I pay close attention to the program when watch my favorite late night talk show</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I listen carefully when I watch my favorite late night talk show</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* recoded for analysis
N = 373

3.8 Parasocial Interaction

In order to focus viewers on their favorite late night talk show, respondents were asked to mark their favorite late night talk show (or the one they watch
the most) and indicate how long they had been watching the show. The reason behind asking these questions is that people tend to watch their favorite programs more often and thus tend to be more knowledgeable about the content and format of the program. If they were to use their favorite late night talk show as a guide to answer the questions to follow, their answers might be more accurate.

The most popular late night talk show was David Letterman chosen by 41.2% (n = 178) of the sample. Arsenio Hall came close with 36.6% (n = 158) of the sample feeling that he was the their favorite late night talk show host. Only 5.1% (n = 22) of the sample said Johnny Carson was their favorite while Rick Dees, Jay Leno, and Howard Stern lagged behind with 1.4% (n = 6), 1.2% (n = 5), and 0.7% (n = 3) of the sample respectively. In addition, 13.7% (n = 59) of the respondents did not report their favorite.

Respondents who watched late night talk shows were then presented with a list of eleven 5-point Likert scale statements reflecting attitudes and behaviors towards the host of their favorite late night talk show. Nine of the items were taken from the 10-item
Parasocial Interaction scale (Rubin & Perse, 1987b). One item was reworded negatively and an 11th negatively worded item was created for this study. The items, means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.6. Respondents were asked to think about their favorite late night talk show host and circle whether they "strongly agree" (coded 5) through strongly disagree" (coded 1) with the following statements. To create a parasocial interaction scale, item scores were averaged. The scale mean was 3.17 (SD = 0.58) and the median was 3.18. Reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of .82.
Table 3.6

Late Night Talk Show Parasocial Interaction Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host makes me feel comfortable, as if I am with a friend</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host is a natural, down-to-earth person</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I look forward to seeing my favorite late night talk show host every night that he/she is on</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.</td>
<td>I would not go see my favorite late night talk show host if he/she made a personal appearance</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>If my favorite late night talk show appeared on another television program or in a movie, I would watch it</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host seems to understand the kind of things I want to know</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>If I saw a story about my favorite late night talk show host in a magazine or newspaper, I would read it</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I miss seeing my favorite late night talk show host when he/she is ill or on vacation</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I would like to meet my favorite late night talk show host in person</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel sorry for my favorite late night talk show host when he/she makes a mistake</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host is not very attractive</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = recoded for analysis
N = 373

3.9 Perceived Host Self-disclosure

Self-disclosure was a central construct of this study because it represented a unique characteristic of late night talk show programming that enabled the audience members to "get to know" the host. Self-disclosure provides "personal" information straight
from the host him/herself as if conversing with a friend.

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they felt that their favorite late night talk show host had self-disclosed him/herself to them. Statements were drawn from scales created by Jourard (1971) and Wheeles (1976) and concerned breadth, depth, and openness of self-disclosure. Respondents circled whether they "strongly agree" (coded 5) through "strongly disagree" (coded 1) with the 17 statements.

The 17 self-disclosure statements were subjected to factor analysis that resulted in one main factor that accounted for 32.9% of the variance. This factor had an eigenvalue of 5.60 and included 11 of the initial 17 statements all drawn from Wheeles (1976). Scores of the 11 statements used were averaged to create a perceived host self-disclosure measure. The mean of this averaged self-disclosure scale was 2.73 (SD = 0.56) and the median was 2.72. The statements, means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.7. Reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of .86.
### Table 3.7
Late Night Talk Show Self-Disclosure Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My favorite talk show host intimately discloses who he/she really is, openly and fully</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My favorite talk show host often discloses intimate, personal things without hesitation</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel that when my favorite late night talk show host self-discloses, he/she is providing accurate reflections of who he/she really is</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host usually talks about him/herself for long periods of time</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Once my favorite talk show host gets started, he/she intimately and fully reveals through self-disclosures</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host does not control his/her self-disclosures of personal and intimate things</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My favorite talk show host is sincere when he/she reveals personal feelings and experiences</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host does not talk often about him/herself</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host typically reveals information about him/herself without intending to</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host often discusses feelings about him/herself</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My favorite late night talk show host rarely expresses his/her personal beliefs and opinions</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 373
* = recoded for analysis

3.10 Perceived Host Familiarity

Familiarity with a favorite late night talk show was operationalized by an adaptation of Clatterbuck's (1979) attributional confidence scale. Clatterbuck's original seven items assess how well one can predict the behaviors and attitudes of the their favorite
programs. Only six of the seven items were used because the seventh was not appropriate to the television viewing context. Attributional confidence was measured by presenting respondents with a set of statements referring to their ability to predict the attitudes and behaviors of their favorite late night talk show host. Respondents were asked to circle whether they "strongly agree" (coded 5) through "strongly disagree" (coded 1) with the statements to follow. The mean of the attributional confidence scale was 2.76 (SD = 0.71) and the median was 2.83. Reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.88. The statement, means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.8.
Table 3.8
Late Night Talk Show Attributional Confidence Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am confident of my general ability to predict how my favorite late night talk show host would behave</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know the values my favorite late night talk show host holds</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know my favorite late night talk show host’s attitudes</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I know my favorite late night talk show host’s feelings and emotions</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can empathize with (share) the way my favorite late night talk show host feels about him/herself</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know my favorite late night talk show host well</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 373
3.11 Statistical Analysis

There were three stages to data analysis. First, factor analysis was done to identify the motives for watching late night talk shows. Second, Pearson correlations were computed to examine the bivariate relationships predicted in this study.

