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The growth of direct broadcast satellite television distribution to the home as a viable competitor to cable and terrestrial broadcast has fostered the availability of special interest or niche channels and therefore provided greater choice to the viewer. This study, based on uses and gratifications theory, examined the relationships among ritual and instrumental viewing motivations and satisfactions, viewer religiosity, and viewing attentiveness as they related to the selection of a niche television channel, Brigham Young University Television.

The uses and gratification approach provides an appropriate framework for studying “media consumption, the interrelated nature of television user motives, and the relationships among viewing motives and viewing patterns” (Abelman, 1989, p. 57). Data was gathered by way of an online survey of non-random, self-selected BYU
Television viewers. Participants answered 67 questions about their motives for choosing to view BYU Television and the gratifications they received from their viewing. The 596 valid responses to the survey were analyzed.

The study results are in harmony with previous uses and gratifications studies examining ritual and instrumental viewing patterns. The data found positive relationships between instrumental viewing motives and instrumental viewing satisfactions, as well as instrumental viewing motives and viewing selectivity. There was no support for those hypotheses that dealt with the level of viewing attention as it related to religiosity or instrumental viewing motives.

Future topics of study are suggested including the opportunity an expanded media universe provides to increase the depth and breadth of uses and gratification theory, as well as to study the role of niche television services in community building.
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Introduction

Direct broadcast satellite systems, broadband cable networks, and digital terrestrial transmitters have begun to substantiate the claims of media prognosticators that the 500 channel universe is on the horizon (History of Satellite Television, 2001). The growth of direct broadcast satellite as a television distribution system in competition with cable and terrestrial broadcast has fostered the emergence and national availability of special interest or niche channels and therefore greater choice for the home viewer.

This change has been facilitated by a mix of factors. A different economic model of television service based on subscription as well as advertising revenues has meant expanded opportunities for program producers and distributors to offer content that appeals to narrow rather than broad audiences. Technological advances have certainly played their part with digital compression, broadband fiber networks and geosynchronous low-orbit satellites. Relaxation of government regulations regarding ownership of multiple media outlets and the mergers of media production and distribution companies has also contributed to the rapidly changing media environment.

These additional channels are a mix of truly new services, multiplexed versions of existing channels that allow for viewing convenience across time zones, and spin-off
channels of existing networks that divide programming into increasingly narrow content areas. One perspective on the viability of, and consumer interest in, an increasing number of differentiated program services is the increased opportunities it provides communication scholars to examine audience behavior, message content, and media effects (Abelman, Atkin & Rand, 1997; Berger, 1995; Ferguson & Perse, 2000; Finn, 1997; Palmgreen, 1984; Ruggerio, 2000; Van der Bulck, 1999; Williams, Phillips & Lum, 1985).

Study Objectives

The objectives of this study are to examine the ritual and instrumental motivations for selecting a niche television channel, in particular Brigham Young University Television, and the satisfactions received from such viewing. An additional goal is to expand our understanding of religious and spiritual gratifications that may be associated with media use and content.

Background

An overview of the various entities mentioned in this study may prove helpful. The following section provides a brief summary of direct broadcast satellite television service in the United States, the history and mission of BYU Television, and an orientation to the teachings about media provided by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Direct Broadcast Satellite

Home satellite receivers have been available and affordable to consumers since the early 1980's. Initially, large-dish direct to home (DTH) receivers were principally marketed to rural or other consumers who were unable to receive broadcast signals and did not have access to cable service (Macy, 2001). Direct broadcast satellite (DBS) signals that are received by a small 18-24 inch dish became available in 1994 (Goolsbee & Petrin, 2001; Long, 2001).

The popularity of the service is demonstrated by its rapid growth (Abraham, 2000). In 2001 the two major DBS services in the United States, Dish Network and DirecTV, reported having a combined total of 21 million subscribers, as compared to cable's 69 million subscribers (Boehlert, 2001). DBS is aggressively marketed throughout the United States as an attractive alternative to cable or terrestrial broadcast and has spurred cable companies to expand their digital service in order to compete. The average cable system in the U.S. currently offers 57 channels (Goolsbee & Petrin, 2001) while Dish Network and DirecTV each offer more than 200 channels (Boehlert, 2001).

“DBS now accounts for about two-thirds of all new subscriptions to multichannel video systems” (Goolsbee & Petrin, 2001, p. 7). Its ability to target niche audiences makes it particularly attractive to advertisers (Abraham, 2000).

As part of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, DBS providers were required to set aside 4 to 7 percent of their spectrum or channel capacity for noncommercial programming that is informational or educational in nature (“Commission Implements,” 1998). The rules governing this set-aside were
implemented in November of 1998, and called for approximately 4 percent of each provider's channel capacity to be reserved for such noncommercial uses ("One Big Dish," 2002).

BYU (Brigham Young University) Television

BYU Television is owned by Brigham Young University located in Provo, Utah and operated by the university's Division of Broadcast Services located in the College of Fine Arts and Communication. The stated programming mission of BYU Television is to create and acquire programming that "enhances the quality of life of our viewers worldwide, represents the standards and educational opportunities of Brigham Young University, and is consistent with the values and standards of our communities of interest and stakeholders" (personal communication, BYU Television Programming Mission, February 4, 2002).

The division has managed a public television station, KBYU, since 1965, and a public radio station, KBYU-FM, since 1960. BYU is one of the largest private universities in the United States with three campuses located in Provo, Utah; Rexburg, Idaho; and Laie, Hawaii.

BYU Television originated with an invitation from the Dish Network to apply for one of the noncommercial education/information channels the service was required to offer. BYU submitted an application in December of 1999 and was notified at the end of the same month that the application had been approved (Carter, 2002; R. Miller, personal
communication, December 20, 2001). Plans called for the university to begin programming the channel by October of 2000.

However, on January 3, 2000 the university was notified that the channel had to be on the air by January 7, 2000 or the space would be allocated elsewhere (J. Reim, personal communication, January 4, 2000). Therefore BYU Television debuted on the Dish Network at 12:01 p.m. on January 7, 2000 (Carter, 2002). The channel is included in the Dish 500 system programming package that adds foreign language and international programming, as well as religious and educational channels, to the basic line-up of commercial television services (Trowbridge, 2000).

BYU Television distribution expanded throughout 2001 and 2002. In addition to the Dish Network, it is now carried on the DirecTV Plus System, approximately ten local cable systems in the Western United States, streamed live on the Internet, and is part of an international closed-circuit digital satellite television service composed of transponders leased or owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). The signal for this closed-circuit system is encoded in the United States, but not encoded internationally. The closed-circuit system is available to LDS congregations at meetinghouses throughout the world, and to home dish owners outside the United States.

BYU Television was selected for this study of audience viewing motivations not only because of the unique and clearly differentiated nature of its mission, but because of the following characteristics.

- It is a new and evolving television service.
• It is noncommercial. Following the same funding guidelines regarding corporate or foundation sponsorship as U.S. public television stations, its operating revenues come from a mix of individual donations, corporate or foundation grants, and a university allocation. This funding mix is very similar to that of one-third of U.S. public television stations.

• It carries a wide range of programming genres including: educational; informational; athletic events; music, dance and dramatic performance; documentary; and religious programs.

• The majority of its programs are self-produced and therefore unique to the service.

