This study attempted to establish the audience activity construct as an intervening factor in the gratification-seeking process, by taking into account the expanded viewing options in the emerging multichannel environment. It examined the viewing motives, activities, and satisfaction of adolescents—the first generation to grow up in that environment. The major theoretical assumption tested was whether more strongly motivated viewers would more actively engage in various audience activities throughout the viewing process and receive greater viewing satisfaction afterwards. Findings from testing the path model generally support this assumption. However, the role of media exposure in the gratification-seeking process comes into question due to its lack of causal linkage to several model components. A revised theoretical model is proposed to help inform future research.

The uses and gratifications perspective, a widely adopted theoretical framework to study media use behavior and effects, assumes that media use behaviors are motivated by certain internal needs and specific gratification-seeking motives. With such self-fashioned intentions, audiences are able to dictate their content selection and use patterns for the purposes of fulfilling their gratification expectations. The strength of those needs, motives, and expectations would ultimately influence the effects of their media use activities. Hence audiences are seen as active rather than passive consumers of media channels.

Although uses and gratifications is a well-established perspective, the concept of a self-motivated audience actively seeking gratifications is not without criticism (Bauer, 1964; Bogart, 1965). Even so, the uses and gratifications perspective has enjoyed empirical support in substantiating the psychological motives for and satisfaction with media use activity (Blumler & Katz, 1974; Rosengren, Wenner, & Palmgreen, 1985). More recently, a related concept framed in light of the uses and gratifications paradigm involves audience activity. The concept of audience activity typically reflects the audiences' cognitive, affective and behavioral involvement with the media use process (e.g., Biocca, 1987; Levy & Windahl, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b). Audience activity research, in essence,
makes the media use studies more complete by focusing on the media use process and its relations with media use motives and satisfaction.

Although scholars have applied the active audience perspective to uncover a wide range of media use contexts, the relations between audience activity and gratification dimensions are still ambivalent and require further empirical scrutiny. This need is reinforced by the fact that few studies have assessed the impact of expanded program options in the emerging multichannel environment. Still fewer studies have addressed the first generation that grew up in this media-rich period—the adolescents of the late 1980s.

The multichannel phenomenon is particularly in need of a closer examination, due to its capacity to change the nature of audience viewing processes and hence audience behavior. For instance, a typical cable television household has at least 36 channels encompassing various types of niche programs that appeal to differing viewing preferences. The remote control device, a standard piece of equipment in a cable home, enables viewers to better control their selection process and viewing conditions (Heeter, 1985). In that regard, studying the first generation growing up in this multichannel environment is a good starting point to understand changing audience behaviors.

The present study examines these adolescents’ viewing motives, activities, and satisfaction. Working from the assumption that audience activities are part of the media gratification-seeking process (Levy, 1983; Palmgreen, 1984), this study attempts to integrate the audience activity construct into the uses and gratifications paradigm. The underlying theoretical thesis tested is whether more strongly motivated viewers would more actively engage in various audience activities throughout the viewing process and receive greater viewing satisfaction afterwards. The study also proposes a theoretical model intended to establish the audience activity construct as an intervening variable in the gratification-seeking process.

AUDIENCE ACTIVITY

Based on Blumler (1979), audience activities can include making media use plans in advance (or having specific media use expectations), forwarding cognitive efforts (or attention) to the media fare under consumption, and using media materials for reflection or discussion or incorporating them into other activities (e.g., purchasing or modeling behavior) after exposure.

Following Blumler’s conceptual framework, Levy (1983) proposed an audience activity typology with a qualitative dimension grounded in a temporal dimension. The two intertwined dimensions depict audience “selectivity” of media fare prior to exposure, “involvement” with media
content during exposure, and "use" of media content for cognitive processing and for interpersonal discussion after exposure. Results from testing the typology (using correlation measures) indicated that the level of audience activity varies across time in an inconsistent manner and that activities from the three temporal phases are only weakly correlated.

