BEA
Educating for Tomorrow's Media

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The Uses and Gratifications of Media Migration: Investigating the Activities, Motivations, and Predictors of Migration Behaviors Originating in Entertainment Television

Drew D. Shade, Sarah Kornfield, and Mary Beth Oliver

Increasingly, media consumers follow entertainment across media; migrating from one medium to the next seeking to fulfill different needs. Using survey methods (N = 444), this exploratory research examines the underlying elements of media migration by studying the uses and gratifications of migration behavior. Specifically, findings of this survey identify migration activities, motivations, and predictors of migration. Results suggest that several of the top migration activities are strongly tied to Internet use. Findings indicate that media migration is motivated by different needs, including entertainment, escape, enlightenment, and more content-congruent exposure. Finally, amidst various predictors, the need for content-congruent exposure emerged as a strong predictor of migration.

Entertainment is possible through a variety of media: one can read a book, turn on the television, surf the Internet, play a video game, and so on. Increasingly, however, audience members engage with multiple media, migrating from one medium to the next as they consume entertainment (Ha & Chan-Olmsted, 2004; Lin & Cho, 2010). As audience members of one entertainment text move—following that specific text—into other media, they engage in what we conceptualize as media migration. When watching a television program, migration activities might involve purchasing a previous season on Blu-ray, reading a book that the program is based on, chatting

Drew D. Shade *(Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University) is an assistant professor in the Department of English and Communication at the University of Cincinnati Blue Ash College. His research interests include the positive effects of prosocial media and migration behaviors across entertainment media.*

Sarah Kornfield *(Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University) is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at Hope College. Her research focuses on gender representations in entertainment media.*

Mary Beth Oliver *(Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison) is a distinguished professor and co-director of the Media Effects Research Laboratory in the College of Communications at The Pennsylvania State University. Her research is in the area of media psychology, with an emphasis on emotion and social cognition.*

Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media 59(2), 2015, pp. 318–341
DOI: 10.1080/08838151.2015.1029121 *ISSN: 0883-8151 print/1550-6878 online*

about the program online, surfing the Internet for more information, sharing with others via social media immediately after viewing, talking to others about it the next day at work/school, making a YouTube video about the series, buying an app that relates to the program, and a variety of other actions. This study examines migration from entertainment television programs to different media as individuals seek to fulfill particular entertainment needs.

Specifically, we explore the possible uses and gratifications (U&G) that motivate migration, the activities associated with migration, and a range of variables that predict migration behavior. Our study takes entertainment television as a starting place and explores why audience members transition from television to other media. As such, the findings of this research are particular to one migration type. However, given the proliferation of new media—for example, Netflix now hosts original programming—and the ways in which news programming often functions as entertainment (Thussu, 2007), this study has implications for migration beyond the transition from entertainment television to other media.

Uses and Gratifications: An Overview

Seeking to understand audiences and their media migration, this study draws upon uses and gratifications' audience-based approach to understand "*why* and *how* people use media" (Lee, 2013, p. 301; Katz, 1959; Ruggiero, 2000). As such, audiences are theorized as active and purposeful, using media in goal-oriented ways as U&G focuses on "what people do with media, instead of what the media do to people" (Rubin, 2008, p. 168; Klapper, 1963). Audience's use of media is further theorized as motivated or driven by specific reasons and cognitive and/or affective needs, wants, and/or interests (Levy & Windahl, 1985; Rubin, 2008). For example, individuals use the Internet to pass time, for information seeking, for convenience and entertainment, and for interpersonal utility (Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). By studying audience's motivations and media use, in the mediating contexts of other individual differences and "structural determinants" (Lee, 2013, p. 301), U&G research can then reasonably predict how motivations affect media use (Jeffres & Atkin, 1996; Lee, 2013; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000; Rubin & Step, 2000).

Criticism of U&G research has questioned the assumption of active audiences and their ability to self-report regarding motivations and media use (Katz, 1987; Ruggiero, 2000). However, the current research focuses explicitly on clear demonstrations of audience activity—how and why audiences stop watching television and start using other media—and a variety of empirical research (e.g., Brener, Billy, & Grady, 2003; Satia-Abouta et al., 2003) has recently demonstrated the validity of self-report methodology (Lee, 2013). Additionally, a variety of migration activities involve Internet usage, which Sundar and Limperos (2013) identify as the "pinnacle" example of active audiences (p. 504). Indeed, they note that "Internet audiences are so active" that "we seldom refer to them as 'audiences,'" instead calling them "users" (Sundar & Limperos, 2013, pp. 504–505). Further criticisms

emphasize the ''lack of clarity'' or discreteness between components such as needs, motives, and behaviors (Ruggiero, 2000). The current research clearly distinguishes between needs, motives, and behaviors, understanding media migration activities to be behaviors that are motivated by specific needs. Indeed, part of this research's contribution as an exploratory study is to develop an initial list of audience behaviors that comprise media migration and ascertain through survey methods which activities are more popularly enacted by audience members.

Literature Review

In working to understand media migration, U&G's key concepts of activity and motivation and U&G's approach to new media technologies specifically undergird this research. The U&G approach postulates that audiences are essentially active, recognizing their own needs and selecting entertainment to gratify specific needs and/or desires (Blumer, 1979; Diddi & LaRose, 2006; Katz, Gurevitch, & Haas, 1973; Lin, 2008; Palmgreen, 1984). Activity is seen as a voluntary, selective orientation to the communication process. In other words, activity concerns how audiences use media based on motivations and individual preferences (Rubin, 2009). This element is evident when audiences exhibit ''varying kinds and degrees of activity'' (Levy & Windahl, 1985, p. 51). Within U&G research, we see media migration as part of these different types of activities. The behavioral components of media migration, in which audiences shift—at the very least—their attention from one medium to another certainly demonstrates the audience's activeness: these viewers not only choose among a plethora of television channels, but choose to migrate from television into other media (Lin, 2002; Sunstein, 2007). Given the behavioral components of media use, scholars have suggested that further examination into media enjoyment could benefit from including behavioral indicators as additional conceptualizations (Nabi & Krcmar, 2004). This introductory research addresses the issue of behavioral indicators, understanding migration as a behavioral indicator of media enjoyment.