• It offers a potentially worldwide audience which can reasonably be assumed to be comfortable identifying and expressing religious and spiritual viewing motivations and satisfactions. BYU Television is owned and operated by a private religious institution, Brigham Young University, which is owned and operated by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, often referred to as the Mormon church. The university has alumni throughout the world. The church has approximately six million members living within the United States and six million members living outside the United States. While the majority of BYU Television viewers reside
within the United States, there is clear evidence that it is used by viewers around the world (Gale, 2000).

- Information about the program offerings is easily available. BYU Television offers detailed program listings on its website, provides program listings to the electronic program guide services of Dish Network and DirecTV, and publishes a listing guide that is available to contributors to the service. This enables viewers to make informed choices about their use of BYU Television in advance of viewing.

With these characteristics in mind, BYU Television more closely resembles a U.S. public television station than it does either a commercial or a religious broadcaster. Both public television and BYU television channels have education and information as a primary mission, both offer a noncommercial service and are funded in part by individuals, corporations and foundations, both position themselves as providing more-than-escapist entertainment. This allows for the possibility of a wider range of viewing motives and satisfactions and therefore broadens the field of study.

Teachings About Media from The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

While the church does not operate BYU Television, it does own and directly oversee the university that owns and operates the channel. Therefore it is logical to assume that the church’s teachings regarding media and media use will influence both
the management of the channel and many of the viewers using the channel. Previous studies of the BYU Television viewing audience indicate that the majority of viewers are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Sixty-four percent of the respondents to Gale's 2000 study reported their religious affiliation as LDS. However, in a study conducted in 2001, just one year later, 98% of the respondents reported that they were LDS (Gale, 2001)

The church provides its members with guidance regarding media use through its publications, in Sunday School lessons and in sermons given in worship services (Stout, 1996). "Mormons are often encouraged to use television, movies and other media in ways consistent with their religious goals" (Stout, 1996, p. 86). In 1975, in an article that appeared in the Ensign magazine, an official LDS publication, the current church president, Gordon B. Hinckley stated,

Let there be good magazines about the house, those which are produced by the Church and by others, which will stimulate their thoughts to ennobling concepts. Let them read a good family newspaper that they may know what is going on in the world . . . . When there is a good show in town, go to the theater as a family. Your patronage will give encouragement to those who wish to produce this type of entertainment. And use that most remarkable of all tools of communication, television to enrich their lives (p.39).
On the one hand, the church produces media and encourages wise media use, on the other hand, much of the media is viewed by the church leadership as destructive, immoral and degrading, with debilitating effects on individuals and families. Church teachings about media can be grouped into three main categories: first, media use that is actively discouraged, such as watching R-rated films; second, warnings about media effects, which are portrayed as powerful and insidious; third, recommendations for appropriate media and media use based on both artistic merit and, more important, church teachings (Stout, 1996).

The commonality in each of these categories is selectivity before media exposure. Church members are expected to make informed, “righteous” choices about media that are based on religious principles and family-centered values (Stout, 1996) before they consume media.
Theoretical Framework

Active Audience

Audience theories and studies are among the most controversial in the field of mass communication because the nature of the audience itself is so strongly debated (Biocca, 1988). Assumptions about the audience underlie almost all communication theories. The orientation toward the audience, active or passive, a mass or a small community, affected by or affecting media, determines the construct of many theoretical perspectives (Webster, 1998).

The uses and gratifications approach to mass media study assumes an active audience, is focused on individuals and groups, and looks to the media-audience link to explore media uses and outcomes. It is concerned with what audiences do with media, more than what media does to audiences, and operates from a micro-level perspective (Webster, 1988). Uses and gratification theory posits that people have specific motivations for using specific media and specific content to achieve specific satisfactions. Uses and gratifications also provides sufficient flexibility to interact with and inform many other approaches to mass communication study (Blumler & Katz, 1974).

An active-audience viewpoint sees the audience as able to, and engaged in, making decisions about media use. “Audience activity describes how intentionally and
purposefully people select, attend to, and use media and their content” (Perse, 1990). This active-audience perspective offers a minimal-effects view of the media/audience relationship. In contrast, the passive-audience is thought to be more directly and easily influenced by the media, leading to a powerful-effects orientation.

The notion of an active-audience is central to uses and gratifications theory (Severin & Tankard, 1997) as well as many other audience-based theories because “activity causes variations in the gratification received . . . (and) . . . gratifications sought explain variations in activity” (Perse, 1990, p. 676). There are some that would argue that the active-audience itself is a dominant theoretical paradigm (Biocca, 1988).

In response to concerns about the amorphous definition of “activity” as it relates to audiences, Frank Biocca (1988) outlined a structure describing audience activity as:

1. selective, in terms of media exposure, perception and retention as well as media type and content;
2. utilitarian, in that the audience is, at least some of the time, choosing a media use in order to satisfy a need;
3. intentional, in that it involves some level of cognitive processing, memory, motivation or personality to achieve purposefulness;
4. involved, in making some effort in selecting, using or responding to the media;
5. impervious to influence, in that activity mediates media effects on the audience.

These general concepts are useful, but there is by no means universal support for or acceptance of a single definition, or agreement that there is even the possibility of a
meta-definition of audience “activity” (Biocca, 1988). Audience activity is multidimensional (Kim & Rubin, 1997).

As with effects theories, there are those that support a notion of a “strong” active-audience and those that conceptualize a “weak” active-audience. A strong audience is seen as independent and autonomous, reflecting all the characteristics listed above. A weak audience is seen as more of a behavioral phenomenon that indicates some level of media selection and use. It is interesting to note that measurements of the latter concepts are used to support the existence of the former ones in regard to evidence of audience activity (Biocca, 1988).

The concept of “activity” has been expanded in uses and gratifications research to differentiate between “activity” and “activeness” (Baran & Davis, 2000). “Activity refers more to what the media consumer does” such as choosing to go out to a film rather than watch a video at home, while activeness is more about what researchers are really trying to study, the audience exercising its free will in choosing to use media and choosing specific media content. Sense-making on the part of the audience is a function of activeness. “Perhaps the most important dimension of the audience’s activity . . . is the extent to which audiences make meanings for the media products they consume” (Grossberg, Wartella & Whitney, 1998, p.241).

Current thinking clarifies the concept of the active-audience by indicating that activeness is relative. Not all members of the audience have the same level of media engagement and involvement. This not only varies between groups and individuals, it varies within the individual, and can be driven by mood, current needs, or even the media.
format and content available. "What the uses and gratifications approach really does, then, is provide a framework for understanding when and how different media consumers become more or less active and what the consequences of that increased or decreased involvement might be" (Baran & Davis, 2000, p. 257).

A widely-accepted model of audience activity was developed by Levy and Windahl (Lin, 1993). It presents audience activity as composed of two dimensions, activity phases and activity sequences. There are three factors involved in the audience’s orientation: selectivity, choosing media or content; involvement, deciding what level of involvement to have with the content; and utility, actually using the content for some purpose. The communication sequence is also threefold, consisting of the time before exposure or use; the time during exposure or use; and the time after exposure or use (Levy, 1987; Lin, 1999).

