

University of Missouri, St. Louis

IRL @ UMSL

Theses

UMSL Graduate Works

11-20-2014

the New Relevance: Motives behind YouTube Use

Xinchen Xu

University of Missouri-St. Louis, xxz5d@mail.umsel.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://irl.umsel.edu/thesis>

Recommended Citation

Xu, Xinchen, "the New Relevance: Motives behind YouTube Use" (2014). *Theses*. 64.
<https://irl.umsel.edu/thesis/64>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the UMSL Graduate Works at IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact marvinh@umsel.edu.

The New Relevance: Motives behind YouTube Viewing

by

Xinchun Xu

B.A., Journalism, Arkansas Tech University, 2012

A THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate School at the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI- ST. LOUIS

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

in

COMMUNICATION

December, 2014

Advisory Committee

Alice Hall, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Amber Reinhart, Ph.D.

Yan Tian, Ph.D.

Abstract

This study applies the uses and gratifications theory (UGT) to discover how people are motivated to use YouTube, an example of Internet based technologies, similarly and differently to watch traditional broadcast television. The new features such as commenting, liking and uploading that YouTube offers can be seen as new affordances that might offer new gratifications to users, which were not found salient to television viewing. A convenience sample of 127 students was recruited to participate in an online survey that included measures of traditional media motives (Rubin, 1983) as well as new media motives adapted from Sundar and Limperos (2013). The study found that participants were motivated to use YouTube for passing time/habit and entertainment, which were similar to their motives for watching traditional broadcast television. The scale on new media motives did not provide conceptually coherent motives relevant to either media. Paired-sample *t-tests* were performed, which revealed some differences in specific items about new motives across the two media outlets.

Introduction

YouTube has become a phenomenon that revolutionized mass communication and computer-mediated communication. Previous studies have dealt with motives behind YouTube viewing (Cheng, Dale, & Liu, 2008; Gill, Arlitt, Li, & Mahanti, 2007), and this study seeks to extend previous findings on YouTube viewing with the application of the uses and gratifications theory.

According to the Pew Research Center, there has been a 40% increase in the amount of time Internet users' reported spending watching or downloading video online from 2006 to 2010, and 22% of online adults have posted and shared videos online (Moore, 2011; Percell, 2010). In the same Pew project, researchers mentioned a subcategory of online video, "user-shared video" in which user-generated videos, such as many of those found on YouTube, were also considered and included (Bondad-Brown, Rice, & Pearce, 2012). User generated content on the Internet has created an industry that attracts more than 69 million users with more than 450 million dollars in advertising earnings (Verna, 2007). Not only does YouTube allow users to share user-generated content, but it also collaborates with major conventional broadcast television stations (Waldfogel, 2009). Due to media convergence, the digitization of media and the increasing popularity of user-generated content, the broadcast television industry was forced to follow the trend to share and post promos, clips from television programs, and even full episodes on YouTube (Bondad-Brown et al, 2012). Popular network talk shows, such as The Ellen Show and Conan regularly update new clips and have millions of subscribers on their YouTube channels (TheEllenShow, n.d.; Team Coco, n.d.). YouTube is a great example representing new emerging media with features like interactivity,

diversity of content, audience control and selectivity, personalization, media convergence, new means for organizing the message structure and global reach (Metzger, 2009) that may overpower the traditional broadcast television industry.

The demographics of the overall Internet users are relatively young in contrast to people who watch traditional broadcast television, and the television industry struggles to attract those younger demographics. According to another study by the Pew Research Center (2010), 93% of teenagers under 18 have gone online and 93% of young adults from 18 to 29 have gone online; 62% of online teens would rather get their news on the Internet than other media outlets, and 31% of online teens gather online information directly related to health, such as dieting. The same Pew study (2010) noted that the home broadband adoption rate increased from about 25% of US adult population in 2004 to 60% in 2009. It is also reported that 71% of American youth consumed online content such as videos, blogs, pictures, and music (Shao, 2008, p. 9). The Internet has become a major component in today's Americans' media diets, and YouTube ranked as the third most visited website globally and in the US attracts a huge amount of traffic on a daily basis (Alexa.com, n.d.).

According to YouTube.com (n.d.), there are more than 1 billion unique users visiting YouTube monthly, which makes up to 6 billion hours spent watching YouTube videos monthly. Around 100 hours of videos are uploaded hourly, and 80% of YouTube use come from outside of the US as well as 40% of YouTube use are from its application on mobile devices. Meanwhile, YouTube attracts more young American adults from 18 to 34 years old than any cable network (YouTube.com, n.d.).

Because of its vast collection of video entertainment, YouTube as well as other

web viewing services can be considered as potential substitutes to traditional broadcast television viewing depressing the television industry in the sense of reducing hours spent on traditional broadcast television viewing (Waldfogel, 2009). At the same time, Waldfogel (2009) argued that YouTube and other online video sharing websites could also provide possible advertising venues for the broadcast television industry and help compensate its loss in the viewership. However, the expansion of YouTube is unpredictable as Kim, Sundar, and Park (2011) noted, “ the development of mobile technology has made it possible to more effectively deliver information through various communication modalities such as audio, video, text, and haptic sensors ” (p. 1208), and YouTube apps can be easily found across various mobile devices and mobile platforms. The increasing mobility of YouTube can penetrate to more users and attract more users.

As YouTube is extremely accessible via the Internet, how users consume and digest information on YouTube and what they use YouTube for may directly affect how they perceive the world and other life events. To understand how people use YouTube similarly and differently to television constitutes future directions to understand changes among the relationships between users and media technologies, particularly among younger generations who were born with such technology. New affordances from YouTube can possibly lead to new content and process gratifications, new gratifications obtained and new motives while influencing users in both positive and negative ways.

The huge variations of video content on YouTube ranging from tutorials to news stories (such as eHow and CNN) can educate people while gratifying users' specific need for the information. Other user-generated content such as daily vlogs, gaming commentaries, and online extreme advocates can well entertain users but may produce

potential negative influences among users. For example, the Syndicate Project (n.d.), allegedly the most subscribed YouTube gaming channel in the UK, has almost 10 million subscribers, some of whom are under 18 years old. However, the shared brutal gaming clips from *The Grand Theft Auto* and strong language in the commentary may have unpredictable influences among those younger users. Another example is Jenna Marbles who, with her over 10 million subscribers, takes a crown in the YouTube community. However, some parents have commented that her videos were inappropriate and worried about their children viewing Marbles' clips (JennaMarbles, n.d.). The possibility that the effects of YouTube are double-edged is inevitable. As YouTube continues to grow, it is worrisome how YouTube affects individual users.

While YouTube functions similarly to television, there are still differences between two media outlets. According to Levy and Windahl (1984), pre-activity or intention to watch television programs was not strongly related to the motive for entertainment seeking. The story can be entirely different on YouTube. YouTube serves as a portal for videos, discussions and networking. A YouTube creative producer can Tweet out his/her upcoming new show, and subscribers will initiate fan communications prior to the release of the clip. Levy and Windahl (1984) also argued that audience might not actively seek diversion. However, the easy accessibility, the endless entertainment in the YouTube library, and somewhat more real viewing experiences from user-generated content may cause users interact with YouTube differently. Looking for diversion may be incredibly salient among YouTube viewers.