Subsequently, a model developed by Levy and Windahl (1984) suggests direct causal links between activity variables and gratifications measures (sought and obtained) or between activity variables and levels of exposure. No causal relations between any activity variables were postulated, though. The causal paths of this model were not actually tested as only correlation results were used to verify the association between model components. The correlation findings revealed that audience "selectivity," "involvement," and "use" covary with gratifications sought and obtained. Levy's (1983) earlier finding—that audience members are not consistently active within the three phases of the temporal dimension—was further verified. However, Levy and Windahl's (1984) somewhat narrow during-exposure involvement measure (i.e., distractive behavior during viewing) might have contributed to the lack of significant correlations among the activity variables.

Rubin and Perse (1987a) examined the intentionality level of activity types in relation to instrumental viewing motives (e.g., more goal-oriented viewing, such as information seeking) and ritualistic viewing motives (e.g., less goal-oriented viewing, such as passing time). They found that, whereas instrumental viewing motives are more predictive of audience activities of higher intentionality (i.e., involvement with media content), ritualistic viewing motives are better predictors for audience activities of lower intentionality (i.e., less audience selectivity or viewing attention). In their later study, Rubin and Perse (1987b) found further support for those findings, aside from confirming that "more active viewers experience higher levels of gratification" (p. 263) than do passive viewers (or ritualized viewers).

The audience activity construct has also been assessed by other existing measures not included in the above discussion. For instance, measures for the activity dimension of cognitive involvement include knowing one's viewing decision ahead of time (Lemish, 1985), thinking about media content during or after viewing (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984), and the level of viewing attention (Kellerman, 1985). Parasocial interaction between an audience and media content, for example, is regarded as an activity dimension reflective of affective involvement (Levy, 1979; Perse & Rubin, 1989; Rubin & McHugh, 1987). Activities such as interpersonal discussion of media content during or after exposure (Lemish, 1985) and purchasing behavior motivated by media exposure (Lin, 1990) are indicators for the dimension of behavioral involvement with the viewing process.
In sum, the empirical evidence has demonstrated that "audience activeness" is not a constant, particularly when the audience's cognitive, affective, and behavioral involvement across different temporal phases of the media use process is examined (Levy & Windahl, 1984). Instead, audience activity is perhaps a multidimensional variable that cannot be measured along a unidimensional "activeness" scale. In criticizing the "audience activeness" notion, Biocca (1987) suggested that the "active" versus "passive" audience dichotomy be abandoned. He noted that the audience activity construct should be studied within a theory that addresses the psychological role of the medium and sociocultural media use orientation (via media socialization and habituation) of the audience.

Although the present study context follows Blumler's (1979) conceptual framework, it nevertheless takes Biocca's (1987) critical assessment into account as well. Thus the audience activity construct is not seen as axiomatically explanatory of the gratification-seeking process. Researchers must consider psychological and sociocultural factors along with media use orientation and leisure activity patterns, all of which might influence such a process (e.g., Biocca, 1987; Elliot, 1974; Gunter, 1987; McGuire, 1974). Audience activity, then, is regarded as the audience's "engagement" with the media use process, which can take the form of cognitive processing, affective involvement, or behavioral response. The extent of such audience "engagement" could vary over time due to the presence of various psychological as well as environmental stimuli during the media use process.

Audience activity (or audience engagement) in the present context hence reflects the input and output process between the audience and the medium itself during the media use process. This could involve inputting a program selection, outputting a particular program selection, inputting certain media messages, or outputting certain cognitive, affective, or behavioral reaction. Such input-output processes do not necessarily imply a two-way communication process but merely suggest a user-medium exchange relationship.

In accordance with the conventional conceptualization of "pursuing gratifications from uses," the less "engaged" audience might, then, be seen as more "obstinate." In other words, these audiences would engage in the viewing process with a lower or less-defined gratification expectation. They might also not rely on the viewing experience to meet certain psychological needs, as reflected by the traditional gratification measures. The less "engaged" (instead of passive) audience more closely exemplify the "imperviousness to influence" noted by Blumler (1979, p. 13).