While this model is helpful, its representation of the communication sequence as clearly delineated segments has not been supported by studies, rather research indicates that the sequence is more of a continuum (Massey, 1995). Another flaw in this model is that it does not allow for the audience to select “no media use” as an option.

The debate over the active-audience is complex. Many question where the locus of control is located. An active-audience approach places it with the audience rather than the media (Webster, 1998). This answer however, does not address whether the audience’s locus of control is driven by social, psychological, biological or cultural forces or the inherent structures of media formats and content (Biocca, 1988).
Another key to audience-activity is motivation (Palmgreen, 1984). It is "a crucial contributor to models of media effects including, for example, uses and gratifications and media system dependency" (Kim & Rubin, 1997, p. 108).

Expanding the conceptualization of an active-audience to include these factors enriches media studies and creates a more accurate view of the complex world in which media are used by complex audiences. The continuing struggle over the nature of audience activity may simply be a reflection of the larger struggle within mass communication to grapple with "the fundamental interactions among the audience, the message and communicators (Biocca, 1988, p. 71)."

**Uses and Gratifications Theory**

The idea that audiences' use of media is related to or dependent upon perceptions of satisfaction, needs met, or other motivations is "almost as old as media research itself" (McQuail, 2000, p. 387). Early communication scholars were researchers from the social sciences "who used the behavior of media audiences as a convenient area within which to study and test concepts, hypotheses and theories that were actually from their own disciplines" (DeFleur & Rokeach, 1988, p.170).

The earliest ideas of mass media reflected the notions of mass society theory. When research failed to support mass society theory it was replaced by limited-effect theories. These in turn also fell out of favor as scholars questioned why, if media effects were so limited, did advertisers advertise and people intentionally seek out media for specific purposes? Over time this led to a shift in communication studies that allowed for
scholars to examine media effects from a new perspective; that of the audience, rather than that of the medium or the message.

Uses and gratifications studies can be clearly traced to the functionalist approach to sociology and psychology prominent in the 1930s (Blumler & Katz, 1974). Throughout the 1940s there were numerous studies of various media, particularly by Paul Lazarsfeld and Frank Stanton, Bernard Berelson and others (Baran & Davis, 2000; McQuail, 2000), that sought to learn the reasons audiences used media and what the audience identified as the consequences of that media use. The landmark study conducted by Herta Herzog at this time entitled “Motivations and Gratifications of Daily Serial Listeners,” is a prominent example. Herzog looked at the reasons women listened to radio soap operas and clearly identified a link between the audiences’ reported needs and reported satisfactions with such listening. (Grossberg et al, 1998) Though the term was coined much later, Herzog is credited by some as having originated the uses and gratifications paradigm (Baran & Davis, 2000). This link to functionalism has been problematic for uses and gratifications proponents.
In the 1950s Wilbur Schramm developed a simple formula he titled the “Fraction of Selection” (West & Turner, 2000). This formula, illustrated below, shows “that audience members judge the level of reward (gratification) they expect from a given medium or message against how much effort they must make to secure the reward (West & Turner, 2000, p. 334; see also, Baran & Davis, 2000).”

![Fraction of Selection Diagram](image)

However, it was not until the work of scholars in the 1960s such as Denis McQuail, Jay Blumler, Elihu Katz, and others, that the thinking being done about how audiences actually used media coalesced into what became the uses and gratifications paradigm. Publications in the mid-1970s by Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch articulated and established the conceptual foundation for uses and gratifications theory. Research of this era concentrated on gratifications sought, often ignoring outcomes or gratifications obtained (Ruggiero, 2000).

During the 1980s uses and gratifications expanded its reach, developing its own take on the interaction of the text and the audience to create meaning. It was also a time
of greatly expanded study. A 1984 publication by Philip Palmgreen identified six major areas of uses and gratifications research then being conducted: 1) gratifications and media consumption; 2) social and psychological origins of gratifications; 3) gratifications and media effects; 4) gratifications sought and obtained; 5) expectancy-value approaches to uses and gratifications; and 6) audience activity, the results being the emergence of a “rather complex theoretical structure” of uses and gratifications (p.21).

“The uses and gratifications perspective is one of a precious few theories that communication can truly call its own” (Lin, 1999, p. 200) It is considered “an axiomatic theory, in that its principles are generally accepted, and it is readily applicable to a wide range of situations involving mediated communication” (Lin, 1999, p. 200). As stated by Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch in 1974, uses and gratifications research is . . .

centered with 1) the social and psychological origins of 2) needs, which generate 3) expectations of 4) the mass media or other sources, which lead to differential patterns of media exposure (or engagement in other activities), resulting in 6) need gratifications and 7) other consequences, perhaps mostly unintended ones (p. 20).

They went on to articulate the five basic assumptions at the heart of the uses and gratifications paradigm:

1. “The audience is conceived of as active” (p. 21).
2. The "initiative in linking need gratification and media choice lies with the audience member." (p. 21).

2. "The media compete with other sources of need satisfaction. The needs served by mass communication constitute but a segment of the wider range of human needs, and the degree to which they can be adequately met through mass media consumption certainly varies" (p. 22).

3. "People are sufficiently self-aware to be able to report their interests and motives in particular cases, or at least recognize them when confronted with them in an intelligible and familiar verbal formulation" (p. 225).

4. "Value judgements about the cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended while audience orientations are explored on their own terms" (p. 22).

Regarding the first assumption, some of the key issues regarding audience-activity were reviewed earlier, but its importance to uses and gratifications is worth emphasizing. "Audience activity is the ... core concept of uses and gratifications theory" (Kim & Rubin, 1997, p. 107).

Audience needs and gratifications have been detailed and classified in several ways over the years. A prominent method of classification was developed by Denis
McQuail and others in the early 1970s. Their system is based on earlier work by Laswell and Wright, and includes the following four categories for media uses and gratifications: (a) diversion, escape from the routines and pressures or daily life, and emotional release; (b) personal relationships, in which the media supply companionship and social utility; (c) personal identity, by which the media support and reinforce values and beliefs; and (d) surveillance, the ways media supplies information or aids the audience in accomplishing a goal (Katz et al., 1974).

In order to account for the depth and breadth of media functions Katz, Gurevitch and Haas posit as their central notion that “mass communication is used by individuals to connect (or sometimes to disconnect) themselves—via instrumental, affective, or integrative relations—with different others (self, family, friends, nation, etc.)” (Katz et al., 1974, p. 23).

The second assumption is that audiences choose both the medium and the content from the medium to meet their needs. Theorists have proposed that while different media can serve the different needs of different individuals at different times, there are some commonalities in the preferences audiences have for using various media for certain purposes (Van den Bulck, 1999; Williams, Phillips & Lum, 1985). Conducting a large-scale study, Katz, Gurevitch and Hass (Katz et al, 1974) were able to ascertain why people turned to one of the five major mass media (that existed at the time the study was published in 1973) namely: books, cinema, television, radio and newspapers to satisfy certain needs. They were also able to establish which media the audience saw as similar in meeting a specific need. For example, “people tended to use newspapers, radio, and
television to connect themselves to society, but used books and films to escape from reality for a while. The better-educated tended to use the print media; those with less education were inclined to the electronic and visual media” (Fiske, 1990, p. 19).

The third assumption acknowledges that audiences and the media they consume are part of a larger world. An audience’s needs, expectations of and perceived rewards for media use, as well as the media itself are influenced by the society, culture and communities in which they exist.