The third step was to test the hypothesis with multiple regression. Parasocial interaction was regressed on:

(a) late night talk show exposure levels,
(b) late night talk show viewing motives,
(c) perceived host self-disclosure,
(d) familiarity, and
(e) level of attention paid to late night talk shows.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter is the report of statistical analyses to test the study's hypotheses.

4.1 Late Night Talk Show Viewing Motives

The first aim of this study was to identify the reasons why college students watch late night talk shows. To do this, the viewing motive statements were subjected to factor analysis with oblique rotation which resulted in grouping like motives together. Six factors resulted, of which four had eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounted for 46.0% of the variance. The factor analysis is summarized in Table 4.1. The four significant factors were:

Factor 1 (Information) had an eigenvalue of 4.71 and accounted for 21.4% of the variance. It included four statements dealing with learning and passing information on to others. This
factor reflected an active, purposive, and instrumental motive for watching late night talk shows.

Factor 2 (Habit-Pass time) had an eigenvalue of 2.97 and accounted for 13.5% of the variance. It included four statements reflecting the habitual use of late night talk show viewing to pass the time away. This factor revealed an inactive, nonpurposive, and ritualistic nature of watching late night talk shows.

Factor 3 (Entertainment) had a eigenvalue of 1.42 and accounted for 6.4% of the variance. It included four statements reflecting the enjoyable and exciting aspects of watching late night talk shows. This factor revealed a more instrumental and purposive motive for viewing late night talk shows for the purpose of entertainment.

Factor 4 (Relaxation) had an eigenvalue of 1.04 and accounted for 4.7% of the variance. It included three statements reflecting relaxation
and escapism as motives for watching late night talk shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1 (Info)</th>
<th>F2 (PassTime)</th>
<th>F3 (Enter)</th>
<th>F4 (Relax)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enter.</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enter.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PassTime</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enter.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enter.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PassTime</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relax</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Habit</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enter.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Comp.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Info.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Info.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Info.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PassTime</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Comp.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1 (Info)</th>
<th>F2 (PassTime)</th>
<th>F3 (Enter)</th>
<th>F4 (Relax)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Escape</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Info.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Enter.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Comp.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Escape</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Habit</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Relax</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 4.71 | 2.97 | 1.42 | 1.04 |
| % Variance | 21.4% | 13.5% | 6.4% | 4.7% |
| Mean | 1.81 | 3.09 | 3.61 | 2.96 |
| SD | .73 | .88 | .65 | .87 |
| Alpha | .85 | .79 | .79 | .75 |

Note. Factor 4 (Relax) refracted for subsequent analysis.
- Item numbers correspond to motive statements on survey.

As shown, factor analysis established four separate factors as significant motives for talk show consumption. These factors included motives of information, entertainment, pass time, and relaxation. Three out of the four factors (information,
entertainment, and relaxation) represent instrumental reasons for viewing late night talk shows (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2
Items of Factored Viewing Motives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I WATCH LATE NIGHT TALK SHOWS. . .</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FACTOR 1 (INFORMATION)**

1. To learn about issues affecting people like me 1.83  .91
2. So I can pass the information I've learned on to other people 1.82  .90
3. So I can talk with others about what is going on 1.79  .82
4. Because it helps me learn things about myself and others 1.80  .84

**FACTOR 2 (PASS TIME)**

1. Because I have nothing to do 2.72  1.19
2. Because it passes the time away (particularly when I am bored) 3.32  1.06
3. When I do not want to go to bed 3.45  1.05
4. Just because it is on 2.89  1.18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I WATCH LATE NIGHT TALK SHOWS.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 3 (ENTERTAINMENT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Because it's enjoyable</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because the host makes me</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Because it entertains me</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because it's exciting</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 4 (RELAXATION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. because it allows me to</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because it relaxes me</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. So I can forget about work</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or other things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous research (Rubin, 1983, 1984; Perse & Rubin, 1989; Rubin & Perse, 1987b) has shown that information and entertainment viewing motives are typically instrumental. They are defined as active, selective, intentional, and purposive motives for watching specific late night talk show content and as such are considered instrumental in nature. Pass time, as a motive, however, implies a more habitual or
nonselective motive for viewing television and, because it is not specific to content like an instrumental motive, is considered a ritualistic motive.

Relaxation, on the other hand, can be seen as both an instrumental and/or a ritualistic motive depending upon various circumstances. This study is similar to past research (Perse & Rubin, 1987a) in that such a motive was goal-directed, i.e. "to watch to relax" and the viewer watched certain content in order to relax. Television consumption for relaxation, thus, was selective and instrumental.

Pearson correlations (see Table 4.4) revealed that there was a significant relationship between talk show viewing and each of the three instrumental motives (Information, $r = .13, p < .05$; Entertainment, $r = .24, p < .001$; and Relaxation, $r = .20, p < .001$). Findings, however, did not support a relationship between talk show exposure and the fourth motive, Pass Time ($r = .06$) which represented a ritualistic rather than instrumental reason for viewing late night talk shows.

A hierarchical regression supported the link between instrumental motives and viewing late night
talk shows (see Table 4.3). All four viewing factors, three instrumental and one ritualistic, predicted 11% of the variance of late night talk show exposure. The analysis revealed, however, that the strongest predictors of talk show exposure were Entertainment ($\beta = .20, p < .01$) and Relaxation ($\beta = .15, p < .05$), of which both are instrumental. Results, then, supported a significant relationship between instrumental viewing motives and late night talk show exposure by college students.
### Table 4.3

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis:  
Demographics And Viewing Motives As Predictors Of  
Television Exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOGRAPHICS</th>
<th>Rsquare</th>
<th>SigCh</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SigF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEWING MOTIVES</th>
<th>Rsquare</th>
<th>SigCh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (Information)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 (Pass Time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 (Entertainment)</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 (Relaxation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $F(7, 337) = 6.28, \ p < .001$

***$p < .001$***
4.2 Tests of Hypothesis

Pearson correlation coefficients were used to assess the bivariate relationships among the variables. My first hypothesis, that parasocial interaction would be associated with higher levels of program viewing, was supported by the Pearson correlations. Results (see Table 4.4) revealed that a significant relationship between viewing late night talk shows and parasocial interaction does exist ($r = .31, p < .001$). The more people watch and are exposed to late night talk show programming, the more likely they may exhibit parasocial behavior with the host.