While the television industry is struggling to survive, questions are produced around why a user may prefer to substitute traditional broadcast television viewing with

web viewing. With YouTube as the focus, similarities and differences among gratifications from traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing can help with future explorations in new emerging media. This study aims to understand YouTube viewing by further investigating similarities between YouTube and traditional broadcast television that motivate users, as well as new motives that YouTube can gratify but traditional broadcast television cannot, so that new media use patterns can be recognized and explained.

Literature Review

The Uses and Gratifications Theory

The uses and gratifications theory (UGT) basically argues that active audiences (media users) engage with goal oriented media use to gratify their needs (Katz, Blumler & Gurevitch, 1973) and those needs can be psychological, social, and interpersonal. UGT also explains how different people engage with the same medium for different purposes (Severin & Tankard, 1997). Blumler (1979) suggested that users' choice of certain media reflected their pre-existing interests; this perspective assumes media users are aware of what their needs are so that they are motivated to choose the right media outlet and content to gratify their needs.

Audience (media users) gratifications that are common across different media include diversion, personal relationships, personal identity, and surveillance (McQuail, Blumler, & Brown, 1972). According to Katz and his colleagues (1973-1974), "studies have shown that audience gratifications can be derived from at least three distinct sources: media content [content gratification], exposure to the media per se [process gratification], and the social context that typified the situation of exposure to different

media [social gratification] (p. 514).” According to Cutler and Danowski (1980), content gratifications are obtained directly from the media message, such as the story of a science fiction and the melody from a symphony; process gratifications are obtained during the use of the medium in which the message is contained, such as watching 3D films for more realistic and engaging visual experience.

UGT is suitable to study how and why people engage with media activities as users actively motivated seek out different media contents and outlets (Klapper, 1963) in which media behavior has been seen as goal-oriented (Haridakis & Hanson, 2009), and the theory represents a framework that successfully explains individual psychological and behavioral involvements with media (Ko, Cho, & Roberts, 2005). Blumler (1979) conceptualized audience activity as the utility, intentionality, selectivity, and involvement of the audience with the media.

UGT and motives of traditional broadcast television viewing

Because UGT focuses on audience activity, it has been often applied to explain the motives behind audiences’ use of traditional mass media, such as the radio, newspaper and television (Herzog, 1942; Suchman, 1941; Berelson, 1948). UGT provides a guideline for investigations about motives for media use and access (Stafford, Stafford & Shakade, 2004).

Rubin (2009) suggests that motives correspond to gratifications users seek and obtain from media. Others have categorized different gratifications into gratifications sought and gratifications obtained (e.g. Rayburn, 1996). Generally speaking, scholars believe that motives and needs of using certain media encourage the engagement with, and gratifications obtained from using the media (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Rosengren

(1974) also suggested that motives of media use could be derived from recognizing human daily problems and seeking solutions for those problems. Furthermore, scholars also worked from gratifications to needs, such as the gratification for surveillance could be linked back to the desire for security and the fulfillment of curiosity (Katz et al., 1973-1974).

Throughout the history, scholars applied UGT to explain human consumption of the television. Rubin (1983) explained that motives behind television viewing could successfully explain individual viewing habits and predict media outcomes; he also suggested that those motives were interactive and not isolated, and he successfully obtained a scale for structured investigation on motives of television viewing. Abelman and Atkin (1997) identified different viewer archetypes supporting the complex and interrelated patterns of television use as medium oriented, station oriented, and network oriented. Audiences' choice over different television channels and satisfaction level after using certain media could be predicted by UGT (Dodos, 1992). While many other media theories delve into media effects rained upon the audiences from viewing television, what makes UGT stand out is its emphasis on the power and initiative from the audiences, as Schramm (1961) said:

In a sense the term "effect" is misleading because it suggests that television "does something" to children...Nothing can be further from the fact. It is the children who are most active in this relationship. It is they who use television rather than television that uses them (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973-1974, p.511).

However, Windahl (1987) argued that audience activeness would be different across different people and different periods of time of consuming media. Different media may

also attract audiences with different levels of activeness (Blumler, 1979).

Further along the line, UGT has also been used to investigate newer media, such as social media like Twitter and Facebook (Chen, 2011). And the rising competition among different media outlets provide users more options to choose from that actually satisfy their needs (Tan, 1985), and the online environment challenges the traditional transmission model of communication in ways that allow users to communicate with each other, provide feedback and even contribute user-generated content.

Similarities between the Web and Television

The Internet has become one major media channel for people to get connected as the number of Internet hosts has grown from just over 1 million in January 1993 to a bit under 1 billion in January 2013 (ISC Domain Survey. n.d.). There are over 200 million Americans online in 2013 comparing to the overall American population of just over 300 million (North America Internet Usage Statistics, n.d.; International Programs, n.d.). Due to the rising popularity of the Internet as a giant bucket filled with information that people can retrieve and share at any time (Hoffman, Novak, & Chatterjee., 1995), scholars have spent more than a decade investigating the case of what the motives were behind the Internet use (Sun et al, 2008; Wolfradt & Doll, 2001).

Additionally, the Internet can serve as a platform both for interpersonal and social purposes to its massive user population. The rising social media industry has generated even more attention from communication scholars. Studies have investigated how people fulfill their romantic needs through the Internet (e.g., Kim et al., 2008; Ellison et al., 2006) and how people turned to different online media based on their different individual characteristics (Correa et al., 2009). The tremendous growth of online users and capacity

declared the Internet has become an integral part of human daily life (Ko, Cho, & Roberts, 2005). The Internet changed how people access information, enjoy entertainment and do businesses. In the meantime, scholars have been debating whether the World Wide Web (WWW) would eventually take over and crush out the halo above television viewing (Ferguson & Perse, 2000).

Korgaonkar and Wolin (1999) suggested that people used Internet for seeking information, entertainment and escape. Ferguson and Perse (2000) later discovered the use of WWW functioned equivalently to television viewing as for the purposes of entertainment, passing time, relaxation, social interaction and information. The entertainment motive was the most salient. However, the relaxation motive was not as strongly endorsed by the participants in reference to WWW as compared to television (Ferguson & Perse, 2000). Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) also identified five motives for using the Internet as for interpersonal utility, to pass time, information seeking, convenience and entertainment (as cited in Bondad-Brown et al, 2012, p.473). Kaye and Johnson (2002) also discovered that people use the Internet for similar reasons as television: for guidance, information seeking, surveillance, and entertainment.