The fourth assumption addresses both the rationale for much of the methodology used in uses and gratifications studies as well as harkens back to the concept of an active, self-aware, and self-determined audience. Because the audience is capable of recognizing and articulating its needs and the way and degree to which they are met by media, data can be collected directly from the audience using traditional qualitative or quantitative methods, such as interviews or questionnaires.

There are some that express concern that the methods, either qualitative or quantitative, used in uses and gratifications research are insufficient. They argue that providing categories of either potential needs or gratifications cannot help but fail to include all possible items (Schroeder, 1999), and that the responses to qualitative studies are eventually categorized by the researcher thereby threatening the validity of any such studies. Underlying these criticisms is the inability or unwillingness of the critic to accept the paradigm of an active-audience (Baran & Davis, 2000).

The final assumption is that the value of the media or the extent and ways in which it meets, or does not meet, the audience’s needs—is determined by the audience not
the researcher. Content that may not meet common standards of quality may still serve a purpose that is gratifying to the audience. This does not imply a lack of respect for the tastes of the audience, but recognizes that needs and ways of meeting them differ. It also allows for the fact that audiences may be dissatisfied with, but continue to use a medium, if there is not another viable choice for achieving their goals.

Again recognizing that audiences and media are part of a larger world, Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch (Katz et al, 1974) set out, in their seminal work, to classify ways in which the social structure influences needs that media might satisfy. Based on work that was current at the time, they indicated five social situations in which media use might meet socially-generated needs. In other words audiences may find themselves in a social situation that:

1. provides limited real-life opportunities to meet certain needs, therefore media is used to supplement, complement, or substitute for that which is not available in real-life;

2. leads to an awareness of a problem that requires information to resolve, with media as the source of that information;

3. is filled with tension and conflict, leading to the consumption of mass media as a way of easing the response to the situation;

4. leads to certain values that are affirmed or enhanced by media consumption;

5. requires familiarity with certain media and content in order to maintain a valued social position or association.
Katz and his colleagues clearly indicate in 1974 that uses and gratifications theory should include recognition that the social sphere in which audiences and media exist does influence media use and creation. In 1985 Blumler felt compelled to remind communication scholars of this position, as well as of the notion that “content does have intended meaning” (West & Turner, 2000, p. 341), thus addressing some of the criticisms of the uses and gratifications paradigm. Palmgreen’s 1984 study concluded that “sufficient empirical evidence has now accumulated for us to state that many uses of the mass media do appear to have their origins in societal structure and social processes” (p. 28).

Uses and gratifications theory addresses the “nature and origins of people’s needs . . . (these needs in turn lead them to) . . . different patterns of media exposure . . . with such exposure assumed to gratify these needs and helping to form habits of media use” (Lowery, 1983, p. 374). The uses and gratifications approach is therefore most appropriate in studying “media consumption, the interrelated nature of television user motives, and the relationships among viewing motives and viewing patterns” (Abelman, 1989, p. 87).

**Audience Activity and Selectivity in an Expanded Media Environment**

Several scholars have postulated and found evidence to support the notion that audience activity and selectivity increases in an expanded media environment (Abelman, 1987; Becker & Schoenbach, 1989; Finn, 1997; Perse, 1990; Lin, 1993). “Evidence is beginning to emerge that developments in communication technology that provide
audience members with a greatly expanded repertoire of choices are also resulting in increased levels of selectivity” (Palmgreen, 1984, p. 44).

Religious and Spiritual Motivations and Gratifications of Mass Media Use

Religion and media have been intertwined since the beginnings of mass media. Mass media began with the first book published using movable type, the Bible (Abelman, 1987). Uses and gratifications studies involving religion and mass media have primarily been examinations of secular media or religious media using secular typologies (Creasman, 2000). They have not examined what people have sought spiritually from television programming, whether that programming is religious or secular.

“Religious beliefs affect individual attitudes and behavior” (Hamilton & Rubin, 1989, p. 668). Often the religious life and the social life of an individual are heavily intertwined. While uses and gratifications theory centers on the individual, it clearly acknowledges that the individual is part of social structures that influence media use and attitudes (Blumler, Gurevitch, & Katz, 1985; Palmgreen, 1978). As outlined earlier many religions, including The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, have specific teachings about media.

Instrumental and Ritual Use of Television

In several studies (Abelman, 1987; Abelman, 1989; Abelman 1997; Atkin & Rand, 1997; Perse, 1990) over the past 15 years communication scholars have clarified the identification of two patterns of television use, ritual and instrumental. Instrumental
viewing is highly selective, purposeful in nature, and linked to watching television to meet cognitive or affective needs (Ferguson & Perse, 2000). Ritualized is habitual viewing for many different reasons, particularly to pass the time. It is non-selective and includes watching a wide variety of program types (Perse, 1990).

In his 1987 study of religious television viewers Robert Abelman further clarified the concept of instrumental and ritualized television viewers and identified a third type of viewer for religious programming, the reactionary viewer. Interestingly, these viewers turned to religious programs out of dissatisfaction with secular television content rather than out of “motives associated with religiosity” (p. 293). He also points out that religious “programming poses some interesting questions about viewer motivations” (p. 295).

Previous Public Television Studies of Particular Relevance

Several previous studies seem particularly relevant to the research questions posed by this examination of viewer motives and satisfaction for selecting BYU Television. These studies primarily deal with viewing motivations and selectivity, reasons for public television vs. commercial television viewing, and religious or spiritual aspects of viewing selections and rewards. All are grounded in uses and gratifications theory and provided particular insights that were used in the theoretical grounding, methodology selection, and instrument construction of this study.

Building on past work is an acknowledged research strategy. Alan Rubin (1983) encouraged communication scholars to “conduct modified replications or extensions” of
uses and gratifications based studies in order to both enhance and refine theoretical, as well as, methodological knowledge.

While public television has many differences from commercial television in the United States, the fundamental difference is that “programming decisions are uniquely motivated by concerns for delivering programs to audiences, rather than delivering audiences to sponsors for advertisers” (Gantz, 1980, p. i). It should be noted that BYU Television has the same theoretical programming mission as public television.

In 1978, with uses and gratifications as a framework, Palmgreen studied the differences in gratifications sought between viewing television in general with viewing public television. In particular the study looked at social constraints on the selection phase of viewing activity. The findings indicated that “comparing gratifications sought with those obtained does appear to successfully discriminate between viewers and non-viewers of public television” (p. 12). In addition, the study found that the uses and gratifications measure was “a better predictor of PTV [public television] viewing among decision makers than such traditional demographic correlates as education, income and number of children in the household” (p. 17).