In essence, to link the audience activity construct with gratifications sought and obtained, one might assume that gratifications sought (or media use motives) should influence the levels of audience activity (or audience engagement) with the media use process from the preexposure
to postexposure period. Audience activity levels, in turn, would help determine the amount of media use gratifications obtained.

Another concept relevant to the audience activity level is "viewing orientation." Viewing orientation is regarded as a concept reflective of viewer perception about the psychological location or perceived importance of TV viewing as a daily ritual. It largely mirrors the notions concerning the psychological role of the medium and sociocultural media use orientation (Biocca, 1987). It is also similar to Levy's (1978) attempt to assess the importance (or the meaning) of TV news to viewers in the viewing gratification-seeking process. Viewing orientation, then, is postulated as an outcome of viewers' gratification-seeking motivations and an antecedent to receiving viewing gratifications. Hence greater gratification-sought levels should imply a stronger viewing orientation (or the greater importance of TV viewing) for the viewer.

Following that logic, the more important it is to enjoy TV viewing rituals, the more likely the viewer will be engaged in preexposure activity to select favorite TV fare (Levy, 1978). By the same token, preexposure activity levels should help determine during-exposure activity levels, which extend their influence to postexposure activity. For instance, the nature of the program selected might influence whether during-viewing discussion occurs; during-viewing discussion might later help facilitate certain postexposure behaviors, such as cognitive recall or retention of the content. Such a proposition is in line with social judgment theory (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965), whereby subsequent higher-order cognitive effects are invariably influenced by previous involvement with media content (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984). This causal assumption, however, contradicts the Levy-Windahl (1984) model, which asserts no causal or associative links between audience activity variables. Their rationale for that assertion was based on the lack of any consistent activity level found across the three activity phases.

Conceptually, the present study deems it more logical to causally link all activity variables in a sequential manner to reflect their temporal nature. Therefore, even though audience activity levels are not assumed constant across time in the present model, subsequent audience activities are seen as inevitably influenced by the preceding activity to a certain degree. Hence there are three steps in the audience activity sequence embedded within three audience activity phases (see Figure 1).

In the preexposure activity phase, viewing selectivity (or viewing selection planning) is the first step in the audience activity sequence. This is followed by the during-exposure activity phase, in which viewing involvement (or psychological and behavioral involvement with media content during viewing) is located as the second step in the activity sequence. Finally, within the postexposure activity phase, postviewing involvement (or psychological and behavioral involvement with media
content after viewing) and postviewing utility (or using media content consumed to initiate other activities after viewing) are the activities taking place in the third step of the activity sequence.

MEDIA EXPOSURE

Traditionally, although gratifications sought have been considered an important predictor for media exposure level, the validity of such causal relationships has recently been questioned. As Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rosengren’s (1985) review suggests, gratification measures (i.e., gratifications sought or obtained) correlate with media exposure frequency at weak to moderate levels.

More recent studies reveal either insignificant or weak correlations between gratifications sought and exposure measures (e.g., Perse, 1986; Wenner, 1986). For instance, Babrow and Swanson (1988) discovered that gratifications sought explain four times less of the total variance of TV news exposure than does viewing intention. Rubin and Perse (1987a) similarly posited a direct causal link between viewing intention and exposure but an indirect reciprocal link between viewing motives and exposure. Perse and Rubin (1988) further concluded that media exposure was not predictive of soap opera viewing satisfaction.
Summing up the literature, gratifications sought are regarded as an insignificant or potentially weak predictor of media exposure level. The same is true for media exposure level in its predictive role for gratifications obtained.

On another front, the relationship between perceived importance of viewing or viewing orientation and media exposure level appears to be more significant. For instance, in his TV news viewing study, Levy (1978) found that those who perceived greater importance of TV news viewing rituals also tended to watch more TV news. According to this logic, one might then assume that viewers who attach greater importance to the daily TV viewing ritual (i.e., viewing orientation, as defined above) would also spend more time watching TV on a daily basis.

By contrast, the association between audience activities and media exposure level is less than robust. For example, Levy (1983) found that more “active” viewers are not necessarily heavier TV news users; they are, instead, more selective in their news exposure activity. Other studies further support these findings (Levy & Windahl, 1984; Lin, 1990) by showing anywhere from insignificant to weak associations between media exposure and different dimensions of audience activities.