My second hypothesis anticipated that parasocial interaction would be related to higher levels of instrumental late night talk show viewing motives. Pearson correlations identified a significant relationship between the viewing motives of Information ($r = .33, p < .001$), Entertainment ($r = .53, p < .001$) and Relaxation ($r = .33, p < .001$) and parasocial interaction.
Table 4.4

Pearson Correlation Coefficients:
Viewing Motives, Talk Show Exposure, Attention, Self-Disclosure, Attributional Confidence, and Parasocial Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Info</th>
<th>Pass/Time</th>
<th>Enter</th>
<th>Relax</th>
<th>Talkexp</th>
<th>Attend</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AttConf</th>
<th>PSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass/Time</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkexp</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AttConf</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
My second hypothesis was supported by Pearson correlations which reveal a significant relationship between parasocial interaction and instrumental viewing motives. Such motives, then, are associated with parasocial interaction for those students who watch late night talk shows.

With instrumental viewing motives being correlates of parasocial interaction, my third hypothesis suggested that ritualistic viewing motives, in contrast, would be negatively related to parasocial interaction. Consistent with the belief that Pass Time as a motive was ritualistic, findings revealed that such a factor was negatively related to the other factors. Pearson correlation indicated a negative relationship between parasocial interaction and Pass Time ($r = -0.17, p < 0.001$) suggesting that parasocial interaction was not linked to ritualistic talk show consumption.

Self-disclosure, as a characteristic of late night talk show programming, was also hypothesized as a correlate of parasocial interaction. In the tradition of Berger and Calabrese's Uncertainty Reduction Theory (1987), my fourth hypothesis anticipated that perceived
host self-disclosure would create the tone of an "intimate" vicarious relationship between audience and host that would encourage parasocial interaction. Pearson correlations revealed that such a relationship between parasocial interaction and perceived host self-disclosure ($r = .24, p < .001$) does exist.

In addition, Pearson correlations suggested that parasocial interaction was associated with more familiarity with a talk show host ($r = .52, p < .001$). Increased familiarity, as measured by Clatterbuck's (1979) attributional confidence scale, enabled the respondents to feel as though they had come to "know" and understand the attitudes and beliefs held by the host and feel as though they could predict his/her behaviors. This knowledge was associated with the "interpersonal" relationship maintained each time the audience watched the host.

My last hypothesis anticipated that more attention to program content would also be a correlate of parasocial interaction. This hypothesis was supported as well. Findings presented an association between greater attention to program content and parasocial interaction ($r = .41, p < .001$).
In addition to using Pearson correlation coefficients, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to compute multivariate relationships. Hierarchical multiple regressions determined the variance accounted for and significance of relationship to parasocial interaction. Demographic variables (age, sex, and class) were entered at the first step to account for any variance they might contribute to parasocial interaction. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis is summarized in Table 4.5.

Talk show viewing, entered at step 2, accounted for 9.8% (p < .001) of the variance in parasocial interaction. Talk show viewing motives, entered at step 3, accounted for an additional 29.3% (p < .001) of the variance. At the final step, perceived host self-disclosure, familiarity, and attention increased the variance another 11.8% (p < .001) to a total of 50.9%.

The hierarchical multiple regression partially supported the study’s hypothesis. Hierarchical regression analysis supported the notion that parasocial interaction was predicted by higher levels of late night talk show exposure (beta = .11, p < .01).
Instrumental viewing motives were related to parasocial interaction. Parasocial interaction was predicted by higher levels on instrumental late night talk show viewing for those motives of information (beta = .09, p < .05) and entertainment (beta = .34, p < .001). Relaxation as a viewing motive, however, was not a significant predictor (beta = .05). So, my second hypothesis, that parasocial interaction would be predicted by higher levels of instrumental viewing motives, was partially supported.

The prediction that parasocial interaction would be predicted by lower levels of ritualistic viewing motives was not supported. Although hierarchical multiple regression analysis did support a negative relationship between ritualistic viewing motives and parasocial interaction (beta = -.06), results were not significant and thus could not support that lower levels of ritualistic would predict parasocial interaction.

Multiple regression analysis did not support a relationship between parasocial interaction and perceived host self-disclosure (beta = .10). The audience’s perceptions of self-disclosures made by the
host was not a significant predictor of their relationship to the host. Although Pearson correlation revealed a positive relationship between parasocial interaction and perceived host self-disclosure, regression analysis found no association. Thus, my hypothesis was only partially supported.

Hierarchical regressions did support that parasocial interaction was predicted by more familiarity with a late night talk show host (\(\beta = .40, p < .001\)). Pearson correlation and hierarchical regression analysis confirmed that the more familiar one is with a late night talk show host and/or with the program in general, the more likely one is to have a parasocial relationship with the host.

My last hypothesis anticipated that greater attention to program content would also predict parasocial interaction. Hierarchical regression analysis and Pearson correlation did support such a relationship (\(\beta = .11, p < .05\)).