Another study a few years later (Gantz, 1980) also examined the motives of public television viewers, and found that “motivations were more important when they watched public television” (p. 26). This may indicate that a different set of expectations for viewing public television as well as that public television is viewed to meet needs not met by commercial television.
Summary

The theoretical underpinning of this study, uses and gratifications theory, supposes that people have specific motivations for using specific media and specific content to achieve specific satisfactions. It is founded on the notion that the individual audience members are active and self-aware, able to articulate in some fashion their reasons for making media choices and the gratifications they do or do not receive from these choices. Audiences with increased media options are thought to become increasingly selective and their viewing patterns can be said to fall into two broad categories, instrumental or ritual. Instrumental viewing motives are more purposeful and selective, while ritual viewing motives are non-selective and principally concerned with passing time or using the television set for a sense of companionship. It is also evident that viewers come to different television services with different motives and expectations in mind.
Research Questions and Methodology

The Quantitative Tradition in Uses and Gratifications Research

As discussed earlier, one of the foundations of uses and gratifications theory is the belief that audiences are sufficiently self-aware of their own motives, media use, and satisfactions to be able to report them (Katz et al, 1974). “Self-report is the most direct method of measurement,” (Palmgreen, 1984, p. 22) and is commonly used in uses and gratifications studies. This allows researchers to confidently seek and obtain information directly from media users that is reliable and accurate. “The use of survey research as the predominant method in uses and gratifications research has been validated” (Parker, 2000, p. 3) numerous times (Rubin, 1981).

Previous Surveys of BYU Television Viewers

To date, the Broadcast Services Division of Brigham Young University has commissioned two studies of BYU Television. They were conducted in 2000 and 2001 by Larrie Gale, Ph.D., a faculty member at the university. At this point in time there is no standardized commercially available audience analysis data, or television “ratings,” available to BYU Television that provides information about the audience viewing the channel. Viewing on direct broadcast satellite, the Internet, or local terrestrial digital
broadcast is not currently measured as is viewing on traditional cable or analog broadcast systems. Therefore, niche channels, such as BYU Televisions must rely on self-reported viewing for audience information.

The purpose of the first study (Gale, 2000) was to gain general demographic information about who was watching the channel and ascertain what the viewer’s programming interests might be. In particular, the study concentrated on discovering if viewers were interested in participating in university telecourses, for credit or personal enrichment, via BYU Television. The study was conducted by way of a written survey mailed to those who had previously contacted the station. It was also posted on the BYU Television web site.

The purpose of the second study (Gale, 2001) was to again gather demographic information, determine what delivery platform viewers were using to receive BYU Television, and discover the geographic location of the viewers. This study was conducted solely online. Analysis of the respondents to the two previous BYU Television surveys did not indicate a significant demographic difference between those responding to the survey online versus those responding to the survey through the mail.

While the previous studies have been useful in beginning to understand who is watching BYU Television, they have not asked why viewers are watching and what satisfactions they receive from their viewing experience. These questions are the focus of the present study.
Hypotheses

This study will explore the instrumental motives and satisfactions of BYU Television viewers that arise out of their level of religiosity, level of attention paid to the television programming being viewed and amount of television viewed (Rubin & Perse, 1987a).

Hypothesis 1:

Higher levels of program selection will be associated with more instrumental viewing motives.

Hypothesis 2:

Higher levels of satisfaction with BYU Television will be associated with more instrumental viewing motives.

Hypothesis 3:

Higher levels of satisfaction with BYU Television will be associated with a higher degree of religiosity.

Hypothesis 4:

Higher levels of attention will be associated with more instrumental viewing motives.
Hypothesis 5:

Higher levels of attention will be associated with a higher degree of religiosity.

Hypothesis 6:

Higher levels of BYU television viewing will be associated with more ritual viewing motives.

The Survey Instrument

In order to test the hypotheses a survey instrument was designed to gather information about the amount of BYU Television viewed, the level of attention paid to BYU Television while viewing, the religiosity of the viewer, the degree of viewing selectivity, the motives for watching BYU Television and the degree to which watching BYU Television satisfied those viewing motives. To strengthen the validity of the study several questions were asked about each variable. This allowed for the construction of scales measuring instrumental and ritual viewing motives, instrumental and ritual viewing satisfaction, religiosity, and the level of attention paid to programs viewed.

While not key factors in this study, basic demographic information describing participants was also gathered to lend additional perspective to the analysis. At the request of BYU Television management and to aid them in comparing BYU Television viewers over time, the questions addressing demographic characteristics: age, income, and education level, are the same as those in Gale’s 2000 and 2001 studies. Several questions regarding media formats available to BYU Television viewers and specific
program preferences were also included in the survey at the request of BYU Television managers. The data gathered in response to these questions is not part of this study and was reported separately to the management of BYU Television.

**Constructing the Instrument**

Many of the variables identified and specific survey questions used in the instrument have been successfully used by other researchers (Abelman, 1987; Gale 2001; Gantz, 1980; Palmgreen, 1978). The instrument was constructed by reviewing previous studies, principally Gantz’s 1980 study comparing the motivations and satisfactions of viewers watching public television versus commercial television. The design of the main body of the instrument is modeled on the Gantz study. In recognition of some of the similarities between BYU Television and U.S. public television, several of the reasons for watching identified by Gantz were included in the present instrument.

In constructing his study Gantz examined viewer correspondence with the sample public television stations in order to develop a reliable and useful list of possible motives for watching public television. A similar procedure was followed in creating this instrument.

BYU Television receives about 400 viewer inquiries or comments per month (personal communication, BYU Television Viewer Services Reports, 2000 and 2001). This contact comes in the form of e-mail messages, letters and telephone calls. All viewer contact with the BYU Television is tracked by the Viewer Services Department. This department issues an internal monthly report that categorizes and summarizes viewer
contact. Hard copies of e-mail messages and viewer letters, along with a copy of the responses are maintained by BYU Television. Telephone calls are briefly summarized in a written log.

To identify unique reasons for watching BYU Television the Viewer Services Reports for 2000 and 2001 were analyzed. A preliminary list of reasons was created and reviewed with BYU Television staff members who have the greatest interaction with viewers, namely those working in the Viewer Services, Membership and Programming Departments. The list of possible reasons was revised based on their suggestions.

A final list of 16 viewing motives, a combination of those identified in previous studies (Gale 2001; Gantz, 1980; Palmgreen 1978) and those derived from an analysis of current BYU Television viewer correspondence, was created. Each motive was designated as either instrumental or ritualistic, as defined by Rubin (1983).

Questions regarding the amount of time spent viewing were asked in two ways, the amount of viewing on a weekly basis and the number of programs or hours watched the previous day. This was done in order to arrive at the most accurate portrayal of actual viewing as possible.

Five questions regarding religious practices were asked. The degree of individual religiosity is often conceptualized as multidimensional, a combination of belief, commitment and behavior (Cornwall, Albrecht, Cunningham, & Pitcher, 1998; Glock, 1973; Gunter & Viney, 1994). The questions included in the instrument emphasized the behavioral aspect of religiosity.
The level of attention paid to television programming was conceptualized as the frequency with which the viewer engaged in other activities while watching television.

After pre-testing a hard copy of the instrument with ten individuals of varying ages and making necessary revisions the study was submitted to the Institutional Review Board of Brigham Young University for approval. The finalized instrument was posted on the BYU Television website, www.byutv.org (see Appendix A).

Data Collection

Participants responded online. Viewers were asked to participate in the survey through a notice and link on the front page of the BYU Television website and through on-air announcements appearing on BYU Television (see Appendix B). Participation was requested from those 18 years of age and older. The instrument remained online for 21 days, beginning March 25, 2002 and ending April 15, 2002.

Administrating the survey solely online was desirable from a practical point of view, it was both cost-effective and efficient. An online survey also offered the greatest opportunity for reaching the largest number of potential participants.