Even though one third of American and northern European population have been using the Internet for about 10 years (Kowalczykowski, 2002), the introduction of wireless technologies such as Wi-Fi and LTE, and smart portable devices like the iPhone and the Android phone could contribute to tremendous changes to the dynamic between users and the Internet due to easier access to the Internet and higher speed Internet connections in today's society. About a decade after Ferguson and Perse (2000), Sun and his colleagues (2008) discovered stronger evidence to support the idea that the Internet is

used as substitute for television. They linked relaxation and passing time motives with the use of Internet, as one of the five trends of Internet use: substitution, information, social interaction, convenience, and control. The internet can be considered to fulfill needs that people are seeking from traditional media, while it is also reported that different media can often provide satisfaction of similar needs (Elliot & Quattlebaum, 1979), but Internet technologies keep advancing and can possibly satisfy users with needs that traditional media cannot. In other words, what people have found about the use of the Internet years ago may not explain how users use the Internet in 2010s and onwards.

Continuing the comparison between the Internet and the television industry, online video-sharing communities are even more directly related to watching television. Haridakis and Hanson (2009) discovered that sociable males used YouTube for entertainment, information seeking, social interaction, and to co-view clips with others, which corresponds to previously discovered motives from traditional mass media use. And historically, UGT has suggested that users' pre-existing interests could very well determine their selections of media content and outlets (Blumler, 1979). Today's users may seek out information on YouTube that was introduced on other media, such as the television, as they consider YouTube has the same capacity to offer gratifications that traditional broadcast television viewing can offer. Bondad-Brown and his colleagues (2012) also confirmed that information seeking and passing time were both salient to online-user shared video use and television viewing.

One of the popular forms of videos on YouTube is video blog in which YouTube creative producers talk about what happens in their daily lives. Those video blogs might generate affinity similar to a regular reality television show. Since seeking entertainment

is one of the motives for viewing reality television shows (Nabi, Biely, Morgan & Stitt, 2003). I suggest that there will be similarities between motives for traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing, suggesting that YouTube can be a functional alternative to traditional broadcast television.

H: There is a positive correlation between motives for traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing. Individuals will tend to rate the same motives similarly between traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing.

New Gratifications and New Motives from YouTube Viewing

Besides the similarities between YouTube viewing and traditional broadcast television viewing, there are also documented differences between the two. Even though Ferguson and Perse's study (2000) did not find strong evidence for the companionship motive behind the Internet use, Internet users are becoming more creative and active in building up their networks around the cyber world due to the increasing popularity of social networking sites (Stein, 2013; Sun et al., 2008). YouTube may satisfy different and more needs than users are seeking from media as compared to television. A recent Pew study (2009) discovered 38% of cellphone owners turned away from commercial breaks to interact with people via cellphones, and 22% of cellphone owners would double check the accuracy of stories on television via mobile technologies. Social motives have been confirmed to be linked with online social media use, such as Twitter (Yang, 2009). Online communities even create bonds between users (Hampton & Wellman, 2003), and people who use internet more frequently have more social ties than users who do not depend on the Internet as much (Zhao, 2006).

Among the characteristics of the Internet, such as low cost, global coverage and easy accessibility, interactivity has been considered one of the most significant (Ko et al., 2005). The interactivity can be human to message as well as human to human, and Ko and colleagues (2005) discovered that people with stronger information seeking motives used the Internet differently from those with higher needs for social interaction with a focus on human to message interaction compared to their counterparts. Ruggiero (2000) suggested that the Internet could provide more connections between users as well as between users and the media. Conventionally, gratifications have been thought to be powered by innate needs, but because of Web 2.0 and other interactive technologies, gratifications conceptually could also be prompted by the experience of new features provided by new technologies (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld (1983) first proposed that medium-specific gratifications are predicted by characteristics of media themselves rather than innate needs or perceptions of use (as cited in Sundar & Limperos, 2013, p. 510).

The use of Internet provides more incentives than consuming traditional mass media (Sun et al., 2008). A previous study has found that college students used the Internet to research and read; they also preferred the easy access to entertainment the Internet could offer; communication and social interaction were both significant motives behind the Internet use; to relieve boredom, to access material otherwise unavailable, to obtain product information and technology support, to access games and sexually explicit sites, and to conduct consumer transactions were also activities mentioned by those students (Ebersole, 2000). Those activities students did via the Internet fundamentally changed how they accessed and digested information while interacting with the media

and peers, which changed process and content gratifications (Sundar & Limperos, 2012). According to Cowles (1989), interactive media were perceived to have a higher capacity of personal characteristics than those that were less interactive, such as traditional broadcast television compared to the Internet.

Stafford, Stafford, and Schkade (2004) proposed a third kind of gratification of considering media as a social environment. Fundamentally, technologies themselves can predict different gratifications: content, process, and social (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Ruggiero (2000) also suggested that technologies should be considered in future UGT research. Sundar and Limperos (2013) believes “it is the time that we broaden our focus beyond social and psychological origins of needs, and also consider potential influences of the perceived capabilities of the media technology upon our gratifications (p. 510).”

Because of the Internet, the assumption of “active users” has become a reality (Sundar & Limperos, 2012), since the internet has been consumed globally (Rayburn, 1996) and hosting unlimited possible resources for information while providing users opportunities to participate. YouTube, as one of many online video-sharing communities, not only provides users creative content to enjoy, but also offers the freedom to choose what the users prefer. YouTube also provides a platform for users to view and co-view with others (Fernando, 2007).

Besides offering conventional video clips that are commercially and professionally produced, user-generated video content make up a major part of the YouTube library. There are also programs tailored for YouTube viewing experience, such as music video parodies, fan made spin-offs, and video blogs. However, even though many YouTube producers may not be professionals, some of their work can be

compared to projects with a big budget. The Young Turks (n.d.) is a YouTube channel self-producing political commentary programs, and it has 1.5 million subscribers and thousands of views per clip. The Young Turks even had a brief airtime on Current TV after its YouTube success until Al Jazeera bought Current TV and cancelled the show (“Al Jazeera targets US”, 2013).

Shao (2008) proposed that users were seeking different gratifications because of the different activities they could engage with user-generated content. Users can be involved with the production, creation, and participation of user-generated content (Shao, 2008). Online user-generated videos on YouTube are often short and dense, which feeds people’s appetite on a tight schedule, and users may have different motivations to tailor their special YouTube diet. Perceived affordances may be able to explain individual use habits of YouTube; perceived affordances are basically those actions that humans capture from objects that are doable (Norman, 1999), such as the switch that can turn on the light and the lock can keep things safe. The tailoring/personalization on YouTube is one of many perceived affordances that users are fond of.

In addition to viewing videos, YouTube provides the users features to rate, comment, and share. Those features offered by YouTube can be conceptualized as another perceived affordance (Norman, 1999) as users expect themselves to be able to rate, comment, and share. Those affordances of new media technologies revolutionized how users engage with the content. Sundar and Limperos (2012) argued that not only did new media provide affordances that allowed users to interact with media, but also could afford users the opportunity to interact with each other. Those new features allow users to move seamlessly between traditional mass communication activities to computer-

mediated communication and interpersonal communication activities (Haridakis & Hanson, 2009). Meanwhile, studies have confirmed that Internet users are focused highly on instrumental needs (e.g. Bondad-Brown et al., 2012), which are purposeful, selective and goal-directed, and deal less with the importance of the medium (Rubin, 1984). Although, because of the advancement of mobile technologies, checking out apps, push messages from social media, and checking emails are become more habitual/ritualized. Cellphone users may often check their phones for updates from their friends when they do not have much to do; tablet computers can also be often carried around with individuals.