In addition, a nonhypothesized relationship between sex and parasocial interaction suggested that men were more likely to have higher parasocial interaction scores (\(\beta = -.15, p < .01\)).
Table 4.5

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Demographics, Viewing Motives, Exposure, and Audience Attitudes as Predictors of Parasocial Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Sig Ch</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOGRAPHICS</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV VIEWING</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk show exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Talk show exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIEWING MOTIVES</strong></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (Information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 (Pass Time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 (Entertainment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 (Relaxation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES</strong></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( F(11, 341) = 32.19, p < .001 \)

***\(p < .001\)
4.3 Summary

The first goal of this study was to identify the reasons why college students watch late night talk shows. The study revealed four major reasons: Information, Pass Time, Entertainment, and Relaxation. A second goal of this study was to explain which viewing motives were related to late night talk show viewing. The results indicate that all instrumental viewing motives were related to viewing, especially Entertainment and Relaxation. Thus, more instrumental viewing motives were associated with viewing late night talk shows.

Pearson correlation coefficients supported all six of my hypotheses; however, hierarchical multiple regression analysis supported only four. A summary of the study's hypotheses is presented in Table 4.6.

My first hypothesis was that parasocial interaction would be predicted by higher levels of program viewing. This was supported. My second and third hypotheses stated that parasocial interaction would be predicted by higher levels of instrumental late night talk show viewing motives and lower levels
of ritualistic late night talk show viewing motives. These hypotheses were partially supported. Pearson correlations indicated support. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis, however, found that parasocial interaction was predicted by instrumental viewing motives; however, only two of the three instrumental motives revealed a significant relationship. Ritualistic viewing motives were not a significant contributor in the regression.

My fourth hypothesis was that parasocial interaction would be predicted by higher levels of perceived host self-disclosure. This hypothesis was partially supported. Although Pearson correlation identified a significant positive relationship between parasocial interaction and perceived host self-disclosure, self-disclosure was not a significant contributor in the regression analysis.

My fifth and sixth hypotheses stated that parasocial interaction would also be predicted by more familiarity with the host and more attention to program content. Both these hypotheses were supported.
Table 4.6
Summary Of Study's Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>PSI r</th>
<th>beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Parasocial interaction will be predicted by higher levels of program viewing</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Parasocial interaction will be predicted by higher levels of instrumental late night talk show viewing motives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (Information)</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 (Entertainment)</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 (Relaxation)</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Parasocial interaction will be predicted by lower levels of ritualistic late night talk show viewing motives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 (Pass Time)</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Parasocial interaction will be predicted by higher levels of perceived host self-disclosure</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Parasocial interaction will be predicted more familiarity with the host</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Parasocial interaction will be predicted by more attention to program content</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 373  ** p < .01  *** p < .001  * p < .05
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to identify the viewing motives associated with late night talk show viewing and examine their relationship to parasocial interaction. In addition, variables such as self-disclosure, familiarity, and attention were included as correlates of late night talk show exposure and parasocial interaction.

In this chapter, the assumptions made in the hypotheses are examined in relation to previous research and in terms of their implications to uses and gratifications research. In addition, results of this study provided considerations for future research that may provide greater insight into the audience's role in television consumption. Lastly, the methodology used in this study was evaluated and previous research provided methodological considerations that were discussed.
5.1 Late Night Talk Show Viewing

Results indicated that 86.3% of the sample watched late night talk shows. Respondents tended to watch an average of 3.74 episodes of late night talk shows a week and admitted that they had watched their favorite late night talk show for an average of 3.53 years. The most watched late night talk show was Arsenio Hall. David Letterman was reported as the second most watched talk show while Johnny Carson came in third on the list. Respectively, Rick Dees, Howard Stern, Byron Allen, Bob Costas and Jay Leno were watched considerably less. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate their favorite late night talk show. The favorite was David Letterman while viewers seem to like Arsenio Hall almost as well.

These findings were not surprising. Arsenio Hall and David Letterman cater to younger audiences, unlike Johnny Carson, and provide entertainment for most of my sample which consisted of college students with an average mean age of 20.18 years. Results and pre-tests of this research did indicate that younger people, rather than older, tend to watch late night talk shows.
In addition, both Arsenio Hall and David Letterman incorporate a diversified list of popular guests that provide fad-oriented entertainment to excite their audiences. Both talk shows, although aired late at night, provide college students with the perfect atmosphere to unwind after a long day of studying.

Daily television viewing was measured and revealed that the average viewing time for the sample was 2.00 hours per day or about 14 hours a week. Realizing that each late night talk show episode is 1 hour and that they watch an average of 3.74 episodes a week, the sample would spend approximately 20% of their total television viewing time watching late night talk shows. With total viewing time for late night talk shows being 5 hours per week (they only air on weekdays), students watched approximately 80% of the late night talk show airing time. These results were important for they significantly accounted for much of the total viewing time of college students. Realizing that general television exposure incorporates a variety of different program genres, it is interesting that late night talk shows make up so much of the total viewing time. They clearly are a popular genre with college students.
5.2 Viewing Motives

Past research (Kippax & Murray, 1980; Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1979; Perse & Rubin, 1989; Rubin, 1981, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987a) has focused on the concept of audience activity in terms of the relationship between television uses and gratifications. One area of this study, in particular, examines television viewing motives and their relationship to parasocial interaction.

Windahl (1981) and Rubin (1984) argued that television use varies depending on the audience member’s needs. Thus, television use could be predicted from the perceived needs of the audience member. Windahl and Rubin identified two general television viewing types: habitual or ritualistic television use that is not content specific and instrumental or goal-directed television use that represents active selection of program content by the audience. Past research has used the categories of instrumental and ritualistic viewing motives to predict specific television use.
According to results, college students tend to watch late night talk shows for instrumental viewing motives, particularly those of entertainment and relaxation. Relaxation was included as an instrumental viewing motive because it was highly correlated with instrumental rather than ritualistic motives. Pre-tests revealed that many students watch late night talk shows intentionally to relax after a day of studying. In addition, previous research on soap opera involvement (Rubin & Perse, 1987a) has supported its use as instrumental.

