

The Corinthian

Volume 4

Article 7

2002

Dual Users: Real Lessons from Reality Television

Windy Caviness Georgia College & State University

Christy Ennis Georgia College & State University

Kesha Evans Georgia College & State University

Paige Harrison Georgia College & State University

Brooke Houston Georgia College & State University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://kb.gcsu.edu/thecorinthian

Part of the Communication Technology and New Media Commons, and the Mass Communication Commons

Recommended Citation

Caviness, Windy; Ennis, Christy; Evans, Kesha; Harrison, Paige; Houston, Brooke; Ivey, Diane; Kirkley, Stephen; Manceau, Adeline; McKinney, Jill; Moore, Kimbo; Scandrett, Gabrielle; Whirley, April; Thompson, John; Abbamonte, Kristin; Bunch, Allison; Champagne, Liane; Dickey, William; Koch, Jenn; and McConville, Katherine (2002) "Dual Users: Real Lessons from Reality Television," *The Corinthian*: Vol. 4, Article 7. Available at: https://kb.gcsu.edu/thecorinthian/vol4/iss1/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research at Knowledge Box. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Corinthian by an authorized editor of Knowledge Box.

Authors

Windy Caviness, Christy Ennis, Kesha Evans, Paige Harrison, Brooke Houston, Diane Ivey, Stephen Kirkley, Adeline Manceau, Jill McKinney, Kimbo Moore, Gabrielle Scandrett, April Whirley, John Thompson, Kristin Abbamonte, Allison Bunch, Liane Champagne, William Dickey, Jenn Koch, and Katherine McConville

GC&SU Students:Windy Caviness, Christy Ennis, Kesha Evans, Paige Harrison, Brooke Houston, Diane Ivey, Stephen Kirkley, Adeline Manceau, Jill McKinney, Kimbo Moore, Gabrielle Scandrett; April Whirley, John Thompson

And Elon University Students: Kristin Abbamonte, Allison Bunch, Liane Champage, William Dickey, Jenn Koch, & Katherine McConville

This paper was a joint effort between Georgia College & State University Mass Communication Senior Seminar and Elon University Mass Communication Senior Seminar and Dr. M.J. Land and Dr. Constance Book

Abstract

This study attempts to understand the differences in activity among an emergent television/Internet audience. The Internet has provided a new entertainment opportunity for producers of television programming. Those television viewers who have also reached out to their favorite television show websites have resulted in a new audience. Examining the programming genre of reality television, two constructs were developed and a written survey administered to a convenience sample of college freshmen. The construct "dual users" was created to examine the television audience that also visits television programming websites. Single users (those that only watch the television show) were compared to the self-reported levels of activity and involvement of dual users. Early findings suggest that the dual users are more involved during viewing of the television show and engaged in less secondary activity than the single users.

This study and the testing of these constructs are in an early phase and merit discussion among media scholars.

Introduction

The latest rage to sweep the airwaves is reality television. In 2000, more than 50 million Americans tuned into the final episode of *Survivor 2*. *Survivor 2* came in just behind the Super Bowl as the most watched television program of the year. *Survivor 2* also passed the non-reality television show *Seinfeld* as the most successful summer

series in television history (www.ananova.com). This season, prime time on the networks included *Survivor*, *Big Brother*, *Temptation Island*, *Love Cruise*, *The Real World*, *Fear Factor*, and other reality television shows.

The reality craze started seven years ago when Bunim/Murray Productions debuted "seven strangers picked to live in a house" in New York City on MTV's *The Real World* (Peyser, 2001). CBS built on the success of cable television's *The Real World*, and produced one of the network's first reality shows, *Survivor*. That success, led other networks to follow CBS's lead in reality shows. As the competition has grown, more shows pushing the envelope with scandalous plots are popping up among the stations leaving viewers wanting more (Wolk, Rice, & Rich, 2001). Almost half of all Americans, as well as 70% of 18-24 year olds, watch reality television shows (Gardyn, 2001).