Limitations

Practical considerations, including funding, limited this study to viewers that self-selected their own participation, therefore the sample was not random. Because of this the data from this study cannot be generalized to the overall population of BYU.
Television viewers. This restricts both the type of statistical tests that can be used and the application of the study results to other situations.

A further limitation centers around the religious or spiritual motivations examined in the study. In designing the instrument effort was made to describe religious and spiritual motives and experiences in the broadest possible terms, while at the same time not rendering them so broadly as to be meaningless. The majority of the religious content on BYU Televison reflects the beliefs and attitudes of one religion, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Members of this denomination also make up the majority of viewers. Caution should be taken in applying the same religious motives and satisfactions to a broader audience or to audiences of other faiths. However, as an exploratory study, these factors should not prevent the meaningful identification of key viewing motives and gratifications for using BYU Television, and indicate possible directions for future studies that may be conducted under different conditions.
Findings

Data Analysis

Responses were converted into a spreadsheet file, Excel, and transferred to SPSS for Windows version 9.0 for analysis. Data was analyzed to ascertain the degree and direction of correlation among the variables in order to test the research hypotheses. Frequency tables were also created in order to provide a description of the participants, as well as evaluate their responses to certain variables.

Responses

There were 1,333 responses to the survey during the 21 days it was online. It was determined that in order to be accepted as a valid survey, participants must have answered all of the demographic questions and 63 of the 65 study questions. Two of the questions, number 4 and number 67, were included at the request of BYU Television management and therefore a non-response to these questions did not influence the participants eligibility or the data analysis. Of those responding, 596 participants completed the survey by answering at least 63 of the 65 study questions, including those dealing with the demographic description of the participant. Therefore there were 596 surveys judged to be qualified for analysis.
Characteristics of the Participants

Figure 2

Age of Participants

Of those responding to the survey 14.9% were age 65 or older, 35.6% were between the ages of 50 and 64, 34.6% were between the ages of 35 and 49, and 14.6% were between the ages of 18 and 34.

Figure 3

Gender of Participants

More women, 62%, responded to the survey than men, 37.4%.
Figure 4

**Education Level of Participants**

Survey participants were on the whole highly educated with 24% reporting some post-graduate work, 25.3% earning a college undergraduate degree, 40.3% attending some college, 7% receiving a high school diploma and 2.7% completing some high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-graduate</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School graduate</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

**Household Income of Participants**

The household income distribution among survey participants showed an interesting distribution with 26.9% reporting incomes of $51,000 and over and 37.9% reporting incomes of $25,000 and under, leaving just 28.2% in the middle range of $26,000 to $50,000 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than $100,000</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76-100,000</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51-75,000</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36-50,000</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26-35,000</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-25,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invalid</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents to the survey were overwhelmingly members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Table 1

Religious Preference of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Christian</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time this study was formulated the only existing previous study (Gale, 2000) reported that 70% of the participants identified themselves as members of The Church of Jesus Christ, while 30% indicated that they were of other faiths or of no particular faith. Based on this information, a question about religious affiliation appeared to make sense in terms of drawing comparisons of viewer satisfactions between LDS and non-LDS participants.
A subsequent study of BYU Television viewers by Gale (2001) reported that 98.3% of the respondents were members of The Church of Jesus Christ. At the time the survey was administered the results of the second study (Gale, 2001) were known and the question was included with the intent of providing support for either the data generated by the 2000 or 2001 study. This study supports the results of the second Gale survey (2001) indicating that, at least among respondents to surveys about BYU Television, viewers of BYU Television are almost entirely members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It may be that initially BYU Television was sampled by a larger number of viewers of differing faiths. Another possibility is that as the service has evolved, and promotion of BYU Television in the LDS community increased, the number of viewers of other faiths has not decreased, but that as a percentage of overall viewers their numbers are very small.

The demographic make-up of the respondents to this survey differed from the two previous studies in several other ways, more of the respondents were female, and far more reported having an annual household income of $25,000 or less.
Table 2

Comparison of Participant Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Gale 2000</th>
<th>Gale 2001</th>
<th>Present Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>50.5% Female</td>
<td>50.7% Female</td>
<td>62% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>8.5% 18-34</td>
<td>15.4% 18-34</td>
<td>14.6% 18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>11.5% $25,000 or less</td>
<td>7.7% $25,000 or less</td>
<td>37.9% $25,000 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33.4% Some college</td>
<td>not asked</td>
<td>40.3% Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Preference</td>
<td>63.9% LDS</td>
<td>98.3% LDS</td>
<td>98.2% LDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several possible explanations for the larger percentage of participants reporting lower income levels. One could be that a larger number of the respondents were female; women tend to have lower incomes than men. It may also be that more college students participated in the present survey thereby increasing the number of those reporting lower incomes. BYU Broadcasting employs almost 120 college students part-time. This could explain the larger number of respondents reporting "some college" and those reporting lower income levels. Both full-time and part-time staff were informed of the survey and allowed to participate. Another possibility is that in the time between the surveys, BYU Television became available on more cable systems, thereby altering the total viewing population.
Construction of Scales

A number of scales were constructed in order to test the hypotheses. These were created by combining sets of variables as indicated in the following tables. Using one-way analysis of variance and regression tests, responses to individual variables were tested against each other to insure that the scales were valid.

The distribution of response scores to each scale was evaluated in order to determine the number of reportable categories for each scale, as well as the parameters of each category. Scales having a sufficient distribution of scores were assigned five categories of response: very high, high, moderate, low or very low, with each category representing an equal 20% scores. Scales with a smaller distribution of scores were assigned three reportable categories: high, moderate and low, with each category representing an equal third of the scores.
Religiosity Scale

Five variables were combined to create a scale to measure the religiosity of study participants. Respondents reported the frequency with which they engaged in the following religious practices or behaviors. Responses were summed and categorized into three levels of religiosity: high, medium and low.

Table 3

Variables Used to Construct Religiosity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOSITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I pray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend religious services...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contribute financially to a church, synagogue, mosque or religious institution...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read scriptures or other holy writings...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contribute my time to a church, synagogue, mosque or religious institution...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewing Selectivity Scale

Three variables were combined to create the viewing selectivity scale that measured the degree to which viewers planned their viewing in advance. Viewers were classified as being very selective, moderately selective, not very selective.
Table 4

Variables Used to Construct Viewing Selectivity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEWING SELECTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I turn on the television, I click around until I find something that interests me...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I turn on the television it’s to watch a specific program...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan in advance what to watch on television</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewing Attention Scale

Two variables were combined to create the viewing attention scale. The intention of this scale was to determine if television was the primary activity the viewer was engaged in, or if television watching was intended to accompany another activity. The assumption being that viewers solely occupied in television viewing are more attentive to the programming than those engaged in other activities while the television is on. Respondents were rated as very attentive, moderately attentive, or not very attentive.

Table 5

Variables Used to Construct Viewing Attention Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEWING ATTENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I watch television) to give me something to watch while I’m doing other things...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you do other things while you watch BYU Television....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BYU Television Viewing Level Scale

Three variables were combined to measure the level of BYU Television viewing. Time spent viewing was rated as high, moderate or low and combined both frequency of viewing and hours spent viewing factors.