Although both instrumental and ritualistic viewing motives were included as reasons for watching late night talk shows, instrumental motives were the most prevalent. There were four significant motives that accounted for 46% of the variance of late night talk show exposure. Instrumental motives accounted for 32.5% of the variance. Generally, people actively selected late night talk show programming with the intention of satisfying some gratification.

Findings suggest that relaxation and entertainment are the two strongest motives for talk show viewing. Information, as an instrumental motive, was only
partially related to talk show exposure. Such a finding was probably due to the fact that most people do not watch late night talk shows for information. Late night talk show programming is not news-oriented and relies heavily on humor and sarcasm to relate information. As such, it would be difficult to rely on the information presented.

Information, however, might be a motive for watching specific late night programs. For example, Arsenio Hall may be watched for informational reasons more than other shows because its format centers around the guests. He includes a number of well-known guests who provide interesting information for the viewers. David Letterman, as well as the others, do not include as many guests and rely on host-audience interaction as the driving force behind their popularity. Future research might consider whether different motives are related to watching specific late night talks shows.

In contrast to finding a positive relationship between instrumental viewing motives and late night talk show exposure, results revealed a negative relationship between ritualistic viewing motives and late night talk show exposure, although it was not
significant. Rubin (1981) found similar findings in that viewing to pass time was negatively related to news and talk programming. Based on pretests, however, this result was not surprising. Many respondents claimed they watched late night talk shows out of habit, because it was on, or because it was something to do. Many said they did not really watch the show but had it on because they did not want to go to bed or because it was the only thing on. This indicates that there are ritualistic reasons for viewing late night talk shows and, although they may not be as salient as instrumental reasons for viewing late night talk shows, they, nonetheless, provide important insights into late night talk show exposure.

5.3 Parasocial Interaction

Horton and Wohl (1956) described parasocial interaction as a relationship of "friendship" or "intimacy" between a television personae and a television viewer. According to Rubin and Rubin (1985) "people and media are coequal communication
and provide similar gratifications" (p. 59). Thus, like social relationships, parasocial relationships develop when a viewer feels that he/she "knows" and "understands" a media personality in the same way they know his/her personal friends (Perse & Rubin, 1989). As such, Perse and Rubin (1989) suggest that parasocial interaction "develops over a period of time and is enhanced when media presentations resemble interpersonal interaction" (p. 60).

Some uses and gratifications research has tried to explain how uncertainty in mediated relationships can be reduced by analyzing people's active and passive uses of television. According to Berger and Calabrese (1975) intimate relationships are formed when uncertainty between the parties is reduced. In mass communication research, by reducing uncertainty with a performer (i.e. "getting to know him/her") through information exchange, the audience is able to predict that performer's behavior thus making a "relationship" more likely. Uncertainty reduction, as argued by Rubin and Perse (1989), "is a basic aspect of parasocial interaction" (p. 74).

In this study, audience perceptions of self-
disclosure and familiarity were studied in terms of their ability to reduce uncertainty and predict parasocial interaction.

In this research, results indicated a significant relationship between talk show exposure and parasocial interaction. Horton and Wohl (1956) found a relationship between extended media exposure and parasocial interaction. They argue that consistency of presentation is one of the necessary elements for the development of parasocial interaction. As audiences watch television programs consistently over time, they can become familiar with the content and might be better able to predict behaviors, attitudes, plots, and situations. This supports Berger and Calabrese’s Uncertainty Reduction Theory that reducing uncertainty through knowledge and familiarity may result in relationship development or, in mass communication research, parasocial interaction.

Thus, parasocial interaction is related to general television and late night talk show exposure either directly or indirectly. Perse and Rubin (1989) argued that indeed television exposure is indirectly related to parasocial interaction with attributional confidence
to parasocial interaction with attributional confidence (familiarity) intervening between the two.

Parasocial interaction was also related to familiarity. There was a relationship between length of exposure to a program, attributional confidence or knowledge (familiarity) one has about the program or characters, and parasocial interaction. Results indicated that length of exposure was associated with increased familiarity with program content which in turn, helped predict parasocial interaction. In other words, late night talk show exposure may be indirectly related to parasocial interaction through attributional confidence.

It does not seem surprising that one gains more knowledge of the host or program, as he/she becomes more familiar with the content and might be able to predict behaviors and attitudes. Uncertainty reduction theory states that familiarity does reduces uncertainty. As uncertainty is reduced relationships develop (Berger & Calabrese, 1987). Thus, it is not hard to see how parasocial interaction is related to attributional confidence. This indirect relationship might help explain one particular result of this
research. Findings indicated that there was no relationship between parasocial interaction and self-disclosure.

As Altman and Taylor (1973) explain, if parasocial interaction parallels interpersonal interaction, a sense of intimacy and self-disclosure should follow from consistent and regular interaction. The concept of self-disclosure requires the exchange of personal information in a relationship that is consistent, strong, and usually progressively intimate. This study hypothesized such a relationship in a mediated situation. The assumption that perceived host self-disclosure would lead to parasocial interaction seems justifiable.

Little research has been done on the relationship between self-disclosure and parasocial interaction in mediated interaction. Horton and Wohl (1956) and Rubin and Perse (1987b) found that parasocial interaction was related to program attention, and attention to self-disclosure by the newscaster, among others. Results from this research, however, indicate only partial support for this relationship. The reason for this may be due to an indirect link similar to that
of talk show exposure and parasocial interaction. Self-disclosure was related highly to attributional confidence and thus may be only indirectly related to parasocial interaction.

In accordance with this study, Rubin and Perse (1987a), believed that parasocial interaction indicated active and involved television use. In a similar study, Rubin and Perse (1987b) found that greater audience activity was linked to instrumental viewing motives and parasocial interaction.