As the media have seen this crave for more reality-based programming, network executives have attempted to blend the opportunity of the World Wide Web to draw audiences into interactive reality television. Web-based television is one of the latest forms of media to involve viewers with the material they are watching on television. Most reality shows now have their own websites for viewers to visit during the week. The websites offer biographies of the characters, trivia games, programming updates, and other components the show may not offer.

This study attempts, through a survey of college freshmen, to discover the different levels of involvement between traditional reality television audiences (single users) and reality television/ Internet audiences (dual users). Uses and gratifications theory will be used to examine the audiences of reality television and websites. Throughout this study we will look at how frequently college freshmen view reality shows, which reality shows they watch, reasons for watching reality television, how often they visit the reality television show's website and why they visit the websites.

Review of Related Literature

A major challenge in trying to better understand reality television based on audience activity lies in simply defining the terms audience activity and reality television. A review of the uses and gratifications theory is also necessary in order to understand the level of audience activity in media use. Finally, this section will compare television

and Internet audiences.

For the purpose of this study, reality television is defined as "real people, rather than actors and actresses, who are acting in forced situations or in their own life situations." Reality television is facing more and more questions of authenticity (Schlosser, 2001). Arguments have developed over what is real, and what is edited and manipulated for television purposes. The people on the shows are supposed to be average people. In actuality though, they are people who audition for their spots on the show (Miller, 2000). Most of these so-called "normal people," who are cast on the show, are just looking to become famous (Wolk, Rice, & Rich, 2001).

The creators of reality television shows could not be more pleased that reality television is doing so well. Reality-based shows are much cheaper to produce than a sitcom (Streisand, 2001). They also generate large audiences and create free publicity on other programs (Caristi, 2001). Producers do not seem to think that reality television is misleading of the truth and "real life." They see the programming as harmless. The programming shows people just want to be a part of the crowd (Reiss & Wiltz, 2001). What is new is that the program provides contrived parameters, and brings in people from the body of the population, without this heady air of stardom (Goodale, 2001).

The continued success of reality television is being questioned. Frutkin (2001) argues the popularity of reality television may not last very long. Yes, the shows are very popular and cost less for networks to produce, but the genre may end up hurting the networks in the end (Frutkin, 2001). While they are cheap to make, they also bring in less money from advertisers. Frutkin also argues less revenue could kill the shows. Networks depend on advertisers to create revenue and without advertising there is no revenue and therefore, no programming. Another disadvantage is that scripted television programs are still popular even after syndication, while reality television loses its initial appeal after the first airing. Scott Stone, who is co-executive producer for shows like The Mole and Popstars says, "On the food chain of library values, comedies are probably the most valuable, dramas are the second most, and then maybe reality after that. Reality television is never going to be like watching repeats of Seinfeld, Cosby, or Frasier" (Frutkin, 2001, pg 26). Other television executives feel that reality television is here to stay because the shows are inexpensive to produce, spawn large audiences, and generate free publicity on other programs (Caristi, 2001).

Despite all the controversy, the public enjoys reality-based programming. People watch reality television for different reasons. In an E-Poll online survey of 2,121 Americans ages 18-54, the number one reason people watch reality television is the thrill of "guessing who will be eliminated from the show" (Gardyn, 2001). Seeing people facing challenging situations and imagining how one would perform in similar situations are the second and third most common reasons viewers tune into reality television (Gardyn, 2001). Men are more than three times as likely as women to tune in to see physically attractive contestants, while women are more likely than men to tune in because they like guessing the outcomes (Gardyn, 2001).

Reality television shows allow their audiences to fantasize about gaining status through automatic fame (Reiss & Wiltz, 2001). Ordinary people can watch these shows and imagine they, too, could become celebrities by being on these shows (Reiss & Wiltz, 2001). According to Gardyn (2001), 40% of reality television viewers consider themselves adventurous, and 86% lead active lives.

Why people watch reality television and visit reality television websites is a part of the uses and gratifications theory of the media. The uses and gratifications perspective shifts the focus of media effects from what media do to people to what people do with the media (Rubin 1993). According to Rubin (1993), we may speculate that people may be motivated to seek and to learn information, but that other perceptual or emotional outcomes do not require such a motivated state. We may come to rely upon a medium, such as television, as an effective way to fill idle time (Levy & Windahl, 1981). Another reason people may watch reality television shows is to displace the time we spend on other activities (Rubin, 1986). Broadcast media has been widely linked with entertainment needs, while newspapers primarily serve surveillance needs (Jeffries & Atkin, 1996). Users of newspapers have better perceptions of computers, as well. Heavy television watchers are more likely to adopt videotext (Jeffries & Atkin, 1996).