Turning to the Levy-Windahl (1984) model, it is assumed that media exposure level is determined by activity level from the preexposure through postexposure phase. Their rationale is that preexposure activity dictates the amount of media consumed, whereas during-exposure activity coincides with (and influences) media exposure level (in terms on message decoding and comprehension). Postexposure activity, in turn, helps generate future media exposure. However, the original scope of their model could be expanded. First, the direct causal link from during-exposure activity to media exposure level appears to be somewhat narrow. If during-exposure activity influences cognitive processing outcomes during media exposure instead of media exposure level, then either the media exposure level component could be redefined as cognitive outcomes of during-exposure activity, or a separate component reflecting those cognitive outcomes should be included as the effects of such activity. Second, if postexposure activity influences future media exposure level, then this causal path should be linked to a “future media exposure” component (which is not included in the model) instead of the ongoing media exposure component.

In sum, the literature suggests that audience activity level should be a weak or moderate predictor of media exposure level. Based on the above discussion, it thus seems reasonable to assume that preexposure activity is instrumental in deciding the level of media exposure. Media exposure level in itself is not causally influenced by during-exposure activity. Postexposure activity, in turn, can be functional in enhancing future media exposure.
Most existing media gratifications research addresses the relations between gratifications measures and medium choice. Little research has focused on the relations between content (or program) choice and media exposure (Palmgreen et al., 1985). Rather than measuring program choice empirically, the majority of studies that examined media context or environment factors treat this concept as part of the institutional structure, or outputs (e.g., Weibull, 1985). In the wake of expanded viewing choices in a multichannel environment, the significance of program options in the overall media consumption process has dramatically increased (Lin, 1990; Morgan, Alexander, Shanahan, & Harris, 1990; Rubin & Bantz, 1987; Williams, Phillips, & Lum, 1985).

Webster and Wakshlag's (1983) television program choice model incorporates program options and viewer needs along with program preference, viewer availability, viewer awareness, and viewing groups. This model suggests that these are all distinguishable and viable antecedent variables for program choice behavior that, in turn, determine subsequent exposure behavior.

The few extant empirical findings do support the causal link between program options and exposure. For instance, the hours of television viewing increased as viewing options expanded during the 1980s (A. C. Nielsen, 1992). Thus the entry of such technologies as cable television and the VCR is, in effect, associated with more diversified viewing patterns instead of less viewing (Greenberg & Heeter, 1987; Kubey & Larson, 1990; Lin & Atkin, 1989; Morgan et al., 1990; Yorke & Kitchen, 1985).

It is logical, then, to postulate that greater breadth and diversity of program or viewing options would encourage greater viewing motivations. Similarly, greater viewing motivations would also enhance viewer interest in exploring various viewing options. Greater viewing motivations and viewing options would then foster greater levels of viewing exposure.

THE RESEARCH MODEL

The research model (see Figure 2) focuses on the causality among measures of viewing orientation, viewing options, viewing exposure (level), audience activities, and gratifications sought and obtained. It does not include demographic and sociocultural factors (e.g., lifestyle variables) or psychological variables (i.e., basic human needs and motivations) that precede gratification-seeking motives. Such factors are beyond the focus of this study.

At the beginning of the model, gratifications sought are linearly linked to viewing orientation (or perceived importance of TV viewing rituals).
Figure 2: Hypothesized Gratification-Seeking Process Model

They are also causally connected to the multidimensional audience activity construct, which consists of viewing selectivity (preexposure activity), viewing involvement (during-exposure activity), and postviewing involvement and utility (postexposure activity). These audience activity components, in turn, are causally linked to gratifications obtained. This is consistent with Levy and Windahl's (1984) postulation that audience activity is an intervening variable in the gratification-seeking process.