As UGT was designed for traditional mass media (television, newspaper, and radio), it has been criticized for its linear focus on audiences (Sundar & Limperos, 2013), and possibilities of neglecting potential new gratifications by applications of old typologies. A new instrument is needed to discover motives behind YouTube viewing for seeking gratifications that television cannot offer.

Those new gratifications can possibly be granted by the advancement of the technology itself. Four different new categories of gratifications (the MAIN model) have been identified as modality-based, agency-based, interactivity-based, and navigability-based (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). The modality refers to different ways to present a message; the agency refers to affordance provided from the Internet allowing users to contribute and serve as the gatekeeper of information online; the interactivity refers to the ability for users to make changes and interact with the medium in real-time, and navigability refers to users' freedom of moving across different websites online (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). It is very possible that users are motivated to use YouTube by some

of those new gratifications. Out of sixteen new gratifications Sundar and Limperos (2013) proposed, I suggest that novelty, agency-enhancing, bandwagon, ownness and dynamic control are more relevant to YouTube viewing.

Novelty, as one of the potential modality based gratifications, focuses on the newness of the technology (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). YouTube has only been around since 2005 and the growth in its popularity came after Google purchased YouTube in 2006 (Youtube.com, n.d.) so that the technology itself is fairly new compared to television. While it has not yet been used by as many users as Facebook, some may still perceive it as quite novel. Alongside with being new, the convergence within YouTube's parent company, Google, continues to change the viewing experience on YouTube with more social features, such as combing Google+ with YouTube (about Google+, n.d.), which makes YouTube unique, innovative and different. The newness might motivate users' engagement with YouTube use.

Agency-enhancing, bandwagon and ownness as some of the potential agency based gratifications are related to the participatory side of the online communities like YouTube as how much one considers he/she has a say of his/her opinions as well as the feeling of the technology being "mine" (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). On YouTube, users are loosely restricted on sharing content with others and they are offered with a fairly free environment for user-generated content as well as other activities contributing back to the website. Agency-enhancement focuses on how much power the users have to have a say and share thoughts with the mass (Sundar & Limperos, 2013); YouTube users are granted with abilities to upload videos and communicate with subscribers. Moreover, with the implantation of Google+ onto the YouTube platform, users can easily share what they

have watched and commented with Google+ friends. Agency-enhancement may be exceptionally salient to many users when using YouTube. Bandwagon is similar to agency-enhancement while focusing on how users can examine others' thoughts (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Even though, YouTube primarily hosts videos, the comment section allows users to reply, and they can indicate thumbs-up and thumbs-down, which provides users the opportunity to view and review others' thoughts on the videos. Users can easily compare others' comments with their own looking for similar opinions or opposite voices. Ownness deals with whether users feel like the technology is theirs when they use it (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). YouTube gives users the control over their channels as well as subscriptions. Users can subscribe to new YouTubers and unsubscribe to some old ones; users can make playlists, watchlists as well as favorite lists in order to maximize their viewing experience. It is possible that YouTube users strongly feel like the YouTube environment is comfortable enough to be theirs.

Dynamic control is one of the potential interactivity-based gratifications that delved into how much one can interact with the medium (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Interactivity is one significant feature that the Internet can offer, and YouTube indeed provide tools for user interactions, such as liking, commenting and sharing on Google+. Similarly to ownness, the personalization and customization side of YouTube is quite user-friendly, while YouTube also offers the opportunity to users to be the watchdog of the community, such as flagging misbehaved YouTube users.

RQ: What are new motives related to YouTube use that are not relevant to traditional broadcast television viewing?

Methodology

Developing the Measure

In order to answer the RQ, a scale for new motives was created. Items on the scale were drafted based on gratifications related to newer media proposed by Sundar and Limperos (2013). They provided a list of sixteen different potential gratifications of new media use. However, this study only covered five of the new gratifications proposed: novelty, agency-enhancing, bandwagon, ownness, and dynamic control (See Appendix 1). These five gratifications were chosen based on the features YouTube currently offers to users: its relatively recent launch for *novelty*, its commenting and sharing features for *agency-enhancing*, its capacity for users' discussions for *bandwagon*, its features to like and favorite for *ownness*, and its features to allow users customize the homepage interface for *dynamic control*. Items from Sundar and Limperos (2013) were slightly reworded to measure motives of YouTube viewing (See Appendix), and each item was measured with a 7-point Likert response scale with 1 as Strongly Agree and 7 as Strongly Disagree; in the final analysis, I recoded the scale to 7 as Strongly Agree and 1 as Strongly Disagree for the sake of easy understanding of the data.

YouTube viewing counted all exposure to clips hosted on YouTube: watching clips directly on YouTube.com, watching clips on the YouTube smartphone or tablet application, watching YouTube clips embedded on other websites, and watching clips shared from YouTube on social media. All types of YouTube videos were considered, including user-generated content as well as professionally and commercially made content. Since the study focuses on YouTube alone, other video sharing websites, such as Vimeo and DailyMotion, were not addressed.

Pilot Study

In order to test the understandability of the measures of new motives and to get a preliminary sense of the reliability of scales measuring new and traditional motives, a pilot study was carried out. Thirty-three students were recruited from a land grant Midwestern public research university to participate in the online survey that was distributed via Qualtrics, a private research software company. Twenty-eight students were included in the final analysis after eliminating students who did not answer a confirmation question correctly. The participants responded to the new measures in relation to both TV and YouTube. They also completed a version of Rubin's (1983) television motive scale, described in more detail below, in relation to both media. In addition, participants were asked whether any of the items were hard to understand. Participants from the pilot study did not indicate major confusion about the measures of new motives or Rubin's scale (1983).

Generally speaking, new items drafted from Sundar and Limperos (2013) exhibited good reliabilities; only items measuring ownness regarding traditional television viewing ($\alpha = 0.77$) and items measuring novelty regarding YouTube viewing ($\alpha = 0.73$) had a Cronbach α value below 0.80. Measures on Rubin's motives also exhibited good reliabilities with the exception of items measuring companionship regarding traditional broadcast television viewing ($\alpha = 0.51$). Therefore, this subscale was not included in the analysis of the final main sample. Since major problems were not found with the initial findings from the pilot, I went forward with the main study.

Main Study

The same online survey was later distributed via Qualtrics in the main study. One

hundred and twenty-seven students were recruited from the same Midwestern university. After screening the results with the confirmation question included in the survey, ninety-two responses were included in the final analysis. The average age of the final sample was 26.64 ($SD=7.87$) and the median age was 24. There were 25 male participants (27%) and 66 female participants (72%) with one not reporting gender. Seventy-nine participants watched TV (86%), and 83 participants used YouTube (90%). The average time spent watching TV per week was 11.83 hours ($SD=8.94$); the average time spent using YouTube per week was 4.44 hours ($SD= 4.40$).