The level of activity of an audience is important. The activity of an audience, according to Blumler (1979), is evident in people's utility, intention, selectivity, and involvement with the media. Bauer (1964) argued that we need to consider the initiative of the audience in "getting the information it wants and avoiding what it does not want". Another factor in measuring audience activity is to find out whether audience activity occurs before, during, or after exposure (Levy and Blumer,

1985).

A key component of the business of reality television is the World Wide Web and interactivity. According to an E-Poll survey, 70% of avid reality television fans, ages 18 to 54, visit websites related to the reality shows they prefer, as do 32% of occasional viewers (Gardyn, 2001). Twenty-six percent of all reality television viewers read or post messages online regarding the genre, and 22% play Internet games that are based on the shows (Gardyn, 2001). One study by Ferguson and Perse (2000) surveyed college students on their personal Internet usage. Entertainment was the most constant motive for searching the web. The top three reasons why these students surfed the web were play, acquisition, and educational. Ferguson and Perse (2000) argued if the main function of the web was entertainment and if the web could provide convenient, reliable, and efficient service, then it could possibly replace television.

The networks have control of what is aired during a show's time slot, where as the web offers coverage continuously. For example, on the show Big Brother 2, one of the houseguests pulled a knife on another houseguest asking, "Would you get mad if I killed you?" This event never aired on television in its entirety, but if viewers were logged on to the website at the right time, they would have witnessed the entire situation as it unfolded.

Web based television is one of the latest forms of media to involve viewers with the material they are watching on television. The Internet holds a level of interactivity that television cannot because the viewers have the opportunity to navigate through a large amount of information and entertainment at their convenience.

On *Big Brother*, the Internet was used as a link to the television show. The corresponding *Big Brother* website had chat capabilities that allowed for opinion exchange on many different topics, including gossip on the characters and who the audience was wanting out of the house (Caristi, 2001). Several fan sites were created with the purpose of trying to sway the public's opinion to have a particular guest voted off the show (Caristi, 2001).

Other research on the reality television show *Big Brother* (Gandy, Carney et al., 2001) examined the differing levels of involvement between television audiences and Internet audiences. Using Levy and Windahl's (1981) definition of an active audience, this study found a more active audience in individuals who watched the show and also

visited the show's website.

The combination of the Internet and television is supposed to lead to one interactive entertainment and information system in the next decade. Producers have found that people might be more active viewers if they have an input on the media experience. More viewers would boost the show's ratings.

This study attempted to more thoroughly understand the popular phenomenon of reality television and its television and Internet audiences. The study does so by examining the degree of audience activity. The primary measure of activity by an audience member was whether the viewer watches reality television programming. The next measure is how often and with how much dedicated attention. The audience involvement, or activity, can also be examined by determining whether the audience member chose to further seek out information on the Internet pertaining to the corresponding reality television show.

Hypotheses

Based on the information that has been gathered through our research, five hypotheses were formed. The five hypotheses attempted to discover the relationship between single users (television only reality television viewers) and dual users (people who watch reality television shows and view reality television websites). We examined the audience activities on four distinct actions: planning, discussing, involving, and retaining. These hypotheses were based on Levy and Windahl's (1981) measure of audience activity. The idea behind each hypothesis is that dual users are a more active audience than television only—single users.

H1: Dual users will plan more in advance for their reality television activities than single users. This hypothesis is based on the belief that if the audience is more actively involved in the program, they will plan their schedules around the opportunity to view the program.

H2: Dual users will discuss their reality television activities with others more than single users. This hypothesis is based on the idea that if the audience is involved in the viewing process they are more likely to discuss the program with others.

H3: The reality television shows seem more real to dual users than to single users. This hypothesis is based on the idea that the more involved the audience is with programming the more realistic the programming will seem to the audience.