However, only information and entertainment motives were related to parasocial interaction. Relaxation was only partially supported as a significant predictor of parasocial interaction. The reason for this may be because relaxation is sometimes seen as a ritualistic motive. In this study, ritualistic viewing motives were negatively related to parasocial interaction. Despite its relationship to parasocial interaction, relaxation does represent a relevant and important motive for late night talk show viewing.

Similar studies have made the same association between instrumental viewing motives and parasocial
instrumental television use (particularly information viewing motives) predicted parasocial interaction with local news personalities. Rubin and Perse (1987a), in a study of soap opera viewing, found that parasocial interaction was linked to more instrumental motives.

As mentioned previously, this research found that instrumental viewing motives were positively related to parasocial interaction. On the other hand, results partially supported a negative relationship between ritualistic viewing motives and parasocial interaction. A reason for this may be that ritualistic television use is not specific to the content and thus does not encourage the reduction of uncertainty or the formation of relationships. Without intention of reducing uncertainty or satisfying gratifications, parasocial interaction would be limited. In addition, as Rubin and Perse (1987a) state "clearly the appeal of a particular program that makes it an avid audience member's favorite is associated with more instrumental or goal-directed involvement" (p. 264).

Some research has indicated that parasocial interaction is a "normal consequence of television viewing" (Perse & Rubin, 1989, p. 61). In other words,
viewing" (Perse & Rubin, 1989, p. 61). In other words, normal people would be prone to develop parasocial relationships as a result of media use. Findings of this study indicate that this may not be true. This study proposed that there are various characteristics of television use that predict parasocial interaction while there are other characteristics that do not.

Instrumental viewing motives proved to be significant factors predicting parasocial interaction. Ritualized viewing motives, on the other hand, were negatively related to parasocial interaction, although not significantly. These findings indicate viewers who watch for television for ritualistic reasons may not develop a parasocial relationship with a media personality.

In a study on soap operas, Rubin and Perse (1987a) suggested that parasocial interaction was a form of program involvement associated with, among other things, higher levels of attention to program content. As mentioned previously, parasocial interaction may indicate an active and involving television use (Levy & Windahl, 1985). As stated by Levy and Windal (1985), attention to plot and characters indicates greater
cognitive activity and involvement, then parasocial interaction may be predicted by attention as a form of active involvement in television use. Rubin and Perse (1987a) found that viewing attention was related to parasocial interaction along with perceived realism of soap opera content. Thus, attention is either directly or indirectly linked to parasocial interaction. Results of this research provide similar findings. Attention was related to parasocial interaction as an aspect of instrumental media use.

5.4 Methodological Limitations

Much of uses and gratification research focuses on audience behavior and television use. Instead of studying the effects of mass communication by examining the medium itself, uses and gratifications starts by analyzing the audience itself. Usually a survey method is used to ask respondents about their attitudes and behaviors in television consumption.

Rubin (1981) states that uses and gratifications research fails to recognize that gratifications can be latent or manifest. Thus, although not recorded,
than previously thought. Many needs are latent or unconscious and may not be reflected in a conscious attitude or behavior. Without recognizing these needs, respondents would not be able to provide accurate reflections of themselves. The may pose a limitation of this research.

Another methodological consideration when analyzing audience behavior is recognizing that each individual is complex in cognitive ability. When looking at viewing motives, research must take into consideration that respondents may have more than one motive for television use. The term "use" tends to reflect "one" use for television consumption only. The pre-tests done prior to this research show that students watch late night talk shows for a variety of reasons depending on present situations. Students also responded that they watch for different motives simultaneously such as to be entertained and to pass the time. Due to these methodological inconsistencies, it is important that uses and gratifications research broaden their frame of reference and incorporate measures that reflect the cognitive complexity and diversity of each individual.
My sample consisted of 432 college students and although students are not usually a representative sample, they proved useful in this study. Pre-tests showed that older persons do not watch late night talk shows and that college students make up most of late night talk show audiences. Approximately 81% of college students surveyed said that watched late night talk shows. My results, however, could have been more representative had a regional or longitudinal study been done. A longitudinal study may have been hard though, since television programs, especially late night talk shows, come and go so frequently. It would be difficult for respondents to remember attitudes and behaviors affected by talks shows of the past. In addition, my sample could have been more representative had it been random. Students were either required to fill out the survey or given extra credit within various communication classes. Although students held a variety of majors, the nonrandom sample make the findings difficult to generalize to the total student population.

Another limitation of this research centers on the
significantly related to late night talk show exposure. This study may not have exhausted the list of ritualistic motives for viewing late night talk shows. Respondents thus may not be able to include all of their reasons for viewing late night talk shows.

5.5 Future Research

The results of this study suggest many directions for future research. The introduction of familiarity as a concept is one area that deserves much attention. What does this concept add to other areas of mass communication research? What aspects of late night talk shows contribute to familiarity? Is there a relationship between familiarity and other media effects?

In this study, the concept of familiarity was defined as a viewer's ability to predict the attitudes and behaviors of a television personality. Familiarity was measured using Clatterbuck's (1979) attributional confidence scale and was related to "understanding and knowing" another and becoming familiar with them. Respondents were asked to indicate their perceived
Respondents were asked to indicate their perceived ability to predict the attitudes and behaviors of their favorite late night talk show host. Future research would benefit by conducting a content analysis to identify the different aspects of late night talk show programming that may contribute to familiarity.

Altman and Taylor (1973) argue that intimacy and self-disclosure should follow from consistent interaction. Regular interaction, according to Berger and Calabrese (1975), helps reduce uncertainty in relationship settings providing for greater familiarity between those involved. Research should examine the relationship between self-disclosure and familiarity as well as other characteristics of late night talk show programming which will be discussed later.