Migration not only functions as a behavioral indicator of media enjoyment, but also demonstrates selectivity among a plethora of new media devices and their varying array of affordances. New convergent media are not productively conceptualized as ''monolithic,'' rather, it is ''more useful to disaggregate such media into their constituent affordances,'' thereby studying the uses and gratifications of new media's varying capabilities (Sundar & Limperos, 2013, p. 505). Here, we recognize new media's fluidity (Lin, 2008). That is, analogous to a liquid, convergent media can ''take on a different communication modality'' upon demand, flowing between ''text, data, graphics, audio, and video'' (Lin, 2008, p. 87). As Lin (2008) demonstrates, the Internet is a prime example of communication technology's fluidity as it can ''switch from one media mode to another'' and can even ''recoil'' upon itself, returning at the user's request to previously downloaded sites (p. 87). This fluidity is an important aspect of migration behaviors. For example, when television

audience members migrate to the Internet, they might engage in information-seeking by visiting an information-based site, such as IMDB.com, to learn about previous television series an actor has starred in or they might visit the television series' Web site to play an interactive game involving the series' characters. Both migration behaviors involve the Internet and yet these are wildly disparate migration behaviors that engage in different Internet affordances and are likely predicated by different motivations.

Following U&G's theoretical understanding of audience activity and seeking to contribute to U&G by developing an initial list of behaviors associated with migration activities, our first research question asks:

RQ_1: What types of migration activities do television viewers engage in?

Moreover, recognizing the multiple capabilities of fluid media, especially Internet-based media, we developed our first hypothesis:

H_1: Given the Internet's fluidity, viewers will migrate to media platforms that are primarily Internet-based.

One goal of U&G research is to understand the motivations that audiences of different media possess. Motivation is mediated by several factors including ''social and psychological characteristics, societal structure, social groups and relationships, and personal involvement'' (Rubin, 2009, p. 148). These factors affect one's uses for entertainment and the gratifications received from that exposure (Rubin, 2009). Due to the agency ascribed to audience members, U&G posits that the effects associated with media exposure are derived as much from the audience member's motivations or ''use'' for the media as from the media content (Ruggiero, 2000). Prior U&G research focuses primarily on the motivations of a singular ''use'' (e.g., Kaye & Johnson, 2002; Ko, Cho, & Roberts, 2005; Lee, 2013); however, this study extends the application of U&G by studying the motivations and gratifications for multiple ''uses.'' That is, this research seeks to understand the interplay of motivations as audience members migrate from television to other media. As such, following U&G's theoretical understanding of motivation, our second research question asks:

RQ_2: What motivations can be found for migration behaviors?

Motivation is essential to understanding migration because ''it influences the selective and active manner in which [audiences] participate in communication and the possible outcomes of the encounters'' (Rubin, 2009, p. 150). While no exhaustive list of media use motivations exists, U&G research has identified key motivations for different media (Rubin, 2008); for example, electronic bulletin board use is primarily motivated by the need for informational learning and socialization (James, Worting, & Forrest, 1995). Concerning media selection/consumption, an individual's motives to select and attend to a message and the extent of those

motives will influence possible effects. Often at the forefront of ''new media and technological advancements'' (Lee, 2013, p. 301), U&G research demonstrates that new media use (usually through the Internet) often follows an instrumental orientation—as opposed to a ritualized one—since this use is more active and purposive (Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). Here, we develop our second hypothesis:

H_2: Given the Internet's instrumental orientation and prior association with informational learning, content-based information seeking will motivate media migration.

This exploratory research of migration has implications for additional media perspectives, including diffusion of innovations (Rogers, 2003). Essentially, when a technology's innovations are diffused, overlapping with other new technologies, then ''the adoption of one technology product'' can prompt ''the adoption'' of other similar technologies, creating a ''technology cluster'' (Lin, 2009, p. 887; Rogers, 2003). As such, early adopters are most likely the primary social group who would employ migration behaviors on a consistent, if not regular, basis (Bohlmann, Calantone, & Zhao, 2010). However, it is important to note that media migration supports the notion of technology adoption (Jeffres & Atkin, 1996), but not necessarily media substitution, since old media are not always being displaced (Lin, 2004). Media migration allows for the inclusion of both old and new media, as it is up to the audience member which media to use, in which way, and how often. Given the capacities of technology in the current media landscape, this research specifically explores the motivations that prompt audiences to seek out different media and the pleasures derived from these varied media uses.

Additionally, this research works to identify predictors of migration. U&G research has identified several components that factor into predictors: 1) individual differences, 2) program characteristics, 3) media habits/preferences, and 4) cognitive and affective aspects. First, individual differences (e.g., lifestyle, personality, and loneliness) significantly influence media behavior (Rubin, 2009). Specifically, loneliness has been positively correlated with Internet use (Kraut et al., 1998; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). Moreover, one's age, gender, and other characteristics play a role in media selection and entertainment activities (Weaver & Wilson, 2009). Essentially, these individual differences (e.g., one's age and/or how lonely one is) influence what type of media content and how much media content an individual uses. Considering that loneliness is a strong predictor of Internet use and our first hypothesis (that television viewers will primarily migrate to Internet based platforms), we develop our third hypothesis:

H_3: Loneliness will be positively correlated with migration activities.

Second, with program characteristics, the type of content and the reasons for content selection can play a role in media usage (Rubin, 2009). For example, some television series are episodic, featuring open-and-shut storylines (e.g., *CSI: Crime*

Scene Investigation, Law & Order), while others are serialized, as the plot spills over from one episode into the next (e.g., *Lost*, *The Walking Dead*). Responding to U&G criticisms (Lichenstein & Rosenfeld, 1983; Ruggiero, 2000), Sundar and Limperos (2013) suggested that ''technology itself could be responsible for creating new gratifications'' (p. 506). Essentially, media can ''create'' or arouse ''new needs'' (Sundar & Limperos, 2013, p. 505). In considering the specific qualities of a television program, we recognize that program-based characteristics play a significant role in a viewer's selection of media content and that such program-based characteristics may even affect the development of a viewer's needs. Serialized television, which demonstrates narrative complexity, often appeals to niche audiences, yet these viewers ''embrace'' these programs ''in much more passionate and committed terms'' than viewers of episodic television (Mittell, 2006, p. 32). Moreover, such viewership has given rise to fan-cultures, active ''feedback to the television industry'' (e.g., emailing the producers), and a plethora of ''amateur television criticism'' in which viewers join blog communities to discuss and critique the series (Mittell, 2006, p. 32). Recognizing these behaviors as migration, we develop our fourth hypothesis:

H_4: Serialized television content will be positively related to media migration activities.

Third, media habits and preferences also influence media use. Much like the role that program-based differences can play in media usage, the medium itself can influence usage, especially when an audience member gravitates to a particular medium (Rubin, 2009). For example, if one gravitates towards Internet-based media, one is unlikely to seek out a hard-copy newspaper as a news source. Recognizing the role that media habits and preferences play in media selection and usage, this exploratory study seeks to understand how media habits and preferences may influence migration behaviors.