H4: Dual users retain more information about the reality show

than single users. If viewers are paying more attention to a program and its content, they are more likely to remember the content.

H5: Dual users will participate in fewer activities while watching the reality show than single users. If viewers are thoroughly involved in the viewing activity, they are less likely to participate in secondary activities that interfere with their ability to watch the programming,

Methodology

Three hundred and forty of the 809 college freshman in English 1101 were surveyed at Georgia College & State University. Twentyfive teachers were sent letters requesting permission to survey their classes. Teachers from nineteen classes agreed to have the survey administered during the allotted class time. Surveys were conducted within a one-week time period. Each survey required about ten minutes to complete.

The survey was composed of 33 questions and five pages divided into four sections: (1) the television home environment and television use; (2) Internet/computer availability and use; (3) viewing of reality television and visiting of reality television websites; (4) demographic information about the respondent.

Results

Of the 340 respondents, 69% were female and 31% were male. The average age of the respondents was 19 years. The majority of the respondents were Caucasian (88%). African Americans made up 6.6% of the sample.

Almost all (99.6%) of the respondents had a television in their homes with 84% having two or more television sets in their homes. Most (70%) receive their television signals by cable and 17% reported having a satellite dish. On average, the respondents watch 2.5 hours of television a day.

Almost all (96.5%) of the respondents also had computers in their homes. Ninety-four percent of students said their home computer was connected to the Internet. Students reported spending 2.1 hours per day online. Students said they most frequently access the Internet from their home (57%). Almost forty percent (39.8%) said they accessed the Internet most frequently from school labs. Nineteen percent of students said they frequently or always browse the web while watching televi-

sion. Students reported spending most of their time online on educational activities, closely followed by communication and recreational activities.

The most popular reality television show among the college freshman was MTV's *Real World*. Over thirty percent (31%) of students said they frequently or always watch *Real World*. Other popular shows include MTV's *Road Rules*, with 23% of students frequently or always watching the show; *A Wedding Story* (26%); *A Dating Story* (21%); *Trading Spaces* (20%); *A Makeover Story* (19.2%); *A Baby Story* (18.5%); and *Blind Date* (18%).

The website visited most often was MTV's *Road Rules* with 4% of students saying they sometimes or frequently visited the site. Other visited websites were those of *Trading Spaces* and *Survivor* with 3% of students saying they sometimes or frequently visit those websites. Students reported preferring to watch reality television with another person or in a group (68%) while preferring to visit reality websites alone.

The data was examined for differences in responses of race, gender, and age. No statistically significant differences were found on the variables race, gender, or age.

In order to answer Hypotheses 1-5, dual users (those who watch reality television and visit reality television websites) and single users (those who only watch reality television) were compared. An analysis of variance was run between the groups and the variables that measured audience activity during television viewing with a level of significance of .05 established.

H1: Dual users will plan more in advance for their reality television activities than television viewers.

Accepted. Dual users are more likely to plan their reality television viewing than television only viewers. This finding indicates that the reality television experience is more important to dual users than to single users.

H2: Dual users will discuss their reality television activities more than television only viewers.

Accepted. Dual users discuss the programming more with others than those who only watch television. This is an indication of the involvement of the dual users audience with the reality television expetience.

H3: The reality television shows seem more real to dual users than to single users.

Rejected. There is no statistically significant difference in dual users and reality single users in their perception of the reality of the show. This could be because the dual user has gained more information about the program from the website and is therefore less likely to believe all of the information in the television program.

H4: Dual users retain more information about the show than single users.

Accepted. Dual users report more knowledge of the program (names of characters and situations) than television only viewers. Dual users are exposed to more information over longer periods of time and therefore obtain more knowledge.

H5: Dual users will participate in fewer activities while watching the show than single users.

Rejected. No statistically significant differences existed between single or dual users and their reported activities while watching the show. The survey question asked about any secondary activities. The results may be different if the question asked about competing secondary activities, activities that interfere with the viewing process.

Three of the five hypotheses concerning dual users and television only viewers were accepted. These findings suggest that the dual users are a more active audience than the television only audiences. This confirms our belief that dual users are more involved in their television viewing experience.