The viewing orientation component is designated as the outcome of gratifications sought (or motives) and an antecedent to viewing selectivity and viewing exposure (Levy, 1978). Although viewing options and gratifications sought are reciprocally linked, they each possess a direct causal path to viewing exposure. Viewing exposure is hypothesized to causally influence gratifications obtained. These assumptions are largely in agreement with the logic of Rubin and Perse's (1987a) model. However, they are contrary to Levy and Windahl's (1984) model, in which viewing exposure is the dependent variable for gratifications obtained, because the model does not treat present and future media exposure activity as two separate variables.

Further, where Levy and Windahl (1984) presumed that all activity measures are antecedent variables to viewing exposure, the present model links only preexposure activity to viewing exposure. This departure from Levy and Windahl's approach can be explained by their own broader in-
terpretation of the occurrence of exposure—relative to activity measures—in the temporal dimension. Their approach thus differs from the present model's adherence to the linear nature of the temporal dimension, using a recursive path model.

Causal links between activities from different temporal phases (from preexposure through postexposure) are postulated in a linear fashion. The two postexposure activity measures (involvement and utility) can varyingly occur in sequence or coincide. Hence they are reciprocally associative in nature. This contradicts Levy and Windahl's proposed typology, where no direct causal links exist between activity variables. The probable cause behind their conceptualization, as discussed above, is the lack of significant correlations found between activity variables from an earlier study (Levy, 1983).

RESEARCH METHOD

A self-administered survey was conducted with 7th and 10th graders from two suburban middle-class communities near a large midwestern metropolitan area. All survey sessions were supervised by trained graduate and faculty researchers. Of the 221 Grade 7 and 223 Grade 10 students who participated in the survey, 206 and 221 provided valid responses, respectively. Questionnaire wording was especially designed to accommodate a teen respondent group and was modified based on a previous pilot study.

Measurement

Confirmatory factor analysis (with varimax rotation) was used to group all items measured for the purposes of data reduction. Each variable grouping was then tested by Cronbach's alpha to ensure scale reliability.

Gratification items used in previous work (e.g., Greenberg, 1974; Levy, 1978, 1979; McQuail, Blumler, & Brown, 1972; Rubin, 1981, 1983) were adapted for the present study. The two sets of gratification factors (sought and obtained) include informational guidance, interpersonal communication, parasocial interaction, entertainment, and diversion. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .69 to .86 for each factor (see appendix); a 5-point scale (ranging from very often to never) was applied to assess all gratification measures. A composite gratifications sought variable was created by averaging the summed averaged scores from the five factors (alpha = .67); a composite gratifications obtained variable was also constructed in the same manner (alpha = .72).²

Viewing orientation (alpha = .75), an indicator of the psychological importance of TV viewing, was measured by asking respondents the
importance of TV viewing as a daily activity, the importance of TV viewing as an after-school activity, and the degree of disappointment for missing a favorite show. Viewing options (alpha = .70), a description of the breadth and depth of TV program choices, was assessed by the respondent's perception of available program options, the number of quality programs, and the quantity of favorite programs on TV. All items for these two constructs were gauged by a 5-point scale (ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree). Viewing exposure was assessed by the amount of time (in hours) spent watching TV on a daily basis alone and with family; daily viewing time is an average of 5 weekdays, Saturday, and Sunday viewing measures.

Items adapted from previous work (e.g., Greenberg & Heeter, 1985; Heeter, 1985; Levy, 1978, 1979; Levy & Windahl, 1984; Palmgreen, Wenner, & Rayburn, 1980; Wenner, 1982) were combined with original measures in creating the audience activity construct. All activity items were measured by a 5-point scale (ranging from very often to never).

Preexposure activity, or viewing selectivity (alpha = .80), indicative of the viewing selection planning process, was assessed by how often respondents know in advance what TV shows to watch, how many TV shows to watch, and when to watch TV. During-exposure activity, or viewing involvement (alpha = .68), reflective of viewers' psychological and behavioral reaction to the program content under exposure, was measured by how often respondents express feelings about the show to a coviewer, talk about the show with a coviewer, and "get into" the show during viewing.