Fourth, there are several cognitive and affective aspects tied to viewing, such as elaboration (Reynolds, 1997), parasocial interaction (Hoffner, 1996), identification (Cohen, 2001), narrative engagement (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2009), and fandom (Wann, 1995). For example, identification with media characters is a ''process that culminates in a cognitive and emotional state in which the audience member is aware not of him- or herself as an audience member, but rather imagines being one of the characters in the media text'' (Cohen, 2001, p. 252). U&G theory recognizes that these differing cognitive and affective states can have specific gratifications for audience members, thereby predicting audience members' media usage. Taking identification as an example, again, U&G would posit that an audience member seeking to escape his or her reality might use media (such as ''binge-watching'' a favorite television series) in which they identify with a primary character to gratify this escapist need. Moreover, when considering these cognitive and affective viewing components, audience activity (such as elaboration, parasocial interaction, identification, narrative engagement, and fandom) can be differentiated as prior, during, and after viewing (Levy & Windahl, 1985).

Following U&G's theoretical understanding of predictors and specifically using well-established motivations for viewing television (Rubin, 1981) and migration motivations from RQ_2, we developed our third research question to address this array of individual differences, program-based characteristics, media habits and preferences, and cognitive and affective elements that influence media use. Specifically, our third research question asks:

RQ_3: How are migration activities predicted by individual differences, program characteristics, media habits/preferences, cognitive and affective aspects tied to viewing, and the motivations for television viewing and migration?

Method

To examine the motivations and predictors of media migration, we administered an online, anonymous survey ($N = 444$) to undergraduates who received credit for participation. The participants were 82.9% Caucasian/White, 49.8% female, and ranged in age from 18–30 ($M = 19.69$, $SD = 1.85$). Ten participants did not provide demographic information. Throughout the survey, questions regarding activities, motivations, and predictors were related directly to the participants' identified favorite television program. To accurately collect data on migration, items were often presented in random order to avoid order effects and the overall questionnaire was structured and presented in a succinct manner to prevent participant fatigue. Throughout the survey, scales primarily used 7-point Likert-type items and anchors of *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*.

Measurements

Migration Activities.

Participants were asked to consider a list of 43 migration activities and indicate whether or not—in connection to their favorite television program—they had taken part in each activity. The binary nature of this question was employed with the goal of capturing a measure that illustrated a range of migration activities as opposed to multiple occurrences of only a few behaviors. Activities included watching clips on YouTube, surfing the Internet for more information, and talking about the program with others. The migration activities included a range of actions, including fan behaviors that, while not always communicative in nature, do display and include communication elements, often on a social level. Some of these program-inspired behaviors included creating/wearing a costume, making a fan video, taking part in a flash mob, and so on. See Table 1 for a full list of migration activities. For data analysis, summing the total number of activities the participants had taken part in created a single measure that ranged from 0 to 43.

Table 1
Percentage of Participants Engaging in Migration Activities

	Percentage
Talked about program with friends/acquaintances	89.4
Watched clips from or about program on YouTube	74.1
Surfed Internet for more information about the program	72.5
Read article about the program in a magazine/newspaper or online	66.9
Visited program's official website	66.2
Read review about the program in a magazine/newspaper or online	60.4
Watched additional content online/via the TV-DVD	59.9
Wrote a Facebook post or Tweet about the program	56.1
Read spoiler or watched sneak peek	55.6
Shared link about the program with friends via email/Facebook	52.3
Watched/read interviews with creative personnel	51.8
Purchased one (or more) of the TV-DVDs	48.6
Visited a program fan site	45.3
Watched content that could be classified as a spinoff/sequel/prequel	39.2
Purchased songs featured in the program	37.6
Put previous seasons on Netflix queue	35.1
Chatted about program online	34.7
Purchased merchandise related to/inspired by the program	34.2
Selected a season pass on TiVo or DVR	32.7
Downloaded wallpaper for computer or phone related to program	30.6
Purchased a poster related to/inspired by the program	30.2
Wrote a paper for a class about the program	28.6
Downloaded content to a mobile device tied to the program	25.0
Downloaded a ringtone that related to the program	23.4
Purchased a video/board game related to/inspired by the program	23.4
Bought the program soundtrack	23.2
Read fan fiction story about characters/world of the program	22.7
Took part in Internet fan discussion about the program	20.5
Read book about the program	20.0
Posted to an online bulletin board about the program	19.8
Wrote review about the program	19.8
Blogged about the program	19.1
Read comic book/graphic novel tied to the program	19.1
Bought app for smartphone that relates to the program	18.9
Read book the program is based on	18.7
Created and/or wore a costume related to the program	18.0
Read book that could be classified as a spinoff/sequel/prequel	18.0
Attended a program convention/conference	15.3
Made a vid (a fan film/video) about the program	15.3
Created program fan site	14.4
Took part in flash mob inspired by the program	14.4
Wrote fan fiction story inspired by the program	14.4
Wrote song inspired by the program (filk)	13.1

Table 2
Migration Motivations: Factor Loadings Using Principal Components and Varimax Rotations

	Entertainment	Escape	Enlightenment	Content-Congruent Exposure
Enjoyment	**.89**	.10	.10	.19
More entertainment	**.80**	.21	−.01	.33
Excitement	**.74**	.15	.29	.20
Relaxation	**.67**	.46	.23	−.07
Habit	.18	**.77**	.08	.17
Companionship	.04	**.75**	.35	−.01
Social interaction	.12	**.69**	.32	.18
Escape/to forget	.36	**.64**	.25	−.09
To pass time	.40	**.56**	−.22	.31
Personal meaningfulness	.15	.31	**.78**	.14
Insight	.12	.23	**.76**	.31
Learning	.15	.19	**.76**	.28
More program information	.19	.08	.33	**.78**
More topic information	.11	.00	.54	**.69**
More entertainment connected to the program	.40	.23	.19	**.68**
Eigenvalue	3.04	2.88	2.70	2.10
Proportion of Variance	20.24	19.19	17.98	14.01

Migration Motivations.

To ascertain motivations for migration related to participants' favorite program, participants responded to a list of 15 possible migration motivations, which were based on previous U&G research and included well-established motivations (Rubin, 1981) since we were interested in whether migration motivations were similar to traditional media motivations. This method of employing pre-existing measures to other contexts is similar to previous U&G research (Haridakis & Hansen, 2009; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000), as there is much overlap with the gratifications for old and new media (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). A list of the possible motivations is provided in Table 2.

Individual Differences.

In addition to gender and age, several personality-based measures were included to capture individual differences. The measures included Brock and Livingston's

(2004) need for entertainment scale ($\alpha = .78$); Cacioppo, Petty, and Kao's (1984) need for cognition scale ($\alpha = .91$); Lemmens, Valkenburg, and Peter's (2009) loneliness scale ($\alpha = .87$); and Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin's (1991) life satisfaction scale ($\alpha = .89$).

Program Characteristics.

Several identifiable characteristics of television programs were incorporated. Specifically, participants were asked if they currently watched the program or if they had watched it previously (time of consumption). Additionally, participants were asked to indicate whether they would identify the program as a series or a serial. Explanations for both distinctions were included.