Conclusion

Audiences of reality television programs are examined in this study. Those who are television audiences only were compared to those who watch reality television shows and visit the reality television websites. The level of audience activity or involvement of each of these groups is examined. Results are mixed. Three of the five hypotheses examining audience activity were accepted. When dual users were compared to single users, dual users were found to plan more for their reality television viewing experience, to discuss the reality television program more, and to retain more information about their reality television viewing experience. These three hypotheses suggest that dual users of reality television media are a more active audience than television only viewers. These findings are supported by similar findings of the Big Brother television program (Gandy, Carney, et al., 2001). Future research should examine the construct of dual users with other

television programming content. Sports programming, in particular, should be of interest because a large number of websites are devoted to information about sports information. Dual users of other media should also be examined. Are viewers of programs who also read magazine articles about the programs a more active audience? Future research should also examine other measures of audience activity to determine if dual users are more active than single users.

Although these preliminary results are mixed, they appear to support the concept that dual users are a more active audience than television only users. These findings are useful for broadcasters as they make decisions about websites and their role in the entertainment industry.

Bibliography

- Bauer, R. A. (1964). The obstinate audience: The influence process from the point of view of social communication. *American Psychologist*, 19, 319-328.
- Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications stud ies. *Communication Research*, 6, 63-75. (1979).
- Caristi, D. (2001, July). Reality shows to the networks rescue. USA Today Magazine, 130, 72.
- Ferguson, D. A., & Perse, E. M. (2000). The World Wide Web as a functional alternative to television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44 2, 155-175.
- Frutkin, A.J. (2001, March 26) Reality's Burnout Factor. Mediaweek p.11
- Gandy, L. Carney, L. et al., (August, 2001). Reality television goes interactive: The *Big Brother* television audience. Paper present ed to the EntertainmentStudies Group, AEJMC, Washington, D.C.
- Gardyn, R. (2001). The tribe has spoken. American Demographics, 23, 34.
- Goodale, G. (2001, August 3). Reality runs Rampant. Christian Science Monitor, p. 13.
- Jeffries, L., & Atkin, D. (1996) .Predicting use of technologies for com munication and consumer needs. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 40 3,318-333.
- Levy, M.R., & Windahl, S. (1981). The concept of audience activity. In K.E. Rosengren, L.A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.) *Media* gratifications research: Current perspectives (pp. 109-122). Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage.

- Miller, E. D. (2000). Fantasies of Reality: Surviving reality based pro gramming *Social Policy*, 31 6.
- Peyser, M. (2001, July 2) Real World After All. Newsweek, p 54-55.
- Reiss, S. & Wiltz, J. (2001, September/October). Why America loves reality TV. *Psychology Today*, 34, 52-54.
- Rubin, A. (1993). Audience activity and media use. Communication Monographs, 60, 98-106.
- Schlosser, J. (2001, July 16). Big Brother overkill. *Broadcasting and Cable*, p. 8.
- Streisand, B. (2001, January 22). Did you say reality TV? Or surreal TV, U.S. News & World Report, p. 36-38.
- Wolk, J., Rice, L. & Rich, J. (2001) Brother from another Planet. Entertainment Weekly, 606 p.34

MASS COMMUNICATION SURVEY

We are a part of a Senior Seminar Class in the Mass Communication Program. We would appreciate your answering the following questions about Reality Television shows and Websites. Please circle the answer that best describes you based on your current residence.

1. How many television sets are in your home?

a.	One	16.2%
b.	Two	17.6%
c.	Three	23.2%
d.	Four or More	42.6%

2. How do you currently receive television signals in your home? (Circle all that apply.)

a. Cable Television Subscription70.2%	
b. Satellite Dish	17.4%
c. Over-the-air signals (antennae)	6.2%
d. other	2.1%

3. How many hours a day do you estimate you watch television? 2.5

4. Do you currently have a personal computer in your home?

YES (96.5%) NO (3.2%)

5. If yes, how many computers do you have in your home? 1.6

6. If yes, does your home computer currently have access to the Internet?

YES (94%) NO (5.1%)