Another area of interest is whether familiarity could be included as a viewing motive. Little research has been done in this area yet some studies have looked at similarity as a motivator of relationship formation (Brewer, 1968). He found a high correlation between perceived similarity and attraction. Attraction, in turn, is related to relationship development. Similarity may be related to familiarity in that it is
similar to you. If such is the case, future research may find evidence suggesting that familiarity with a program type may motivate television exposure. These ideas raise a lot of interesting questions that may help users and gratifications gain greater insight into the appeal of certain programming and the motivation behind television consumption.

Results of this study reveal that familiarity is related to parasocial interaction; however, what is its relationship to other media effects such as news awareness, political effects, and the success of spinoffs? Is there a relationship between familiarity and liking? Uncertainty Reduction Theory (Berger & Calabrese (1975) states that relationships are formed when uncertainty between those involved is reduced. The reduction of uncertainty, they argue, increases familiarity and the eventual liking of the other.

Such research proposes that becoming parasocially involved with a media personality might lead to greater familiarity and liking of that television performer. Television exposure may increase, resulting in more awareness and more loyalty to specific program content. Findings as these may become important when creating
political campaigns and in making the public aware of important and relevant issues.

Another area which research has not considered is the relationship of format and production techniques to late night talk show viewing. Do repetition, laughter, camera movements, lighting, and other aspects of format/production influence late night talk show exposure? Is there a relationship between format/production techniques and familiarity? Could this relationship influence the development of parasocial interaction? Once research has been conducted in these areas, it would be interesting to then compare late night talk shows to other entertainment programs. Do the same relationships exist or are late night talk shows unique in their format/production?

Parasocial interaction has been studied as it relates to mass media use (Horton & Wohl, 1956), news programming (Perse, 1990a, 1990b), and soap opera entertainment (Rubin & Perse, 1987a); however, research examining its influence on other media effects has been scarce. How does parasocial interaction relate to political involvement and news awareness? Rubin and
Perse (1987a) found that parasocial interaction was related to behavioral and cognitive involvement. As a parasocial relationship develops, involvement increases. Is, then, involvement related to awareness, either directly or indirectly through television exposure or familiarity? Recognizing that increased familiarity might lead to greater awareness, diffusion of innovation research may benefit in terms of finding new ways to promote development through awareness.

5.6 Summary

In conclusion, this investigation revealed that late night talk show viewing was related to instrumental viewing motives, particularly those of entertainment and relaxation. In addition, instrumental viewing motives were related to parasocial interaction. Parasocial interaction was also associated with perceived host self-disclosure, familiarity, and attention to program content. Results such as these provide relevant information suggesting the "active" nature of the audience and establish the "individuality" of television viewing. Parasocial
"individuality" of television viewing. Parasocial interaction, as a media consequence, is dependent upon the individual's goals and needs and not merely by television exposure. Thus, research examining television content and exposure solely may need to include the audience and its relationship to television consumption as a means for more comprehensive study.
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APPENDIX

SURVEY QUESTIONS

WE ARE INTERESTED IN STUDYING LATE NIGHT TALK SHOWS AND WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR HELP BY ANSWERING THESE QUESTIONS. YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE ANONYMOUS AND KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

First, here are a few questions about the amount of your television viewing.

1. Yesterday, about how many hours of television did you watch?

______________ hours

2. You may not have watched the same amount of television yesterday as you usually do. About how many hours of television do you usually watch on the average weekday?

______________ hours

3. Do you ever watch a late night talk show? (Please circle your response.)
   -Yes
   -No

   (If no, please turn to page #107)
4. About how many days a week do you usually watch the following late night talk shows?

A.) Arsenio Hall  5  4  3  2  1  0  times a week
B.) Johnny Carson  5  4  3  2  1  0  times a week
C.) David Letterman  5  4  3  2  1  0  times a week
D.) Rick Dees  5  4  3  2  1  0  times a week
E.) Byron Allen  5  4  3  2  1  0  times a week
F.) Other  5  4  3  2  1  0  times a week

Here are several reasons people have given for watching late night talk shows. Please tell me how much each reason is like your own reason for watching late night talk shows--EXACTLY like your own, A LOT like your own, SOMewhat like your own, NOT MUCH like your own or NOT AT ALL like your own reason. Please circle your response.

I WATCH LATE NIGHT TALK SHOWS . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exactly</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Much</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Because it's enjoyable. .  5  4  3  2  1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exactly</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Much</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Because it's exciting. . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Because it passes the time away (particularly when I am bored). . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Because the host makes me laugh . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Because the guests make me laugh . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Because I have nothing better to do. . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Because it relaxes me . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Just because it is on . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Because it entertains me . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>So I won't have to be alone . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exactly</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Not Much</td>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. So I can talk with others about what is going on . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. to learn about issues affecting people like me . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. So I can pass the information I've learned on to other people. . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When I do not want to go to bed . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. So I can be with others who are watching. . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. So I can forget about work or other things . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Because it helps me learn things about myself and others . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Because I like the guests . . .</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Because it is something to do with friends... 5 4 3 2 1

20. So I can get away from the family or others... 5 4 3 2 1

21. Because it is a habit, just something to do... 5 4 3 2 1

22. Because it allows me to unwind... 5 4 3 2 1

Now, here are some things people might do while they are watching television. How often do you do these when you watch late night talk shows? If you do it ALWAYS, circle a 5, if you do it FREQUENTLY, circle a 4, if you do it SOMETIMES, circle a 3, if you do it RARELY, circle a 2, and if you do it NEVER, circle a 1.