Media Habits/Preferences.

To ascertain viewing habits, participants were asked the number of hours they watched television on an average weekday and on an average weekend day. Those items were used to create one measure that reflected television viewing for an average week. For media preferences, participants were asked about liking of several different genres. The six genre-liking categories included in the analysis were the most frequently selected genres that the participants had identified for their favorite program. The top six were comedy (41.7%), drama (19.8%), reality (10.4%), crime (8.1%), action/adventure (5.4%), and mystery (2.7%).

Cognitive and Affective Aspects.

Considering cognitive and affective aspects tied to viewing, several measures were selected, including Reynolds' (1997) elaboration scale ($\alpha = .79$); Hoffner's (1996) parasocial interaction scale ($\alpha = .88$); Cohen's (2001) identification scale ($\alpha = .93$); and Busselle and Bilandzic's (2009) narrative engagement scale ($\alpha = .70$). Included was a 10-item measure of television fandom ($\alpha = .82$) adapted from Wann's (1995) sport fandom motivation scale (using items 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, and 19). Lastly, four affect scales were included (Watson & Clark, 1999) that indicated whether viewing the program resulted in the participants being: thrilled ($\alpha = .95$); inspired ($\alpha = .93$); engaged ($\alpha = .86$); or humored ($\alpha = .82$). These measures used 5-point scales with anchors of *not at all* and *extremely*.

Media Motivations.

To ascertain participants' motivations for engaging in media use, several measures were used. Motivations for viewing the program specifically were included using Rubin's (1981) U&G measures for television, including passing time/habit ($\alpha = .85$), companionship ($\alpha = .81$), arousal/excitement ($\alpha = .83$), specific program content ($\alpha = .84$), relaxation ($\alpha = .76$), information/learning ($\alpha = .83$), escape/to forget ($\alpha = .73$), entertainment/enjoyment ($\alpha = .86$), social interaction ($\alpha = .73$), and an additional three-item measure added to assess viewing for meaningfulness ($\alpha =$

.83), by asking whether they watched because it was very moving, meaningful, and/or thought-provoking. The final measures included were Oliver and Raney's (2011) eudaimonic ($\alpha = .89$) and hedonic ($\alpha = .85$) motivations scales. The second research question asked what migration motivations might exist. Based on analysis of the data collected, several motivations (discussed in the results section) were identified.

Multicollinearity and Power Analyses

Tests for multicollinearity of the predictors of migration activities indicated that a few variables might have collinearity problems as the VIF for each were above 3, but below 5. However, it has often been suggested that a VIF less than 10 is an indicator that collinearity is inconsequential (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995; Kennedy, 1992). Those variables included identification, inspiring affect, engaging affect, the migration motivation for enlightenment, and the television viewing motivations for specific program content for entertainment/enjoyment and for meaningfulness. As reported at the end of this section, only two of these variables were found as predictors (inspiring affect and the television viewing motivation for specific program content) and neither was predicted in the final hypotheses. Because of issues with multicollinearity, some of the predictors in the regression did not reach statistical significance. Consequently, Table 3 provides the zero-order correlations (and descriptive statistics for the predictors).

Additionally, G*Power software (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) was used to conduct a post hoc power analysis. The sample size (444 participants) was used with the predictor variables (40). The effect sizes employed for this assessment were: small ($f\ 2 = .01$), medium ($f\ 2 = .10$), and large ($f\ 2 = .33$). The alpha level used was $p < .05$. The power analysis showed that the statistical power was .56 for detecting a small effect, while the power exceeded .99 for the detection of moderate and large effects. While the statistical power to detect a small effect was less than ideal according to the power analysis conducted, Cohen's (1992) power primer indicates that samples over 393 participants are more than sufficient to measure small effects at the .05 level.

Results

Migration Activities

RQ_1 asked what types of migration activities people engage in. Talking about the program with friends and acquaintances was the most frequently reported activity at 89.4 percent. As H_1 predicted, viewers migrated to media platforms that were primarily Internet-based as four of the top five migration activities can be associated with the Internet: watching clips on YouTube (74.1 percent), surfing the Internet

Table 3
Predictors of Migration Activities

	Mean	SD	β	Zero-order Correlations
Step 1: Individual differences				
Gender	0.51	0.50	−.05	−.05
Age	19.67	1.86	.02	.02
Need for entertainment	4.49	0.71	−.01	−.03
Need for cognition	4.38	0.79	−.08	−.08
Loneliness	2.64	1.36	.21***	.18
Life satisfaction	4.81	1.27	.07	−.08
R^2			.04**	
Step 2: Program characteristics				
Consumption time	1.62	0.49	−.07	−.04
Series/serial	1.53	0.50	.11*	.10
R^2			.06	
R^2 Change			.02*	
Step 3: Media habits/preferences				
Television consumption	20.19	11.99	.01	.04
Genre liking				
Action/adventures	5.65	1.36	−.17**	−.22
Comedies	6.38	1.01	−.28***	−.31
Crime programs	5.16	1.51	.05	−.05
Dramas	5.36	1.45	.02	−.03
Mysteries	5.10	1.56	.04	−.06
Reality programs	4.08	1.98	.12*	.10
R^2			.18	
R^2 Change			.12***	
Step 4: Cognitive/affective aspects				
Elaboration	4.26	0.87	.02	.01
Parasocial interaction	4.92	1.09	.04	.12
Identification	4.83	1.11	.07	.14
Television fandom	4.57	0.93	.15**	.21
Narrative engagement	4.83	0.76	−.30***	−.13
Thrilling affect	2.12	0.99	.19**	.37
Inspiring affect	2.64	1.00	.21**	.35
Engaging affect	3.39	0.87	−.09	.11
Humoring affect	3.55	0.80	.05	−.01
R^2			.34	
R^2 Change			.17***	

(*continued*)

Table 3
(*Continued*)

	Mean	SD	β	Zero-order Correlations
Step 5: Motivations				
Viewing				
Pass time/habit	4.27	1.23	−.13*	.08
Companionship	3.21	1.41	.09	.31
Arousal/excitement	5.10	1.23	−.01	.09
Specific program content	6.17	0.89	−.18*	−.24
Relaxation	4.90	1.23	.03	.08
Information/learning	3.47	1.45	.04	.35
Escape/to forget	4.21	1.34	.03	.19
Entertainment/enjoyment	6.12	0.86	.12	−.18
Social interaction	4.26	1.41	.09	.23
Meaningfulness	4.26	1.45	−.03	.25
Migration				
Entertainment	5.06	1.23	.03	.10
Escape	3.79	1.19	.07	.30
Enlightenment	3.65	1.44	.06	.37
Content-congruent exposure	4.33	1.41	.20***	.31
Eudaimonic	4.86	1.05	−.12*	−.05
Hedonic	5.46	0.87	−.01	−.24
R^2			.43	
R^2 Change			.09***	
F (16, 367)			6.87***	
N			408	

Note. Gender coded male = 0; female = 1. Series/serial coded series = 1; serial = 2. Consumption time coded current consumption = 1; prior consumption = 2.
†$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

for more information (72.5 percent), reading an article online (66.9 percent), and visiting the official Web site (66.2 percent). A full list of the 43 migration activities identified and included in the study, plus the percentage of people who reported engaging in each activity, are provided in Table 1. An examination of the main themes identified from these findings is found in the discussion section.