7. How many hours a day do you estimate that you spend online? 2.1

8. Where do you most frequently access the Internet?

a. work	1.2%
b. home	56.9%
c. school	39.8%
d. other	1.2%

9. How often do you browse the web and watch television at the same time?

NEVERRARELYSOMETIMESFREQUENTLYALWAYS28.3%25.4%27.4%17.4%1.5%10. Rank the following online activities from 1-6 by how much time
you spend on each. Put a 1 by the activity you do the most often, etc.

a. recreation	2.9
b. work	3.6
c. educational	2.3

d. shopping	4.2
e. email or chatting	2.8
f. other	4.2

11. How often do you (or did you) watch the following Reality Television Shows?

Temptation NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
58.2%	16.2%	12.4%	6.5%	6.8%
Big Brothe	r			
NEVER 69.7%		SOMETIMES 8.5%	FREQUENTLY 2.6%	ALWAYS .9%
Survivor NEVER 37.6%	RARELY 29.4%	SOMETIMES 17.9%	FREQUENTLY 9.7%	ALWAYS 5.3%
The Amari	no Pass			
<i>The Amazi</i> NEVER 86.7%	ng Kace RARELY 7.1%	SOMETIMES 3.2%	FREQUENTLY 2.1%	ALWAYS .3%
Fear Facto)r			
NEVER 50.3%	RARELY 22.1%	SOMETIMES 19.7%	FREQUENTLY 6.2%	ALWAYS 1.8%
The Mole				
NEVER 80%	RARELY 10.3%	SOMETIMES 5.9%	FREQUENTLY 2.1%	ALWAYS 1.5%
Love Cruis	е			
NEVER 82.1%	RARELY 6.8%	SOMETIMES 5.3%	FREQUENTLY 2.4%	ALWAYS 2.9%
A Wedding	Story			
NEVER 47.6%	RARELY 12.6%	SOMETIMES 16.2%	FREQUENTLY 16.8%	ALWAYS 6.8%

A Dating S	Story			
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
	15.3%		15.9%	5%
A Baby Sto				
			FREQUENTLY	
55%	13.8%	12.4%	13.5%	5%
Trading Sp	20005			
	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ATWAYS
	7.9%	14.1%	10.9%	9.1%
57.710	1.570	14.170	10.970	9.170
A Makeove	er Story			
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
56%	11.2%	13.6%	12.1% 7	.1%
Blind Date	2			
NEVER			FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
32.6%	21.2%	27.6%	14.4%	3.8%
Change of	Heart			
0 0		SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
66.8%	13.2%		5.3%	.3%
MTV's Ro	ad Rules			
	RARELY		FREQUENTLY	
20%	25%	31.8%	15.9%	7.4%
MTV's Re	al World			
		SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ATWAVS
18%	20.1%		19.5%	11.8%
10 /0	20.170	50.570	17.570	11.0 /0
Other				
	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
	33.5%		-	2.9%

For the following questions think about your favorite Reality Television Show listed above.

12. Do yo NEVER 24.8%			te to watch the sho FREQUENTLY 21.5%	w? ALWAYS 8%	
13. Do yo NEVER 11.8%	•	a) discuss the sho SOMETIMES 33.9%	ow with others? FREQUENTLY 23.9%	ALWAYS 6.2%	
14. Does tl NEVER 20.6%		/ show seem rea SOMETIMES 33.3%	l to you? FREQUENTLY 18.6%	ALWAYS 8.3%	
15. Do yo NEVER 15.4%		specifics about e SOMETIMES 30.5%	each episode? FREQUENTLY 21.3%	ALWAYS 10.1%	
16. Do you NEVER 11%			s while watching t FREQUENTLY 25.2%		
17. Do you prefer to watch reality television:a. Alone12%b. with another person45.6%c. with a large group of people22.8%d. do not watch reality television19.2%					
18. What attracts you to a reality TV show? Check all that apply.					
See people like me40.8%Personality of characters76.5%Relationships66.9%Attractiveness of characters53.8%Location of show48.7%What they are doing on the show81.7%					
My friends watch 30.6%					