Measures

The survey included the measures of new motives (See Appendix) along with measures of traditional motives that drive the participant to view traditional broadcast television. Traditional broadcast television viewing was defined for the respondents as television programs broadcasted from cable, satellite or over-the-air television signals. Watching television programs on Hulu and Netflix was not considered television viewing in this study; watching DVDs or on-demand content on the TV set or television networks' websites were also excluded from traditional broadcast television viewing.

According to Rubin (1983), traditional motives that are examined between traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing are passing time/habit, entertainment, information/learning, companionship and escape. Rubin's original scale was duplicated for use in this study (Rubin, 1983).

Each item above was measured with a 7-point Likert scale with 1 as Strongly Agree and 7 as Strongly Disagree. The scoring of these items was reversed for the final analysis, so that higher numbers indicated stronger agreement. The order of each item

was randomized across participants.

Other Measures

At beginning of the survey, it asked if participants actually watched TV or used YouTube, and participants were skipped past the measurement on motives if they indicated that they did not use either medium. The survey included questions regarding how many hours a week the participant spent using each media outlet as well. The survey also asked about basic demographic information such as age, gender, and major as well as ethnicity.

Analyses

Exploratory factorial analyses were performed among Rubin's motives (1985) to discover the most conceptually coherent items about motives. In order to test the hypothesis that YouTube viewing shared the same motives of traditional broadcast television viewing, a paired-sample *t-test* and a bivariate correlation analysis were executed to compare the salience of different motives across the two media outlets: traditional television viewing and YouTube viewing.

Factorial analyses were not successful with new motives drafted from Sundar and Limperos (2013) as most statements fell into one factor and were not distinct from each other. Instead, paired-sample *t-tests* were performed on each individual statement on new motives across the two media outlets to explain the research question regarding whether YouTube viewing was linked to motives that traditional broadcast television viewing was not.

Results

Traditional Motives

Based on the factorial analysis of traditional motives in relation to traditional broadcast television viewing, the screen plot indicated those items fell into four factors, and the eigenvalues also showed four factors that were above 1. An orthogonal rotation was performed in order to clearly categorize each item into the four-factors as a loading over 0.60 on one factor with a value below 0.40 on the other three (See Table 1). The four factors discovered among traditional motives, which corresponded to Rubin's scale, were passing time/habit ($\alpha = 0.79$), information ($\alpha = 0.74$), entertainment ($\alpha = 0.81$) and escape ($\alpha = 0.84$). Based on the means, entertainment was the most salient motive behind traditional television viewing ($M=6.12$, $SD=0.73$) followed by passing time/habit ($M=5.67$, $SD=1.21$). Measures on entertainment ($\alpha = 0.85$) and passing time/habit ($\alpha = 0.87$) regarding YouTube viewing also presented good reliability.

However, the information and escape factors were not as clear in regards to YouTube viewing as items regarding those two factors cross-loaded and interrelated with the others. For example, when participants were asked if they used YouTube because it helped them learn things about themselves and others, a motive for information, three out of four factors had a loading above 0.4.

A paired-sample *t*-test and a bivariate correlation analysis were performed between the two media outlets regarding motives for passing time/ habit and entertainment. There was a significant difference between YouTube viewing ($M=5.28$, $SD=1.38$) and traditional television viewing ($M=5.75$, $SD=1.22$) on the motives for passing time/habit; $t(71) = 3.26$, $p=0.002$. Participants tended to agree more that they

watched TV for passing time/habit. For the entertainment factor, there was a significant difference between the scores from YouTube viewing ($M=5.89$, $SD=1.03$) and traditional broadcast television viewing ($M=6.12$, $SD=0.74$); $t(71)=2.64$, $p=0.010$, which suggested that participants tended to agree more with that they watched TV for entertainment. Nevertheless, there was a significant positive correlation between the two media outlets in regards to the entertainment motive ($r= 0.71$, $p<0.001$); a significant positive correlation was also found in regards to the passing time/habit factor ($r=0.56$, <0.001).

The evidence found from this study partially supported the hypothesis: there is a positive correlation between the entertainment motive for traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing as well as the passing time/habit motive, and entertainment motive is the most salient for both media outlets.

New Motives

A factorial analysis failed to discover conceptually coherent factors with new motives in relation to either media. Only two factors were found regarding YouTube viewing with an eigenvalue above 1 and one factor had an eigenvalue above 10. After rotation, most items were loaded into one factor with a few that had a loading above 0.4 on both factors. Three factors were found regarding traditional broadcast television viewing and one factor had an eigenvalue above 10; after rotation, 16 out of 20 items were loaded in the first factor with a value above 0.6 and a value no more than 0.4 on the other two.

In order to further investigate the research question, a paired-sample *t*-test was performed on each item about new motives between YouTube viewing and traditional broadcast television viewing. A significant difference was found between the two media

outlets regarding the statement that the participant used the outlet for the power to broadcast with viewers (see Table 2); $t(71)=2.78$, $p=0.007$, which suggested that participants agreed more with that they used YouTube for the power to broadcast. For the statement of if they used each outlet because the outlet allowed them to review opinions from others before they made the decision, a significant difference was found (See Table 2); $t(71)=3.163$, $p=0.002$, which suggested that participants agreed more that YouTube allowed them to review others' opinions. A significant difference was found indicating participants were more motivated to use YouTube due to the ability to change how the interface looked (See Table 2); $t(69)=2.28$, $p=0.026$. A significant difference was found that participants were more motivated to use YouTube because of the ability to influence how the interface works (See Table 2); $t(71)=3.10$, $p=0.003$. These findings indicated that participants were more motivated to use YouTube because of the interactivity among users and the features to customize the interface YouTube that afforded, which provided some directions for future research.

Follow-up Analyses

To further explore with current data, an independent sample *t*-tests was performed on new motives to examine differences between male and female participants in relation to YouTube viewing. Male participants tended to agree more that they used YouTube because it was unusual; $t(80)=2.45$, $p=0.016$. Male participants were more motivated to use YouTube because it allowed them to review others' opinions before they made theirs; $t(81)=1.99$, $p=0.050$. Male participants were also more motivated to use YouTube because it allowed them to assert their identities; $t(81)=2.83$, $p=0.006$. Interestingly, male participants disagreed less that they used YouTube because it allowed them to share

thoughts with many; $t(81)=2.07$, $p=0.042$; as well as to broadcast to many; $t(81)=2.43$, $p=0.018$. The full list of findings that indicated the differences between male and female participants can be found in Table 3.

The relationship between time spent on YouTube and viewing motives were also considered. Participants tended to agree more with statements on new motives as they spent more time using YouTube (See Table 4). Only one out of 19 items measuring new motives in relation to YouTube viewing were not found to be significantly correlated with time spent on YouTube: *“I use YouTube because it is new.”*

Discussion

Traditional broadcast television viewing and YouTube viewing are two discrete technologies with similar powers to motivate users' engagement with the medium. It does not seem that YouTube has replaced or substituted traditional television viewing in Americans' daily media diets, but the technology itself is changing rapidly. YouTube viewing is growing more relevant to Americans' daily media diets. The results indicate that entertainment and passing time/habit motives are important to users in relation to YouTube.