Migration Motivations

To identify what motivations for migration might exist, an exploratory factor analysis using principal components extraction and varimax rotation was employed

to answer RQ_2. The initial analysis found four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, which accounted for 71.42% of the total variance. Table 2 reports the variables and factor loadings for each factor.

The first factor was labeled ''entertainment,'' and included the variables ''enjoyment,'' ''more entertainment,'' ''excitement,'' and ''relaxation.'' The second factor was labeled ''escape,'' and included the variables ''habit,'' ''companionship,'' ''social interaction,'' ''escape/to forget,'' and ''to pass time.'' The third factor was labeled ''enlightenment,'' and included the variables ''personal meaningfulness,'' ''insight,'' and ''learning.'' The fourth and final factor was labeled ''more content-congruent exposure,'' and included the variables ''more program information,'' ''more topic information,'' and ''more entertainment connected to the program.''

Averaging the ratings of the variables that represented these factors created four scales of migration motivations. All four scales showed acceptable levels of reliability (entertainment, $\alpha = .86$, $M = 5.01$, $SD = 1.26$; escape, $\alpha = .80$, $M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.22$; enlightenment, $\alpha = .85$, $M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.43$; more content-congruent exposure, $\alpha = .82$, $M = 4.31$, $SD = 1.42$).

Predictors of Migration Activities

To test H_2 (content-based information), H_3 (loneliness), and H_4 (serialized television content), and answer RQ_3, a hierarchal multiple regression with five steps was employed to examine predictors of migration. The five steps included: 1) individual differences, such as gender and loneliness among others; 2) program characteristics, such as consumption time and series/serials; 3) media habits and preferences, such as television consumption and genre liking; 4) cognitive and affective aspects, such as parasocial interaction, identification, narrative engagement, and television fandom; and 5) motivations, such as viewing, migration, eudaimonic, and hedonic. For each step, all variables were entered based on the previously referenced categories of possible predictors (see Table 3).

The strongest predictors of migration activities with high levels of the variables in question were, as predicted by H_2, the migration motivation for more content-congruent exposure from Step 5, $\beta = .195$, $t = 3.349$, $p < .001$; and, as predicted by H_3, loneliness from Step 1, $\beta = .212$, $t = 3.486$, $p < .001$. The strongest predictors of migration activities with low levels were narrative engagement from Step 4, $\beta = -.301$, $t = -4.888$, $p < .001$; and liking of comedies in Step 3, $\beta = -.278$, $t = -5.490$, $p < .001$.

Additional predictors included high levels of television fandom from Step 4, $\beta = .151$, $t = 2.693$, $p < .01$; thrilling affect from Step 4, $\beta = .192$, $t = 3.050$, $p < .01$; inspiring affect from Step 4, $\beta = .210$, $t = 3.100$, $p < .01$ and low levels of liking action/adventures from Step 3, $\beta = -.167$, $t = -2.911$, $p < .01$. To an even lesser extent, migration was predicted by liking of reality programs from Step 3, $\beta = .120$, $t = 2.295$, $p < .05$; and, as predicted by H_4, serial versus series viewing from Step 2, $\beta = .114$, $t = 2.312$, $p < .05$. Additionally, migration was predicted by low

levels of the television viewing motivations for passing time/as habit, $\beta = -.125$, $t = -2.099$, $p < .05$; for specific program content, $\beta = -.176$, $t = -2.347$, $p < .05$; and eudaimonic motivations, $\beta = -.121$, $t = -2.305$, $p < .05$; all from Step 5.

Discussion

Migration Activities

Data collection resulted in a range of participation regarding migration activities tied to the participants' favorite program. Over two-thirds had watched clips on YouTube, surfed the Internet for more information, read an article about the program, and visited the official Web site. Not surprisingly, almost 90 percent of the sample had discussed the program with someone; an act often referred to as the ''water cooler effect.'' At least four of the top five migration activities were connected to the Internet, which supports the notion that the active nature of media audiences has reached its highest levels due to the capabilities surrounding the Internet (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). One possible reason for this finding is tied to the fluidity of the Internet. The ability of the Internet ''to be transformed into a text, graphic, audio, voice, or visual modalities—or a combination of these communication platforms, back and forth on command'' (Lin, 2004, p. 449) can make migration to, from, and within this media channel easy and enjoyable.

These results indicate that audiences and the entertainment industry make connections between these screen-based media: television and the Internet (through computers, tablets, smartphones, etc.). Previous research within the diffusion of innovations would group these media into technology clusters due to their interrelated attributes (Vishwanath & Chen, 2006). As Lin (2009) noted, ''the same cluster usually share certain similar attributes that can either supplement or complement one another's technical function to enhance each technology's utility or value to their users'' (p. 887). As indicated by the fact that four of the top five migration activities were connected to the Internet, viewing additional content online appears to be a crucial activity for enriching future viewing experiences and heightening the affective and cognitive ties an audience member has towards a specific program. For migration behaviors that originate in entertainment television, the Internet can supplement and/or complement media consumption.

The ten least frequent migration activities (with only 13.1–18.9% engagement) were quite fanatical in nature (see Table 1). For example, creating a fan site, making a fan video, writing fan fiction, or writing a song about/inspired by the program were some of the least frequent behaviors. Individuals who consider themselves loyal fans often manifest these behaviors. This observed variation in the prevalence and nature of activities suggest that migration behaviors are not interchangeable, as some take place less frequently than others or are related to different media use. However, throughout the discussion, the migration activities measure is treated as an overall

summation because of the tangible evidence of ''after viewing'' behavior present. Due to the exploratory nature of this research, the measure allowed us to make larger generalities that can be dissected with future research.

Migration Motivations

Based on the findings, four key motivations for media migration were identified. The first motivation, entertainment, included items reflecting enjoyment, excitement, and relaxation. The second motivation was escape, reflecting a break from the real world and further connection to the television world, including items such as habit, to pass time, and for companionship with the program itself. The third motivation was enlightenment, and included the items for insight, learning, and meaningfulness. The final motivation was more content-congruent exposure, which involves the desire to consume further information/entertainment tied to the program or topic of the program.