Table 6

Variables Used to Construct BYU Television Viewing Level Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BYU TELEVISION VIEWING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About how many times each week do you tune into BYU Television...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you watch BYU Television about how many shows do you watch...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many shows, if any, did you watch on BYU Television yesterday...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ritual Viewing Motivation Scale and Ritual Viewing Satisfaction Scale

A ritual viewing "uses" or motivation scale was created by combining seven variables. Participants were asked how important these reasons for watching BYU Television were to them. These variables reflect factors previously identified as being ritual viewing motivations (Rubin, 1983) or are similar in nature to those so identified. Ritual viewing use was rated as very high, high, moderate, low or very low.

A separate BYU Television Ritual Viewing Satisfaction scale was constructed using variables that asked viewers how well watching BYU Television "gratified" or
satisfied each of these motivations. Ritual viewing satisfaction was rated as very high, high, moderate, low or very low.

Table 7

Variables Used to Construct BYU Television Ritual Viewing Motivation and Satisfaction Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RITUAL VIEWING MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...keep me company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to be entertained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to bring the spirit into my home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to relax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...help to relieve pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...change of pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...have safe channel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumental Viewing Motivation and Instrumental Viewing Satisfaction Scales

An instrumental viewing “uses” or motivation scale was created by using eight variables previously identified as being instrumental in nature (Rubin, 1983) or similar to those so identified. Instrumental viewing use was rated as very high, high, moderate, low or very low.

A separate BYU Television Instrumental Viewing Satisfaction scale was constructed using variables that asked viewers how well watching BYU Television
“gratified” or satisfied each of these motivations. Instrumental viewing satisfaction was rated as very high, high, moderate, low or very low.

Table 8

Variables Used to Construct BYU Television Instrumental Viewing Motivation and Satisfaction Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL VIEWING MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...something to talk about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...help with challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...something to think about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...help to live my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to develop tastes and interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...help with relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...help me to teach others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to feel connected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the importance of this data to testing the hypotheses it was desirable to obtain as precise an evaluation of the participants responses as possible. Therefore, as discussed earlier, responses to the ritual and instrumental viewing motivation and satisfaction scales were evaluated using scores that grouped the responses into five equal categories, each representing 20% of the responses. The distribution of the range of scores warranted these five categories.
Again due to the importance of these scales, their internal validity was tested in several ways. First was a basic examination of the frequency of participants appearing in either category. The assumption being that a serious overlap in the number of participants being assigned to either group would cast the validity of the scales into doubt. The following table indicates a normal distribution for both groups and that the groupings are mutually exclusive.

Table 9
Comparison of Participants Having Instrumental or Ritual Viewing Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewing Motivation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Viewing Motivation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very high instrumental viewing</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>very high ritual viewing</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high instrumental viewing</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>high ritual viewing</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate instrumental viewing</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>moderate ritual viewing</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low instrumental viewing</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>low ritual viewing</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very low instrumental viewing</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>very low ritual viewing</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, a test of correlation and a linear regression analysis were conducted comparing the viewing selectivity scale, attention scale, instrumental viewing motivation scale, and ritual viewing motivation scale in order to examine if they were appropriately related to each other. These tests revealed:

10. the viewing selection scale is associated with the instrumental viewing motivation scale, $r = .110$, $p = .004$

11. the instrumental viewing motivation scale is associated with the ritual viewing motivation scale, $r = .444$, $p = .000$.

12. the viewing attention scale is associated with the ritual viewing scale, $r = .184$, $p = .036$.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1 stated that higher levels of viewing selectivity would be associated with a higher level of instrumental viewing motives. The study indicates some support for this hypothesis. A cross-tabulation of responses using the viewing selectivity scale and instrumental viewing motivation scale showed a weak positive association between these two factors. The Pearson Chi-Square showed a value of 22.594 with a significance of .004, $p = .007$. The positive association of these variables has been established in other studies (Perse, 1990; Rubin & Perse, 1987a; Rubin & Perse, 1987b) and a similar finding here lends credence to the scales developed for the study.

Hypothesis 2 stated that higher levels of satisfaction with BYU Television would be associated with more instrumental viewing motives. This hypothesis was supported by
the data. A cross-tabulation of responses using the instrumental viewing satisfaction scale with the instrumental viewing motivation scale indicated a strong positive association between these two factors. The Pearson Chi-Square value was 416.540 with a significance of .000, p = .000.

Hypothesis 3 stated that higher levels of satisfaction with BYU Television would be associated with a higher degree of religiosity. This hypothesis was not fully supported by the data generated by the study. Instrumental viewing satisfaction and ritual viewing satisfaction were separately tested against the degree of religiosity. The level of those with instrumental viewing satisfaction was weakly associated with the a higher degree of religiosity. A cross-tabulation of responses using the religiosity scale and the instrumental viewing satisfaction scale resulted in a Pearson Chi-Square value of 19.715 and a significance of .011, indicating a weak positive association, p = .039, significance .000. There was no evidence for an association between ritual viewing satisfaction and religiosity. A cross-tabulation of responses using the religiosity scale and the ritual viewing satisfaction scale resulted in a Pearson Chi-Square value of 4.148 and a significance of .657 indicating no association between the variables.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that higher levels of attention would be associated with more instrumental viewing motives. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. A cross-tabulation of the responses using the attention scale and instrumental viewing scale resulted in a Pearson Chi-Square of 12.457 and a significance of .132, p = .041 with a significance of .072, indicating no association between the variables.
Hypothesis 5 predicted that higher levels of attention would be associated with a higher degree of religiosity. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. A cross-tabulation of responses using the attention scale and the religiosity scale resulted in a Pearson Chi-Square of 5.742 and a significance of .219, $p = .038$ with a significance of .093.

Hypothesis 6 stated that higher levels of BYU television viewing would be associated with more ritual viewing motives. This hypothesis was somewhat supported by the data. A cross-tabulation of the responses using the ritual viewing motivation scale and the television viewing scale resulted in a Pearson Chi-Square of 18.660 with a significance of .017, $p = .042$ and a significance of .057. This indicated a weak positive association between the variables.
Discussion

The study indicates some support for Hypothesis 1, the idea that planned viewing, that is viewing selectivity, and instrumental viewing motives for watching BYU Television are positively associated. This finding supports that of previous audience studies examining selectivity and instrumental viewing (Perse, 1990; Rubin & Perse, 1987b; Rubin & Perse, 1988). A positive association between this variables was expected, but the strength of the association was not as strong as expected.

It may be that due to the fairly narrow range of program content on BYU Television and the pattern of scheduling multiple plays of programs within a fairly short period of time, those with higher levels of instrumental viewing motivations frequently find what they are looking for on BYU Television and therefore do not feel a strong need to plan their viewing. It is also possible there are other instrumental viewing motives for those who watch BYU Television that were not explored in this study and that those motives might have a stronger tie to viewing selectivity.

Hypothesis 2 stated that higher levels of satisfaction with BYU Television would be associated with more instrumental viewing motives. This hypothesis was supported by the data and is in line with previous studies (Perse, 1990; Rubin & Perse, 1987b; Rubin & Perse, 1988). Comparing the levels of satisfaction between instrumental viewing motives
and ritual viewing motives it is clear that those with instrumental viewing motives are much more satisfied watching BYU Television.