Limitations

Measures of new motives drafted from Sundar and Limperos (2013) were conceptually indistinguishable from each other. They did not factor into distinct scales, which resulted in tangled data that did not satisfactorily provide answers to the research question. Participants tended to disagree with those statements on new motives whether they were asked in relation to television or YouTube. It is possible that those statements were misleading and confusing to participants. Further exploration and refinements are

needed to identify possible new gratifications other than what has been found regarding traditional media outlets.

How competent participants were with YouTube might have affected the results. YouTube is a newer technology that requires people to discover features with some effort. Since participants in this study were mostly college students who were not born with such technology, they might not use YouTube as efficiently as those who were younger and born with such technology available to them. The results might have been different if the sample consisted of more dedicated or more knowledgeable YouTube users.

Follow-up analysis showed that more time on YouTube was associated with greater salience of items measuring new motives, which could also be seen as evidence that people who were more familiar with the technology used YouTube for different purposes. People who have spent more time using YouTube may be more familiar with these affordances and they may be more important to them. YouTube is available to both registered and unregistered users. These two types of users might differ in their level of competency in that registered users might use YouTube more efficiently. If the survey had included a question regarding if a user was registered or not, the results might be more insightful.

I also carried out a follow-up analysis comparing male and female participants' ratings of the salience of the new motives in relation to YouTube as well as how much time they spent using YouTube. Although an independent sample *t*-test did not show a significant difference in time spent using YouTube between males ($M=4.93$, $SD=4.37$) and females ($M=4.01$, $SD=4.37$); $t(81)=0.86$, $p=0.391$, the new motives tended to be more

salient to males, which might be due to males being more tech-savvy than females. According to an article published by Nielson, males are more attracted to a computer's operating system, the processor speed, and other technological features than females when it comes to choosing a digital device (Insights, 2014). This could also be evidence showing that males think technology-based affordances are more relevant than females.

Practical Implementation

Due to higher audience selectivity, UGT scholars have concerns regarding how people are affected by media. For viewers who mainly seek out media for entertainment and passing time/habit, the question is how much viewers will take in as truthful portrayals of the real life. According to Schramm (1961), children could possibly be consumed by fantasies from media and led to problems fitting in the real world.

Furthermore, scholars have discovered mass media could help adolescents to develop sexual awareness and even lead to actual sexual behaviors (e.g. Brown, 2002). Video blogs about sexual experience can be easily found and accessed on YouTube, which create possible influences on adolescents' sexuality realizations. There are over three million results if one searches sexual education (Sexual Education Search Result, n.d.).

With information about motives/gratifications behind YouTube viewing, and the differences between TV viewing and YouTube viewing, possible preventions of negative effects from YouTube viewing may be enlightened, and possible complementary strategies to curb negative effects from traditional broadcasted TV viewing based on YouTube may also be discovered.

On the positive side, advocates on YouTube may also encourage teens and

younger viewers to be more socially responsible. Jacksgap, a pair of British twins, visited third world countries and posted short clips documenting their journeys that have been viewed by their over 3 million subscribers (The Rickshaw Run - The Beginning, 2013, September 7). Another British YouTuber, Charlie McDonnell has posted clips of his experience helping with hunger relief and involvement with charities (e.g. The Alzheimer's Society #P4A; The Hunger Problem - #IFYoutube; Meet Mr. Frank - #IFYoutube), and those materials have been viewed for thousands of times each. It is also possible to strengthen good effects from YouTube based on knowledge about what motivated people to use YouTube.

Besides greater media effects, YouTube can also serve as a great platform for marketers and new business ventures. Dreze and Zufryden (1997) predicted that the Internet would have huge potential for marketing. It has developed into a solidified business nowadays. Burberry, a British luxury fashion house, launched its YouTube channel in 2011, which made it the first in the industry (Burberry, n.d.). Other reputable brands also moved onto the YouTube platform, such as Toyota, Coca-Cola, and even the Bank of America. With knowledge of how users consume information on YouTube and motives behind YouTube viewing, it might produce new ways for businesses to use YouTube for benefits.

Future Exploration

Dependency on television viewing has been suggested to be possible among people who endorse the relaxation and negative effect reductions as outcomes of viewing television (McIlwraith, Jacobvitz, Kuey & Alexander, 1991). Relaxation is related to entertainment and passing time motives, which were proven to be salient to YouTube

viewing. According to Rubin (2009), media dependency is highly related to motives behind users' engagement with media. Needs for entertainment and social connections are relevant to explain one's media dependency (Sun et al., 2008). Because of the new features that the Internet enabled YouTube to offer, users may depend on YouTube due to specific motive driving them to use YouTube at the first place. By looking closely at YouTube dependency, it might be possible to discover more in-depth individual differences in media use and media effects. According to Sun et al. (2008), motives for connection and control, which are expected to be highly significant for YouTube, successfully predicted Internet dependency; motives for substitution, information seeking and social interaction have been most significant predicting Internet dependency. It is possible that YouTube is a potential functional alternative for those who are highly dependent on television.

Works Cited

- Abelman, R., Atkin, D., & Rand, M. (1997). What viewers watch when they watch TV: affiliation change as case study. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 41(3), 360-379.
- About Google+. (n.d.). Google+. Retrieved April 26, 2014, from <https://www.google.com/+/learnmore/>
- Alexa.com. (n.d.). *youtube.com Site Overview*. Retrieved May 7, 2014, from <http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/youtube.com>
- Al Jazeera targets US expansion after buying Current TV. (2013, January 2).BBC News. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-20896484>
- Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1985). The origins of individual media-system dependency a sociological framework. *Communication Research*, 12(4), 485-510.
- Berelson, B. (1948). What missing the newspaper means. *Communications research*, 1949, 111-129.
- Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. *Communication research*, 6(1), 9-36.
- Busselle, R., Reagan, J., Pinkleton, B., & Jackson, K. (1999). Factors affecting Internet use in a saturated-access population. *Telematics and Informatics*, 16(1), 45-58.
- Burberry. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/user/Burberry>
- Cheng, X., Dale, C., & Liu, J. (2008, June). Statistics and social network of youtube videos. In *Quality of Service, 2008. IWQoS 2008. 16th International Workshop on* (pp. 229-238). IEEE.

- Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W., & De Zuniga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The intersection of users' personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(2), 247-253.
- Cowles, D. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interactive media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 33*(1), 83-89.
- Cutler, N. E., & Danowski, J. A. (1980). Process gratification in aging cohorts. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 57*(2), 269-276.
- Dobos, J. (1992). Gratification models of satisfaction and choice of communication channels in organizations. *Communication Research, 19*(1), 29-51.
- Ebersole, S. (2000). Uses and gratifications of the web among students. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 6*(1), 0-0.
- eHow. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/user/eHow/vid>
- Elliott, W. R., & Quattlebaum, C. P. (1979). Similarities in patterns of media use: A cluster analysis of media gratifications. *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports), 43*(1), 61-72.
- Emerson, M. B., & Perse, E. M. (1995). Media events and sports orientations to the 1992 Winter Olympics. *Journal of International Communication, 2*(1), 80-99.
- Ferguson, D. A., & Perse, E. M. (2000). The World Wide Web as a functional alternative to television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44*(2), 155-174.
- Fernando, A. (2007). Social media change rules. *Communication World, 24*(1), 9 10.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Correa, T., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Selective Exposure to Cable News and Immigration in the US: The Relationship Between FOX News, CNN,

and Attitudes Toward Mexican Immigrants. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 56(4), 597-615.

Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 319-336.

Gill, P., Arlitt, M., Li, Z., & Mahanti, A. (2007, October). Youtube traffic characterization: a view from the edge. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement* (pp. 15-28). ACM.

Grant, A. E., Guthrie, K. K., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1991). Television Shopping A Media System Dependency Perspective. *Communication Research*, 18(6), 773-798.

Haridakis, P., & Hanson, G. (2009). Social interaction and co-viewing with YouTube: Blending mass communication reception and social connection. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(2), 317-335.

Haridakis, P. M., & Rubin, A. M. (2005). Third-person effects in the aftermath of terrorism. *Mass Communication & Society*, 8(1), 39-59.

Herzog, H. (1942). Motivations and gratifications of daily serial listeners. *Radio research*, 1943.

Hoffman, D. L., Novak, T. P., & Chatterjee, P. (1995). Commercial scenarios for the Web: opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 1(3), 0-0. International Programs. (n.d.). - *Country Rankings*.

Retrieved November 13, 2013, from

<http://www.census.gov/population/international/data/idb/rank.php>

Insights (2014). Retrieved December 3, 2014, from

<http://www.nielsen.com/cn/en/insights/news/2014/the-female-male-digital-divide.html>

ISC Domain Survey. (n.d.). *Internet System Consortium*. Retrieved November 13, 2013, from <http://ftp.isc.org/www/survey/reports/2013/07/>

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. NYU press.

JennaMarbles. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from

<https://www.youtube.com/user/JennaMarbles>

Katz, E., Haas, H., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). On the use of the mass media for important things. *American sociological review*, 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(1), 54-71.

Kim, M., Kwon, K. N., & Lee, M. (2008). Psychological characteristics of internet dating service users. In *CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ADVERTISING* (p. 257).

Klapper, J. T. (1963). Mass communication research: An old road resurveyed. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 27(4), 515-527.

Korgaonkar, P. K., & Wolin, L. D. (1999). A multivariate analysis of web usage. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39, 53-68.

Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. *Journal of personality assessment*, 38(4), 377-383.

Levy, M. R., & Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications a conceptual clarification and exploration. *Communication research*, 11(1), 51-78.

- Lin, C. A. (1993). Modeling the gratification-seeking process of television viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 20(2), 224-244.
- McIlwraith, R., Jacobvitz, R. S., Kubey, R., & Alexander, A. (1991). Television addiction: Theories and data behind the ubiquitous metaphor. *American Behavioral Scientist*.
- McQuail, D. (1983). *McQuail's mass communication theory*. Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D., Blumler, J. G., & Brown, J. R. (1972). The television audience: A revised perspective. *Media studies: A reader, 1972*, 438-454.
- Meet Mr. Frank - #IFYoutube. (2013, April 12). YouTube. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IH5Q8bptPCI>
- Nabi, R. L., Biely, E. N., Morgan, S. J., & Stitt, C. R. (2003). Reality-based television programming and the psychology of its appeal. *Media Psychology*, 5(4), 303-330.
- Newswire (a) . (n.d.). *Newswire*. Retrieved November 18, 2013, from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/newswire/2012/nielsen-tops-of-2012television.html>
- Newswire (b). (n.d.). *Nielsen Estimates 115.6 Million TV Homes in the U.S., Up 1.2%*. Retrieved November 18, 2013, from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/newswire/2013/nielsen-estimates-115-6-million-tv-homes-in-the-u-s---up-1-2-.html>
- Norman, D. A. (1999). Affordance, conventions, and design. *interactions*, 6(3), 38-43.
- North America Internet Usage Statistics, Population and Telecommunications Reports. (n.d.). *North America Internet Usage Statistics, Population and Telecommunications Reports*. Retrieved November 18, 2013, from <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats14.htm#north>

- Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* 3rd ed. (pp.165-184). New York, NY: Routledge
- O'Reilly, T. (2005). *What is web 2.0, design patterns and business models for the next generation of software*. Retrieved December 1, 2008.
- Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A., & Rayburn, J. D. (1981). Gratification discrepancies and news program choice. *Communication Research*, 8(4), 451-478.
- Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44(2), 175-196.
- Rayburn, J. D., Palmgreen, P., & Acker, T. (1984). Media gratifications and choosing a morning news program. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 61(1), 149-156.
- Rayburn, J. D. (1996). Uses and gratifications. *An integrated approach to communication theory and research*, 97-119.
- Rosengren, K. E. (1974). Uses and gratifications: A paradigm outlined. *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research*, 3, 269-286.
- Rubin, A. M. (1984). Ritualized and instrumental television viewing. *Journal of Communication*, 34(3), 67-77.
- Rubin, A. M. (2002). The uses-and-gratifications perspective of media effects. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research (2nd ed.)* pp.524-548
- Rubin, A. M. (2009). The uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In J. Bryant & M. B.
- Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987). Audience activity and soap opera involvement a

- uses and effects investigation. *Human Communication Research*, 14(2), 246-268.
- Rubin, A. M., & Step, M. M. (1997). Viewing television talk shows. *Communication Research Reports*, 14(1), 106-115.
- Schafer, M. (2011). *baster culture!*. Netherlands : Amsterdam University Press.
- Severin, W. J., & Tankard, J. W. (1997). *Communication theories: origins, methods, and uses in the mass media*(4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Sexual Education Search Result. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved April 1, 2014, from https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=sexual+education
- Stafford, T. F., Stafford, M. R., & Schkade, L. L. (2004). Determining uses and gratifications for the Internet. *Decision Sciences*, 35(2), 259-288.
- Stein, L. (2013). Policy and Participation on Social Media: The Cases of YouTube, Facebook, and Wikipedia. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 6(3), 353-371.
- Suchman, E. (1941). An invitation to music. *Radio research*, 140-188.
- Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 57, 504-525
- Sun, S., Rubin, A. M., & Haridakis, P. M. (2008). The role of motivation and media involvement in explaining Internet dependency. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 52(3), 408-431.
- Tan, A. S. (1985). *Mass communication theories and research*. New York: Wiley.
- Team Coco. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/user/teamcoco>
- The Alzheimer's Society #P4A. (2012, December 17). YouTube. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IB9Lq-wmoW4>