Of the four migration motivations identified, the only motivation that concretely predicted migration was the desire for more content-congruent exposure. The ability of content-congruent exposure in contributing to migration behaviors is fittingly tied to the need for informational learning (James, Worting, & Forrest, 1995) and the fact that migration of this kind follows an instrumental orientation (Papacharissi & Rubin, 2009). Based on this finding, the need for more information/entertainment connected to the program or topic of the program is more likely to lead to migration than any of the other motivations identified in this study.

Predictors of Migration Activities

As predicted by the third hypothesis, migration was more likely to take place when an individual was lonely, which may be due to gratifications sought via further exposure to a specific program, or tied to the extra time an individual has to seek content due to less real-life interaction with others. This finding is consistent with previous research that has found connections between Internet use and loneliness/depression (Kraut et al., 1998; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000) and indicated that loneliness can significantly influence media consumption behavior (Rubin, 2009).

Additionally, low levels of narrative engagement strongly predicted greater migration, which means that lack of engagement with the narrative caused viewers to seek engagement to the program via other media. However, this does not explain why participants would indicate that their favorite program did not have an engaging narrative. It may be possible that they enjoy the program since it facilitates use of other media, thus making an overall media consumption experience even more gratifying than the experience of just watching the program. Along this line of reasoning, Andrejevic (2008) noted that some audiences become increasingly attached to a television program, not through the entertainment/gratification of the

program itself, but through online audience-labor via fan Web sites that provide television series recaps and related discussion forums.

Another interpretation of this finding involves media adoption/substitution and fluidity, since fluidity can help to ''explain the adoption of other new hybrid communication technologies that merge multimedia functions into one single device'' (Lin, 2004, p. 459). Migration behaviors could be conducted on a single device, such as using an iPad to watch a program via the TiVo app and then using the IMDb app to see what other programs an actor has appeared in or reading about the narrative direction on a Web browsing app. However, a single device is not the only option as technology clusters could lend well to migration behavior (Vishwanath & Chen, 2006), such as watching a program on a television and using a smartphone to conduct the subsequent behaviors mentioned previously. This interpretation is speculative at this point and this finding deserves greater systematic attention in future research.

Additionally, less liking of comedies strongly predicted greater migration and, to a lesser extent, liking of action/adventures was negatively associated with migration activities. That is, those who dislike comedies are more likely to migrate and those who like action/adventures are less likely to migrate. Regarding these generic preferences, it is possible that the simple structure of situational comedies and the procedural nature of action/adventures do not warrant much need to migrate and so those who like these genres tend to migrate less frequently.

Three cognitive and affective aspects tied to viewing consumption were positive predictors of migration: television fandom, thrilling affect, and inspiring affect. Fandom practices are frequently tied to behaviors that are often unique. Since migration was measured with the use of 43 possible activities that only indicated whether participants had taken part in each activity once, it is not unfathomable that those with high level of television fandom were also those who participated in a number of activities. Additionally, due to the decline in traditional social groupings like class, gender, and age as a means of characterizing individual and social attributes (Machin & Van Leeuween, 2005), the idea of lifestyle factors, such as high levels of television fandom, for example, might be an ideal way of further exploring this and similar findings. Lifestyle factors examine the ways that different behavior practices express identity and values as these elements have a strong impact on media use and viewing preferences (Jiang & Leung, 2012).

Regarding the affective measures, the more thrilled and inspired the participants were, the more likely they were to engage in migration. In terms of thrilling television programs, it seems reasonable to surmise that the type of content that keeps a person on the edge of their seat may also be the type of content that leads to further exposure to similar media. This additional exposure to similar content on different media is consistent with research conducted regarding the congruency and attraction to media no matter which modality is present (Yang & Huesmann, 2013). Using prior research on media modalities and the survey results, media modality can explain why participants who found the program thrilling would be attracted to similar content found in other media channels. Additionally, a

potentially promising finding revealed that inspirational programming may result in the desire to seek out additional media tied to the original programming. The impact this could have in terms of positive/prosocial effects, such as a desire to learn ways to help underprivileged people who are depicted in a program, may be an important avenue for future migration studies.

To a lesser extent, increased liking of reality programs and serials, when compared to series, were shown to be migration predictors. One possible explanation for reality television is that this genre often involves a competition element that can necessitate the use of other media (e.g., texting in votes) and which produces results many viewers would be interested in reviewing/investigating in different media platforms. For serials, the prediction made in the fourth hypothesis was confirmed in that this finding may reflect the idea that programs with overarching plotlines/mysteries presented over an extended period of time have a better chance of increasing migration in comparison to narratives that conclude at the end of each episode.

Finally, three viewing motivations were found to have a small negative association with migration activities. Specifically, television viewing that was motivated by passing time/habit, specific content, and eudaimonic purposes were negatively associated with migration activities. When individuals watch television only as habit, it seems that they are less likely to migrate. Additionally, while high levels of the migration motivation for more content-congruent exposure was found to be a predictor, findings revealed that a similar motivation associated with television viewing functioned on a different valence: lower levels of the viewing motivation for more specific program content predicted migration. Finally, the survey showed that eudaimonic motivations, or the desire for exposure to meaningful media, negatively predicted migration. Based on this, migration is more likely to occur when individuals have a desire for media that bring pleasure as opposed to a sense of meaningfulness.

Potential Limitations

While several limitations associated with the present research warrant consideration, three areas are of particular importance when considering this study context. First, some argue that U&G researchers rely too heavily on self-report data from participants who are asked to articulate reasoning behind their media selection (Rubin, 2008). Given the potential problems associated with self-report data, future scholars may find it helpful to consider additional measures of migration, including behavioral measures such as contributing to fan Web sites or sharing videos associated with television programming. Second, another criticism is that findings from U&G research are difficult to generalize to a larger population, thus making it challenging to properly grasp the implication of widespread media use (Ruggiero, 2000). In addition to this U&G criticism, some concerns have been raised about the generalizability of findings gathered from college students (Abelman, 1996; Sears, 1986). While the participants of this survey were drawn from a convenience sample,

the use of undergraduate students are warranted and valid when inferences are not being made about the general population (Basil, 1996). In the case of the current study, a student sample is ideal for this context as prior research has shown that early adopters of new media technologies/behaviors tend to be younger and better educated (Atkin & LaRose, 1994), making college students a logical choice for this sample. In previous studies, college students have served as a sample of early adopters in a range of media contexts, including blogging (J. Lee, 2008), mobile TV (S. Lee, 2008), and smartphone adoption (Lee, 2014) to name a few. Lastly, this survey focused solely on television. While that decision was important for establishing a clear means of analysis for this exploratory research, it does not examine migration that originates in other media such as books or video games. As such, future scholars would benefit from considering additional media from which migration may originate.