Agree Somewhat

Strongly

Disagree

Strongly

Agree Agree Somewhat Disagree Disagree

1. I watch my favorite late night talk show from beginning to end. 5 4 3 2 1
2. I often make comments to others about the program while I am watching my favorite late night talk show.  
   Agree | Agree | Somewhat | Disagree | Disagree
   5     | 4     | 3        | 2        | 1

3. I am often thinking about something else when I am watching my favorite late night talk show.  
   Agree | Agree | Somewhat | Disagree | Disagree
   5     | 4     | 3        | 2        | 1

4. I often miss what is happening on the program when I watch my favorite late night talk show.  
   Agree | Agree | Somewhat | Disagree | Disagree
   5     | 4     | 3        | 2        | 1

5. My mind often wanders when I watch my favorite late night talk show.  
   Agree | Agree | Somewhat | Disagree | Disagree
   5     | 4     | 3        | 2        | 1
Agree Somewhat and
Strongly  Disagree  Strongly
Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Disagree

6. I pay close attention to the program when I watch my favorite late night talk show.  5  4  3  2  1

7. I listen carefully when I watch my favorite late night talk show.  5  4  3  2  1

Which of the following is your favorite late night talk show? (If you do not have a favorite, which one do you watch the most?) Please circle your favorite.

Arsenio Hall
Johnny Carson
david Letterman
Rick Dees
Byron Allen
Other __________

How long have you been watching your favorite late night talk show?

__________ years
Now, think about your favorite late night talk show host. Please circle whether you STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, AGREE SOMewhat/DISAGREE SOMEWHAT, DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE with the following statements.

Agree Somewhat
and
Strongly
Agree Agree Somewhat Disagree Strongly

1. My favorite late night talk show host makes me feel comfortable, as if I am with a friend.  5  4  3  2  1

2. My favorite talk show host is a natural, down-to-earth person.  5  4  3  2  1

3. I look forward to seeing my favorite late night talk show host every night that he/she is on.  5  4  3  2  1
4. I would not go see my favorite late night talk show host if he/she made a personal appearance. 5  4  3  2  1

5. If my favorite late night talk show host appeared on another television program or in a movie, I would watch it. 5  4  3  2  1

6. My favorite late night talk show host seems to understand the kind of things I want to know. 5  4  3  2  1
7. If I saw a story about my favorite late night talk show host in a magazine or newspaper, I would read it. 5 4 3 2 1

8. I miss seeing my favorite talk show host when he/she is ill or on vacation. 5 4 3 2 1

9. I would like to meet my favorite late night talk show host in person. 5 4 3 2 1
10. I feel sorry for my favorite late night talk show host when he/she makes a mistake. 5 4 3 2 1

11. My favorite late night talk show host is not very attractive. 5 4 3 2 1

12. I get to know more about my favorite talk show host during the monologue. 5 4 3 2 1

13. I like when the host talks directly to the audience. 5 4 3 2 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. I like when the camera shows close-ups of my favorite late night talk show host. 5 4 3 2 1

15. I like when my favorite late night talk show host goes into the studio audience. 5 4 3 2 1

For the next set of questions, circle the extent to which you feel that your favorite late night talk show host has revealed **him/herself** to you. Again, please tell me whether you STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, SOMewhat AGREE/SOMewhat DISAGREE, DISAGREE, or STRONGLy DISAGREE with the following statements.
1. My favorite late night talk show host expresses personal views on the present government—the president, government, policies.  5  4  3  2  1

2. My favorite talk show host reveals views on religion—personal religious views.  5  4  3  2  1

3. My favorite talk show host reveals his/her taste in clothing.  5  4  3  2  1
Agree Somewhat and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. My favorite talk show host reveals his/her favorite ways of spending spare time, such as hunting, reading, sports events, parties, dancing, etc. 5 4 3 2 1

5. My favorite talk show host reveals what he/she finds to be the worst pressures and strains in his/her work. 5 4 3 2 1

6. My favorite talk show host reveals the kinds of things that make him/her just furious. 5 4 3 2 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My favorite talk show host intimately discloses who he/she really is, openly and fully.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My favorite talk show host often discloses intimate, personal things without hesitation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel that when my favorite late night talk show host self-discloses, he/she is providing accurate reflections of who he/she really is.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. My favorite late night talk show host usually talks about him/herself for long periods of time.  5  4  3  2  1

11. Once my favorite talk show host gets started, he/she intimately and fully reveals through self-disclosures.  5  4  3  2  1

12. My favorite late night talk show host does not control his/her self-disclosures of personal or intimate things.  5  4  3  2  1
13. My favorite late night talk show host is sincere when he/she reveals personal feelings and experiences. 5 4 3 2 1

14. I am confident of my general ability to predict how my favorite late night talk show host would behave. 5 4 3 2 1

15. I know the values my favorite late night talk show host holds. 5 4 3 2 1

16. I know my favorite late night talk show host's attitudes. 5 4 3 2 1
Agree Somewhat and
Strongly Disagree Strongly
Agree Agree Somewhat Disagree Disagree

17. I know my favorite late night talk show host's feelings and emotions.  5  4  3  2  1

18. I can empathize with (share) the way my favorite late night talk show host feels about him/herself.  5  4  3  2  1

19. I know my favorite late night talk show host well.  5  4  3  2  1

20. My favorite late night talk show host does not talk often about him/herself.  5  4  3  2  1
21. My favorite late night talk show host typically reveals information about him/herself without intending to.  5  4  3  2  1

22. My favorite late night talk show host often discusses feelings about him/herself.  5  4  3  2  1

23. My favorite late night talk show host rarely expresses his/her personal beliefs and opinions.  5  4  3  2  1
DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Finally, please answer a few questions about yourself.

12. How old are you? (As of your last birthday).

________ yrs.

13. What sex are you? Please circle your response.

Male ......... 1
Female........ 2

14. What is your year in school? Please circle your response.

Freshman................. 1
Sophomore................ 2
Junior.................. 3
Senior................... 4
Continuing Senior......... 5
Graduate student.......... 6
Other..................... 7

15. What is your major? _________________

Thank you for your time.