- TheEllenShow. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from
<https://www.youtube.com/user/TheEllenSh>
- The Hunger Problem - #IFYoutube. (2013, April 22). YouTube. Retrieved April 2, 2014,
from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zuP951T0md0>
- The Rickshaw Run - The Beginning. (2013, September 7). *YouTube*. Retrieved
November 26, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9fNOu_zfbsY
- TheSyndicateProject. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from
<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC1ieoHqKW-yYgDhLHlIcx28w>
- The Young Turks. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from
<https://www.youtube.com/user/TheYoungTurks>
- YouTube.com. (n.d.). YouTube. Retrieved April 12, 2014, from
<http://www.youtube.com/yt/press/statistics.html>
- Verna, Paul (2007), "User-Generated Content: Will Web 2.0 Pay Its Way?" eMarketer,
June 2007, 1-31.
- Waldfoegel, J. (2009). Lost on the web: Does web distribution stimulate or depress
television viewing?. *Information Economics and Policy*, 21(2), 158-168.
- Wolfradt, U., & Doll, J. (2001). Motives of adolescents to use the Internet as a function
of personality traits, personal and social factors. *Journal of Educational
Computing Research*, 24(1), 13-28.

Appendix

New Motive Items

Novelty	I watch TV/ I use YouTube because it is new. because the technology is innovative. because the interface is different. because the experience is unusual.
Agency Enhancement	I watch TV/ I use YouTube because it allows me to have my say. because it allows me to assert my identity because it allows me to send my thoughts to many because it gives me the power to broadcast to my followers.
Bandwagon	I watch TV/ I use YouTube because it allows me to review opinions of others before I make decisions because it comforts me to know the thoughts and opinions of others. because it allows me to compare my opinions with those of others.
Ownness	I watch TV/ I use YouTube because I feel like it is mine once I use it because it features content that is a true reflection of myself. because it allows me to customize so that I can make it my own.
Dynamic Control	I watch TV/ I use YouTube because it gives me control because it allows me to be in charge. because I am able to control my interaction with the interface. because I am able to influence how it looks. because I am able to influence how it works.

Table 1

Pattern Matrix for Traditional Motives in Relation to Traditional Broadcast Television Viewing

I watch the television ...	Passing Time/ Habit	Information	Escape	Entertainment
because I just like to watch.	<u>0.813</u>	-0.248	-0	0
because it is a habit, just something I do	<u>0.575</u>	0.065	0.2	0
when I have nothing better to do	<u>0.978</u>	-0.052	-0	#
because it passes the time away, particularly when I am bored.	<u>0.88</u>	0.013	-0	#
because it gives me something to do to occupy my time	<u>0.772</u>	-0.305	0.3	0
because it entertains me	0.141	0.092	0	<u>1</u>
because it is enjoyable	-0.074	0.194	0.2	<u>1</u>
because it amuses me	0.102	0.119	0.1	<u>1</u>
because it helps me learn things about myself and others	-0.191	<u>0.886</u>	0	0
so I can learn how to do things that I have not done before.	0.005	<u>0.648</u>	0.1	0
so I could learn about what could happen to me.	-0.116	<u>0.926</u>	-0	0
I watch the television so I can forget about school or other things.	-0.152	-0.142	<u>1</u>	0

so I can get away from the rest of the family or others.	0.182	0.289	<u>0.5</u>	#
I watch the television so I can get away from what I am doing.	0.003	-0.008	<u>0.8</u>	0

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.^a

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Table 2

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations of New Motives in Reference to YouTube and Television

	YouTube	TV
Because it gives me the power to broadcast to my followers. **	3.83 (1.64)	2.71 (1.89)
Because it allows me to review opinions of others before I make decisions. **	4.17 (2.04)	3.45 (1.62)
Because I am able to influence how it looks. **	3.13 (1.68)	2.73 (1.51)
Because I am able to influence how it works. **	3.51 (1.88)	2.93(1.43)

*Difference between means is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); **Difference between means is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); ***Difference between means is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed)

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations of YouTube Viewing Motives of Males and Females

I use YouTube ...	Males	Females
because it is new.	3.43 (2.04)	2.97 (1.58)
because the technology is innovative.	4.61 (1.67)	3.92 (1.68)
because the interface is different.	3.7 (1.66)	3.28 (1.75)
because the experience is unusual. *	4.22 (1.41)	3.2 (1.76)
because it allows me to have my say.	3.69 (1.69)	3.25 (1.85)
because it allows me to assert my identity. **	4.17 (1.64)	3.05 (1.61)
it allows me to send my thoughts to many. *	3.91 (1.88)	2.95 (1.91)
because it gives me the power to broadcast to my followers. *	4.13 (1.89)	3.00 (1.90)
because it allows me to review opinions of others before I make decisions. *	4.87 (1.84)	3.88 (2.08)
because it comforts me to know the thoughts and opinions of others.	4.43 (1.95)	3.78 (1.8)
I use YouTube because it allows me to compare my opinions with those of others.	4.35 (1.95)	3.92 (1.98)

because I feel like it is mine once I use it	3.83 (1.70)	3.05 (1.78)
because it features content that is a true reflection of myself. **	4.82 (1.68)	3.61 (1.80)
because it allows me to customize so that I can make it my own.	4.39 (1.70)	3.58 (1.98)
because it gives me control. ***	4.52 (1.56)	3.17 (1.72)
because it allows me to be in charge. *	3.96 (1.92)	3.05 (1.78)
because I am able to control my interaction with the interface. **	4.48 (1.47)	3.38 (1.86)
because I am able to influence how it looks.	4.48 (1.65)	3.20 (1.89)
I use YouTube because I am able to influence how it works.	4.48 (1.65)	3.17 (1.89)

Difference between means is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); **Difference between means is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); *Difference between means is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed)*

Table 4

Correlations between Time Spent on YouTube and New Motives

	How many hours a week do you use YouTube on average?
I use YouTube because it is new.	0.128
I use YouTube because the technology is innovative.	0.328**
I use YouTube because the interface is different.	0.268*
I use YouTube because the experience is unusual.	0.379**
I use YouTube because it allows me to have my say.	0.319**
I use YouTube because it allows me to assert my identity	0.492**
I use YouTube because it allows me to send my thoughts to many	0.398**
I use YouTube because it gives me the power to broadcast to my followers.	0.361**
I use YouTube because it allows me to review opinions of others before I make decisions	0.331**
I use YouTube because it comforts me to know the thoughts and opinions of others.	0.408**
I use YouTube because it allows me to compare my opinions with those of others.	0.316*
I use YouTube because I feel like it is mine once I use it	0.383**
I use YouTube because it features content that is a true reflection of myself.	0.302**

I use YouTube because it allows me to customize so that I can make it my own.	0.248*
I use YouTube because it gives me control	0.369**
I use YouTube because it allows me to be in charge.	0.273*
I use YouTube because I am able to control my interaction with the interface.	0.273*
I use YouTube because I am able to influence how it looks.	0.332**
I use YouTube because I am able to influence how it works.	0.327**

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

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