Theoretical Implications

Despite the abovementioned limitations, this study offers further insight into several related concepts and increased understanding of media migration. Findings from this research provide further evidence of the active nature of audiences (Rubin, 2008; Klapper, 1963) and even support the notion of these individuals as ''users'' as opposed to ''audience members'' (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Results collected in relation to migration activities adds to previous knowledge of the varying types and degrees of activity possible within the realm of U&G (Levy & Windahl, 1985) and self-reports of these migration activities collected in this survey provide behavioral indicators of media enjoyment (Nabi & Krcmar, 2004) while extending the notion of fluidity and modality (Lin, 2008) to media migration. Considering the fact that audiences use media based on specific motivations (Rubin, 2009), this exploratory study identified four possible motivations of participation in the process of media migration, which can be classified as ''new needs'' created or aroused by new media and their capabilities (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). And while further work needs to be done to better understand the predictors of migration activities, this research provided groundwork for additional testing. Finally, this study offers a proper label for this media consumption process and presents initial evidence of its existence.

Practical Implications

Migration research is increasingly relevant to the entertainment industry, which refers to elements of media migration with concepts such as crossmedia or transmedia. Both concepts identify the Internet as the final medium consumed, suggesting that movement involves and ultimately concludes with the Internet (Iacobacci, 2008); however, media migration allows considerably more opportunities for media movement and recognizes that despite the Internet's fluidity other media can be the final medium experienced. If industry professionals and media content creators

could better identify the types of media content that lead to increased migration as well as the kinds of audience members who are more likely to migrate, this information could be incredibly useful for marketing and advertising strategies (such as cross-promotion, Twitter hashtag prompts, and content communities like YouTube).

Future Research

Since media migration involves a new area of study, there are many avenues for future research. One possibility is to investigate questions that were not able to be asked in the present survey, including *why* migration behavior takes place: is migration tied to a lack of achieved gratifications or is it connected to the need for continued gratification? In addition, while the binary nature of the migration activities items were employed to capture a measure that illustrated a range of behaviors, future research should consider using additional response options to gather a broader range of understanding. Likewise, future research may consider additional predictors that were not examined here, such as including personality traits, which extant research has identified as important in technology adoption such as being venturesome, socially mobile, and innovative (Lin, 2004).

Additionally, future migration studies could fruitfully intersect three prominent areas of media research. First, although this study focused on entertainment, migration can be studied with a range of media consumption, including news and information gathering. Following a specific news story across different media often leads the consumer to migrate across a variety of networks, brands, partisanships, and mobile news platforms. Second, future research could consider testing migration in an experimental setting with treatment conditions, such as mood induction or exposure to different media or genres. Experimental research studying migration may help to close the gap between U&G and traditional effects research by not relying so heavily on self-report measures for data collection. A final avenue of future research would involve parasocial relationships as the origin point for possible migration behavior, as opposed to a media narrative. While fan studies have been a large part of critical and cultural studies for many years, it may prove interesting to study the intricacies of parasocial migration as it relates to loyal fans of different media figures.

Conclusion

Twenty-five years ago, Levy and Windahl (1985) encouraged researchers to begin a more comprehensive investigation into what types of audience activities are connected to which motivations, uses, and gratifications. One such activity is media migration, and this introductory research demonstrates how migration is associated with specific motivations and other key activities and predictors. First, this research suggests that migration activities often involve the traditional ''water cooler effect'' and, to a greater extent, Internet use to watch clips, surf for program

information, or visit a program's Web site likely due to the similar attributes of these media within technology clusters. Second, this research identifies four migration motivations, including the need for enjoyment, escape, enlightenment, and more content-congruent exposure. Finally, several predictors of migration were identified, including high levels of the migration motivation for content-congruent exposure and loneliness and low levels of narrative engagement, which may be tied to the concepts of media substitution and fluidity.

The study of media migration offers a new perspective on our changing media landscape. Understanding migration through U&G, we further extend this area of research by considering the multiplicity of uses and gratifications as audience members engage in a sequence of media experiences through migration, exploring how audience members might perceive media as fulfilling different entertainment needs, recognizing the active role of the audience tied to migration, and suggesting that migration activities are behavioral indicators of enjoyment. Within our digital media environment, media content travels instantaneously, is more accessible than ever, and audiences have more choices and control. Considering these conditions, audience members are choosing to migrate from one medium to the next, seeking further gratification. The affordances offered through digital media not only allow the consumer to engage with media, but also to actively construct meaning from this engagement (Sundar, 2008). Continued research into additional factors associated with migration behaviors will provide insight into audiences' motivations, the uses they have for different media, the pleasure derived from migration, a complete model for the migration process, and the possibility of building theory in the area of media migration.

References

Abelman, R. (1996). Can we generalize from Generation X? Not! *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 40*, 441–446.

Andrejevic, M. (2008). Watching television without pity: The productivity of online fans. *Television & New Media, 9*, 24–46. doi:10.1177/1527476407307241.

Atkin, D., & LaRose, R. (1994). A meta-analysis of the information services adoption literature. *Advances in Telematics, 2*, 91–110.

Basil, M. D. (1996). The use of student samples in communication research. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 40*, 431–440.

Blumer, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. *Communication Research, 6*, 9–36.

Bohlmann, J. D., Calantone, R. J., & Zhao, M. (2010). The effects of market network heterogeneity on innovation diffusion: An agent-based modeling approach. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 27*, 741–760. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5885.2010.00748.x

Brener, N. D., Billy, J. O. G., & Grady, W. R. (2003). Assessment of factors affecting the validity of self-reported health-risk behavior among adolescents: Evidence from the scientific literature. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 33*, 436–547.

Brock, T. C., & Livingston, S. D. (2004). The need for entertainment scale. In L. J. Shrum (Ed.), *The psychology of entertainment media: Blurring the lines between entertainment and persuasion* (255–274). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Busselle, R., & Bilandzic, H. (2009). Measuring narrative engagement. *Media Psychology, 12*, 321–347. doi:10.1080/15213260903287259

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 306–307. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_13

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Quantitative Methods in Psychology, 112*, 155–159.

Cohen, J. (2001). Defining identification: A theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. *Mass Communication & Society, 4*, 245–264. doi:10.1207/S15327825MCS0403_01

Diddi, A., & LaRose, R. (2006). Getting hooked on news: Use and gratifications and the formation of news habits among college students in an Internet environment. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *50*, 193–210. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem5002_2

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71–75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149–1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Ha, L., & Chan-Olmsted, S. M. (2004). Cross-media use in electronic media: The role of cable television Web sites in cable television network branding and viewership. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 48*, 620–645. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4804_6

Hair, J. F. Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Haridakis, P., & Hansen, G. (2009). Social interaction and co-viewing with YouTube: Blending mass communication reception and social connection. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 53*, 317–335. doi:10.1080/08838150902908270

Hoffner, C. (1996). Children's wishful identification and parasocial interaction with favorite television characters. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 40*, 389–402.