There are two postexposure activity measures. Postviewing involvement (alpha = .76), depicting viewers' psychological and behavioral reaction to program content after exposure, was gauged by how often (after watching an interesting show) respondents think about it for a long time, remember it for a long time, remain moved for a long time, and discuss it with someone. Viewing utility (alpha = .74), describing viewers' use of program content, was measured by how often (after watching an interesting show) respondents would do something that is fun, meaningful, or helps improve themselves and would buy something because they saw it on TV.

Statistical Analysis

Aside from using factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha tests to find variable groupings and scale reliability, Pearson's product moment coefficients were calculated among all model components to screen for multicollinearity. Path coefficients were then produced by gathering standardized beta weights from a multiple regression procedure to examine the linear causal structure of the hypothesized model (Figure 2). Statistical significance for all tests was set at the .05 level.
Figure 3 lists the path coefficients among all model components, as all but three are statistically significant. Zero-order correlations between model components are shown in parentheses. Specifically, gratifications sought is correlated with viewing options at a moderate level of .33, and it accounted for 24% of the variance in viewing orientation ($B = .49$). Although gratifications sought ($B = -.01$) and viewing selectivity ($B = -.003$) did not emerge as significant predictors for the viewing exposure equation, they joined viewing options ($B = .14$) and viewing orientation ($B = .32$) to account for 30% of its total variance.

Viewing orientation ($B = .32$) and gratifications sought ($B = .13$), in turn, jointly explained 16% of the variance in viewing selectivity. Gratifications sought ($B = .41$) and viewing selectivity ($B = .09$) combined accounted for 20% of the variance in viewing involvement (during-exposure). Viewing involvement ($B = .39$) and gratifications sought ($B = .25$) together explained 30% of the variance in postviewing involvement. Viewing involvement ($B = .16$) and gratifications sought ($B = .45$) in conjunction accounted for 29% of the variance in postviewing utility.

Viewing exposure ($B = .03$) was an insignificant predictor in the regression equation for gratifications obtained. The remaining predictors—including viewing orientation ($B = .27$), viewing selectivity ($B = .10$), viewing
involvement (B = .17), postviewing involvement (B = .11), and postviewing utility (B = .29)—were all significant. The equation yielded a strong $R^2$ value of .41.

By examining the decomposed zero-order correlations between gratifications sought and its endogenous variables (Table 1), it appears that the original zero-order correlations were almost perfectly reproduced by the hypothesized model. The same is true for the relationship between gratifications obtained and its exogenous variables. These results point to a recursive model with validity. They do not, however, imply a best-fitting model for the data, as evidenced by the still large residual terms (Table 2) for the endogenous variables (ranging from .77 to .92).

As the present study was not intended to find the best-fitting model by creating overidentified models for further testing purposes, a revised model without the three insignificant causal paths is proposed as an optional model for future reference. The deletion of the three nonsignificant relationships provides a model whose path coefficients do not deviate from those in Figure 1 by more than .01 in any hypothesized relationship. Multiple regression procedures indicate that all causal paths yielded identical $R^2$'s for their designated endogenous variables, as compared to those of the originally hypothesized model. This suggests that the revised model should adequately fit the data statistically, although theoretical justification would be needed to determine whether the revised model has sufficient construct validity (Anderson, 1987).

**DISCUSSION**

This study attempted to validate a gratification-seeking process model that would establish the role of process variables such as audience activity—and its related antecedents—in the uses and gratifications paradigm. Findings from the study largely supported the underlying theoretical assumptions and verified Blumler's (1979) as well as Levy and Windahl's (1984) contention that audience activity is an intervening factor in the media use process. Caveats, however, should be applied to the interpretation of the path coefficients, as some of the model components are intercorrelated at a moderately strong level. Multicollinearity might thus have an impact on the power of the multiple regression tests used to generate path coefficients, although the large sample size should help temper concerns over the reduction of statistical power.