To be in the know	14.7%
To escape my own life	29.6%
To pass the time	26.9%
I find them educational	12.4%

19. How often do you (or did you) visit the following Reality Show Websites? Temptation Island SOMETIMES FREQUENTLY ALWAYS NEVER RARELY 95.9% 2.1% 1.2% **Big Brother** SOMETIMES FREOUENTLY ALWAYS NEVER RARELY 95.6% 2.7% 1.2% Survivor FREOUENTLY ALWAYS NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES 93.8% 2.4% 2.4% .9% The Amazing Race NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES FREQUENTLY ALWAYS 98.5% 6% .3% Fear Factor SOMETIMES FREQUENTLY NEVER **ALWAYS** RARELY 96.7% 6% 2.1% The Mole NEVER SOMETIMES FREOUENTLY **ALWAYS** RARELY .6% 97.9% .9% Love Cruise SOMETIMES FREQUENTLY ALWAYS NEVER RARELY 97.9% 6% .9%

A Wedding Story NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES FREQUENTLY ALWAYS

95.9%	1.8%	1.5%	.3%	
A Dating S NEVER 96.4%	Story RARELY 1.2%	SOMETIMES 1.5%	FREQUENTLY .3%	ALWAYS
A Baby Sta NEVER 95.6%	ory RARELY 2.4%	SOMETIMES 1.2%	FREQUENTLY .3%	ALWAYS
Trading Sp NEVER 94.7%	RARELY 1.5%	SOMETIMES 2.7%	FREQUENTLY .6%	ALWAYS
A Makeova NEVER 96.2%	er Story RARELY 1.5%	SOMETIMES 1.5%	FREQUENTLY .3%	ALWAYS
Blind Date NEVER 96.4%		SOMETIMES 1.5%	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
Change of NEVER 97.9%	F Heart RARELY .6%	SOMETIMES .6%	FREQUENTLY .3%	ALWAYS
MTV's <i>Ro</i> NEVER 90.2%	oad Rules RARELY 5.6%	SOMETIMES 3.3%	FREQUENTLY .3%	ALWAYS
MTV's <i>Re</i> NEVER 89.1%	al World RARELY 6.2%	SOMETIMES 4.1%	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
Other NEVER 73.2%	RARELY .3%	SOMETIMES .6%	FREQUENTLY .3%	ALWAYS

For the following questions think about your favorite Reality Television Show listed above. If you have never visited a reality television show website, skip to question #29.

•	(or did you) RARELY 9.7%	*	e to visit the webs FREQUENTLY .5%	
		discuss the site SOMETIMES 6.6%	with others? FREQUENTLY .5%	ALWAYS
		/ website seem 1 SOMETIMES 10.8%	real to you? FREQUENTLY 2.1%	ALWAYS 1.5%
•		pecifics about th SOMETIMES 7.3%	ne website? FREQUENTLY .5%	ALWAYS 1.6%
 24. Do you participate in other activities while visiting the website? NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES FREQUENTLY ALWAYS 41.1% 7.4% 13.2% 2.6% 1.6% 25. When do you usually access the website? Before During Right after the show Throughout the week 5.1% 4.5% 13.4% 22.9% 				
26. Have you ever visited the website of a reality television show that you have never watched on television? YES (3.7%) NO (61.1%)				
27. Do you a. Alone b. with ano	•	sit reality televis	tion websites: 33.1% 14%	

b. with another person	1470
c. with a large group of people	1.3%

28. What attracts you to a reality TV show website? Check all that apply.

More background on characters	34.8%
More intimate camera shots	14.1%
Updates on show	27.9%
Entertainment	26.5%
Information	30.4%
I find it educational	3.3%
Pass the time	26.3%
To escape my own life	6.7%
To participate in contests	9%
To interact with other fans of the show	4.1%
29. What ethnic group do you belong to?	
a. African-Ameican	6.6%
b. Caucasian	88%
c. Hispanic or Latino	.9%
d. Asian American	.3%
e. Biracial	1.8%

f. Other

30.	What is your gender?
	MALE (31%)

FEMALE (69%)

1.8%

31. What is your age? Mean = 19.05