Iacobacci, N. (2008). From crossmedia to transmedia: Thoughts on the future of entertainment. *Lunch over IP.* Retrieved from http://www.lunchoverip.com/2008/05/

James, M. L., Worting, C. E., & Forrest, E. J. (1995). An exploratory study of the perceived benefits of electronic bulletin board use and their impact on other communication activities. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 39*, 30–50.

Jeffres, L., & Atkin, D. (1996). Predicting use of technologies for communication and consumer needs. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 40*, 318–331.

Jiang, Q., & Leung, L. (2012). Lifestyles, gratifications sought, and narrative appeal: American and Korean TV drama viewing among Internet users in urban China. *International Communication Gazette, 74*, 159–180. doi:10.1177/1748048511432601

Katz, E. (1959). Mass communication research and the study of popular culture. *Studies in Public Communication, 2*, 1–6.

Katz, E. (1987). Communication research since Lazarsfeld. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 51*, 525–545.

Katz, E. Gurevitch, M., & Haas, H. (1973). On the use of the mass media for important things. *American Sociological Review, 38*, 164–181.

Kaye, B. K., & Johnson, T. J. (2002). Online and in the know: Uses and gratifications of the Web for political information. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 46*, 54–71.

Kennedy, P. (1992). *A guide to econometrics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Klapper, J. T. (1963). Mass communication research: An old road resurveyed. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 27*, 515–527.

Ko, H., Cho, C. H., & Roberts M. S. (2005). Internet uses and gratifications. *Journal of Advertising, 34*, 57–70.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *The American Psychologist, 53*, 1017–1031. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017

Lee, A. M. (2013). News audiences revisited: Theorizing the link between audience motivations and news consumption. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 57*, 300–317. doi:10.1080/08838151.2013.816712

Lee, J. (2008, November). *Blogging as a predictor of early adopters' political involvement: Findings from a survey on the 2004 U.S. election*. Paper presented at the 94th Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, San Diego.

Lee, S. (2008, May). *Communicating through mobile TV among young college students and its potential social impact*. Paper presented at the 58th Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Montreal.

Lee, S. Y. (2014). Examining the factors that influence early adopters' smartphone adoption: The case of college students. *Telematics and Informatics, 31*, 308–318. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2013.06.001

Lemmens, J. S., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2009). Development and validation of a game addiction scale for adolescents. *Media Psychology, 12*, 77–95. doi:10.1080/15213260802669458

Levy, M., & Windahl, S. (1985). The concept of audience activity. In K. Rosengren, L. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), *Media gratifications research: Current perspectives* (pp. 109–122). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lichtenstein, A., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (1983). Uses and misuse of gratification research: An explication of media functions. *Communication Research, 10*, 97–109. doi:10.1177/009365083010001005

Lin, C. A. (2002). Perceived gratifications of online media service use among potential users. *Telematics and Informatics, 19*, 3–19.

Lin, C. A. (2004). Webcasting adoption: Technology fluidity, user innovativeness, and media substitution. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 48*, 446–465. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4803_6

Lin, C. A. (2008). Technology fluidity and on-demand Webcasting adoption. *Telematics and Informatics, 25*, 84–98. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2006.06.002

Lin, C. A. (2009). Exploring the online radio adoption decision-making process: Cognition, attitude, and technology fluidity. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 86*, 884–899. doi:10.1177/107769900908600410

Lin, J., & Cho, C. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of cross-media usage: A study of a TV program's official web site. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 54*, 316–336. doi:10.1080/08838151003737998

Machin, D., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2005) Language style and lifestyle: The case of a global magazine. *Media, Culture and Society, 27*: 577–600. doi:10.1177/0163443705054151

Mittell, J. (2006). Narrative complexity in contemporary American television. *Velvet Light Trap: A Critical Journal of Film & Television, 58*: 29–40.

Nabi, R. L., & Krcmar, M. (2004). Conceptualizing media enjoyment as attitude: Implications for mass media effects research. *Communication Theory, 14*, 288–310. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00316.x

Oliver, M. B., & Raney, A. A. (2011). Entertainment as pleasurable *and* meaningful: Differentiating hedonic and eudaimonic motivations for entertainment consumption. *Journal of Communication, 61*, 984–1004.

Palmgreen, P. (1984). Uses and gratifications: A theoretical perspective. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 8* (pp. 20–55). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44*, 175–196. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4402_2

Reynolds, R. A. (1997). A validation test of a message elaboration measure. *Communication Research Reports, 14*, 269–278. doi:10.1080/08824099709388670

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. *Communication Research, 8*, 141–165.

Rubin, A. M. (2008). Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 165–184). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rubin, A. M. (2009). Uses and gratifications: An evolving perspective of media effects. In R. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Sage handbook of media processes and effects* (pp. 147–159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rubin, A. M., & Step, M. M. (2000). Impact of motivation, attraction, and parasocial interaction on talk radio listening. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44*, 635–654.

Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and gratifications theory in the 21st century. *Mass Communication & Society, 3*, 3–37. doi:10.1207/S15327825MCS0301_02

Satia-Abouta, J., Patterson, R. E., King, I. B., Stratton, K. L., Shattuck, A. L., Kirstal, A. R., … White, E. (2003). Reliability and validity of self-report of vitamin and mineral supplement use in the vitamins and lifestyle study. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 157*, 944–954.

Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 515–530. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.3.515

Sundar, S. S. (2008). The MAIN model: A heuristic approach to understanding technology effects on credibility. In M. J. Metzger & A. J. Flanagin (Eds.), *Digital media, youth, and credibility* (pp. 72–100). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. doi:10.1162/dmal.9780262562324.073

Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 57*, 504–525. doi:10.1080/08838151.2013.845827

Sunstein, C. R. (2007). *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thussu, D. K. (2007). *News as entertainment: The rise of global infotainment*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Vishwanath, A., & Chen, H. (2006). Technology clusters: Using multidimensional scaling to evaluate and structure technology clusters. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57*, 1451–1460. doi:10.1002/asi.20435

Wann, D. L. (1995). Preliminary validation of the sport fan motivation scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 19*, 377–396. doi:10.1177/019372395019004004

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1999). The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule—Expanded form. Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa.

Weaver, A. J., & Wilson, B. J. (2009). The role of graphic and sanitized violence in the enjoyment of television dramas. *Human Communication Research, 35*, 442–463. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2009.01358.x

Yang, G. S., & Huesmann, L. R. (2013). Correlations of media habits across time, generations, and media modalities. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 57*, 356–373. doi:10.1080/08838151.2013.816711