As expected, audience activity was both a significant effect for gratifications sought and a significant cause for gratifications obtained. The moderate to strong zero-order correlations between audience activity measures and measures of both gratifications sought and obtained supports this assumption. Namely, adolescent viewers with a greater level of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Viewing Selectivity</th>
<th>Viewing Involvement</th>
<th>Postviewing Involvement</th>
<th>Postviewing Utility</th>
<th>Viewing Exposure</th>
<th>Viewing Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gratifications sought</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-order correlation</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gratifications obtained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanalyzed effect</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-order correlation</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Decomposed Zero-Order Correlations for the Endogenous Variables of Gratifications Sought and the Exogenous Variables of Gratifications Obtained From the Revised Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Viewing Selectivity</th>
<th>Viewing Involvement</th>
<th>Postviewing Involvement</th>
<th>Viewing Utility</th>
<th>Viewing Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratifications sought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-order correlation</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratifications obtained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanalyzed effect</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-order correlation</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gratification expectation were engaged in various audience activities from the preexposure through postexposure periods at varying degrees. Consequently, these more "engaged" audiences (with the viewing process) also received a greater level of viewing gratification. These findings hence parallel those of Levy and Windahl's (1984) model, which addresses adults.

However, as the amount of variance accounted for by audience activity variables ranged from 16% to 30%, one would suspect that variables beyond the present study scope could help explain the remaining variance. These variables might include demographics, parental mediation, the number of siblings and parents (living at home), ability to make viewing decisions, and other sociocultural factors (e.g., family lifestyle and leisure patterns). Although all audience activity variables were significant predictors for gratifications obtained, these variables could have accounted for more variance in the model if the interscale reliability of their measures is improved and additional audience activity measures are added to the equation.

As expected, viewing options emerged as a significant predictor for greater viewing exposure, consistent with findings from past studies of adolescents (Greenberg & Heeter, 1987; Kubey & Larson, 1990; Morgan et al., 1990) and adults (Levy, 1978; Yorke & Kitchen, 1985). With the proliferating multimedia environment, the multiplicity of program options prompts a reconsideration of key questions regarding the relations between indigenous content and gratification dimensions (Biocca, 1987; Gunter, 1987). For instance, one might examine the motivation and gratification factors associated with viewers (teen or otherwise) of differential viewing preferences. Such viewers might watch varying numbers of programs of a similar or very different nature, and do so at differing exposure levels.

In all cases, the lack of predictive strength for gratifications sought—as an antecedent variable to viewing exposure—is in agreement with most previous work (e.g., Perse, 1986; Wenner, 1986) but inconsistent with Levy and Windahl's (1984) typology. Similarly, the finding that viewing exposure is an insignificant predictor for gratifications obtained confirms Rubin and Perse’s (1987b) finding but disconfirms Levy and Windahl’s (1984) conceptualization.

As the moderate correlations between viewing exposure and gratification measures in the present study further supports past findings with adult samples (e.g., Perse, 1986; Rosengren et al., 1985; Wenner, 1986), one wonders about the significance of viewing exposure in the hierarchy of gratification-seeking process variables. Succinctly put, media exposure can perhaps be viewed as a necessary but not a sufficient element in the gratification-seeking process.

Conceptualized as a measure of psychological tendencies toward the daily TV viewing ritual, the success of viewing orientation as a predictor for
media exposure, viewing selectivity, and gratifications obtained prompted several theoretical questions. First, as 81% of the correlation between gratifications sought and viewing exposure is due to the contribution of viewing orientation, can perceived importance of TV viewing be a more important determinant for exposure than gratifications sought? Second, would avid viewing planners with or without a strong viewing orientation engage in the viewing process in much the same way? Third, can viewing orientation be an inherent part of the "engaged" audience nature because it is a stronger predictor than most audience activity variables in predicting gratifications obtained? If the answers to these questions are affirmative, then Biocca's (1987) recommendation to eliminate the passive versus active distinction should perhaps be seriously considered.

Several generalizations can be proposed from the revised path model to help summarize the present theoretical framework. First, more "captivated viewers" (i.e., those with stronger viewing orientation) who have access to more abundant program options are prone to be heavier viewers. Second, viewers with greater gratification expectations tend to be more captured viewers, who are more inclined to actively engage in the viewing process, through certain cognitive processing and reflection, affective response, and behavioral reaction. Third, these more motivated, captured, and engaged viewers would also derive more gratification from their viewing experience.

According to Swanson (1987), a number of conceptual and methodological approaches can be adapted to further clarify the pending questions regarding causal relations among various constructs within the gratification-seeking framework. Although the present model successfully explains a moderate amount of variance in audience activity and a sizable portion of variance in gratifications obtained, alternative models using similar components might also have equal or greater explanatory strength.

In particular, the role of ever-expanding program options and viewing orientation in the gratification-seeking process deserves further scrutiny. The theoretical relationship between viewing exposure and gratification measures also requires further clarification in light of the changing conceptions about the nature of audience along with the complex nature of viewing processes, in relation to audience activities in an abundant media environment. Effects of viewing gratifications in this enriched media environment—either of a ritualistic or of an instrumental nature—could also be better explored in conjunction with indigenous program content exposure. This should help explain the different psychological needs and fulfillments met through those unique and differential viewing experiences.

Future studies should also investigate the effects of the uses of various media technologies in connection with their unique content offerings and in combination with the audience activity and gratification dimensions.
Ideally, a follow-up study that would trace adolescents through adulthood might demonstrate how the hypothesized and optional revised models withstand the test of time. Such a study might provide some interesting contrasts in terms of how these children have changed in their media gratification-seeking activity patterns due to maturation in their age and changing media technology over time. Moreover, a cross section of samples drawn from different demographic and sociocultural compositions of adults and children could also be used to thoroughly examine the validity and reliability of the present model.

**APPENDIX**

Gratification Items

Gratifications sought

1. Informational guidance
   I watch TV to get advice on
   • how to make friends in school
   • how to get along with my family
   • how to solve my personal problems

2. Interpersonal communication
   I watch TV to
   • find something interesting to talk to my family about
   • find something interesting to use in starting a conversation
   • find something interesting to talk to my friends about

3. Parasocial interaction
   I watch TV because
   • I want to find people like me on TV
   • I like to think of some people on TV as friends
   • I want to talk to the TV to express my feelings

4. Entertainment
   I watch TV because I want to
   • be entertained
   • get some excitement
   • have some fun
   • feel good

5. Diversion
   I watch TV because
   • I want to forget about my problems
   • I need to relax
   • I need to kill time
   • I am lonely
   • I am bored

(Appendix continued)
Gratifications obtained

1. Informational guidance
   I am satisfied with the advice I get from TV on
   • how to make friends in school
   • how to get along with my family
   • how to solve my personal problems

2. Interpersonal communication
   Watching TV
   • gives me something interesting to talk to my family about
   • gives me something interesting to use in starting a conversation
   • gives me something interesting to talk to my friends about

3. Parasocial interaction
   Watching TV makes me feel
   • there are people like me on TV
   • some people on TV are like friends
   • I can talk back to the TV to express my feelings

4. Entertainment
   Watching TV
   • keeps me entertained
   • gives me excitement
   • gives me a lot of fun
   • makes me feel good

5. Diversion
   Watching TV
   • helps me forget about my problems
   • helps me relax
   • helps me kill time
   • keeps me from feeling lonely
   • keeps me from getting bored

NOTES

1. These 7th and 10th graders were chosen for this study because the two age groups represent early- and mid-adolescence. During the early- and mid-adolescence stage, children are most susceptible to media culture in their socialization process (see, e.g., Hamberg, 1982).

2. Different gratifications dimensions were collapsed into one single indicator to accomplish parsimony without the expense of omitting any important element of the gratification construct. Only analyzing the strongest gratification dimension(s) would require theoretical justifications that might be beyond the scope of the current study. The idea of doing a separate path analysis for each gratification dimension was contemplated and dropped due to the overwhelming amount of information it might generate, thereby diluting the purpose of exploring a "generalized" and broad model. However, it should be noted that, by averaging the summed averaged scores for all gratification measures, a certain degree of interscale reliability was sacrificed due to the nature of this statistical manipulation.
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