While this seems to be an almost forgone conclusion, there are a number of reasons why this finding is important to understanding these television viewers. Just because an instrumental viewer has intentionally sought out programming on BYU Television, it is not a given that they will be satisfied with what they find. It can be argued that those seeking a specific gratification, or set of gratifications, may have higher and more strongly defined expectations of that gratification, be more knowledgeable about the types of gratifications possible and therefore be more critical of the gratification as delivered or perceived.

The review of viewer correspondence with BYU Television provides anecdotal evidence that often those most critical of BYU Television in general or, more often, critical of a specific program, are those who made the greatest effort to secure the service and watch the program. Positive viewer correspondence is often centered on the unique nature of the service itself and refers to motives and satisfactions more likely to be categorized as ritual viewing motives and satisfactions. Also, when a straight frequency table of motives, ritual and instrumental, was generated, the strongest response by far was generated by a ritual viewing motive, "to bring the Spirit into my home." It was rated as very important by 89.2% of respondents.

With this factor in mind, the study's indication that instrumental viewers have a higher degree of satisfaction than ritual viewers, is interesting information to those managing BYU Television as well as scholars. It also supports the implication of
previously mentioned studies that the viewer’s motivation for viewing may be more important than the viewing experience itself in predicting viewing satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3 stated that higher levels of satisfaction with BYU Television would be associated with a higher degree of religiosity. This hypothesis was not fully supported by the data generated by the study. A higher degree of instrumental viewing motives and satisfactions is weakly associated with a higher degree of religiosity. This is not the case for those with ritual viewing motives and satisfactions, no association between these variables was found.

Based on the religious content of much of BYU Television’s programming, the effort that is often required to secure the service, and the amount of viewer correspondence that mentions religion or spirituality, it was thought that these factors would be more strongly associated. It may be that the variables used to create the religiosity scale did not sufficiently represent the religiosity or spirituality of the study participants, in that the variables measured religious behaviors rather than an individual’s spiritual feelings or experiences. Another possible factor contributing to this result is that the participants in the study were, according to the scale used, overwhelmingly religious. Among participants, 70.6% scored as highly religious and 28.2% as moderately religious. The lack of variation in the population participating in the survey did not provide much opportunity for comparison.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that higher levels of attention would be associated with more instrumental viewing motives. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. It was thought that those with instrumental viewing motives would be more invested in
viewing the program and less likely to participate in other activities while watching BYU Television. Ritual viewing motives are often associated with lack of specific attention being paid to the programming, with the television programming providing a backdrop or ambience to daily living.

Many of the programs currently aired on BYU Television are lectures, group discussions and music performances. The highly aural, rather than visual, nature of these program formats may make it possible for viewers with instrumental motivations who are watching BYU Television to engage in other activities while still feeling they are being attentive to and finding satisfaction in the programming. Another possibility is that the variables designed to measure attentiveness were insufficient.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that higher levels of attention would be associated with a higher degree of religiosity. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. The assumption underlying this hypothesis was that with the large amount of BYU Television programs that include either religious content or content that is shaped by a religious world view, viewer's personal religiosity would positively influence their attentiveness to the programming. The same factors that came into play regarding the second and third hypotheses may very well apply here also.

Hypothesis 6 stated that higher levels of BYU television viewing would be associated with more ritual viewing motives. This hypothesis was somewhat supported by the data. Previous studies have shown that ritual viewing is positively associated with a larger amount of time spent viewing (Perse, 1990; Rubin & Perse, 1987a; Rubin & Perse, 1988.) This result confirms the anecdotal evidence of BYU Television Viewer.
Services reports and personnel who mention viewers describing BYU Television as being on all day, or as a routine part of their daily life. These latter comments more often refer to a time period in which viewing is convenient for the viewer, rather than interest in specific program content. It is also consistent with the finding that there was no relationship between instrumental viewing motives and higher amounts of BYU Television viewing.

**Summary**

Four of the six study hypotheses are at least somewhat supported by the data generated. These results are in harmony with previous uses and gratifications studies examining ritual and instrumental viewing patterns. The strongest support is for those questions dealing with the relationship between instrumental viewing motives and instrumental viewing satisfaction. There is no support for those hypotheses that tested the level of viewing attention as it related to religiosity or instrumental viewing motives.
Conclusion

As technological advances and funding models fuel the proliferation of television media outlets, the number, viability and variety of niche channels will only increase. The reach of these channels, using a combination of delivery platforms, allows for worldwide distribution and the potential aggregation of vast, yet seemingly diverse audiences. BYU Television is at the forefront of these new niche channels and, as such, is certainly worthy of study.

Audiences for television services need no longer be solely defined by geographic location or some other descriptor of physical space. Their commonality also need not be limited to homogeneous social, economic or ethnic neighborhoods. Audiences can simultaneously aggregate around areas of interest and belief in ways never before possible.

Theoretical Implications

Understanding audiences' expectations of these services, what motives drive their use, how that use is similar to or different from their use of other electronic and print media, and what satisfactions they receive, provides the communication scholar with expanded opportunities for study and insight. Uses and gratifications, as well as related
communications theories such as expectancy modeling and social presence theory, provide valid ways for examining these issues. With the power of changing communications technologies, particularly in the area of individual viewer choice, so clearly evident, an enlarged uses and gratifications theory becomes an even more valuable tool for communication research.

Niche channels, such as BYU Television, with specialized content or specific world views may also fuel the evolution of audiences into communities of interest and belief or into autonomous participating audiences of one. The increased ability of the audience to actively choose, from not only a wide variety of media platforms but an enormous number of channels within each platform, may signal a change in the nature of the audience (Williams, et al., 1984). The expansion of media choice and niche services calls for a new look at the notion of audience itself.

The results of this study of viewer’s motivations and satisfactions in using a niche television channels indicates that selectivity and instrumentality are positively associated with viewer satisfaction. The rapid national and worldwide growth of BYU Television demonstrates that viewers will go to some lengths to seek out specific programming to achieve that satisfaction.

Suggestions for Future Study

Future studies of niche television services should continue to use BYU Television as a topic of study. Such research could examine audience viewing motivations and satisfactions as they relate to a comparison of the value viewers place on unique
program content vs. traditional television production styles and formats. A look at how BYU Television viewers use other media would be helpful in understanding the role of niche services in daily life. A worldwide service, such as BYU Television, greatly expands the opportunity to study audiences viewing the same programs from beyond the traditional demographic perspectives of women vs. men, old vs. young, rich vs. poor to include more complex factors such as geographic region, language, and cultural differences.

From a social perspective questions such as, does viewing the same program create the same experience for viewers of different cultures and, does viewing the same programming create a new community or strengthen an existing one, might be posed. In the same vein, if there are communities of interest or belief, might there be metafactors, or overarching values, that would mitigate obvious differences among audience members in order to achieve similar viewing motivations or satisfactions. The role of a niche service in community building, beyond the dissemination of information and perhaps attitudes, is another area of research. This study briefly alluded to this topic with the question that asked participants how important BYU Television was in helping them “feel connected to the people and things I value.” Participants rated this reason very highly with 61.7% saying it was very important to them.

Finally, the role of religion and spirituality in media studies has been sorely neglected. As a major influence in human beliefs and behavior, religion has been ignored by media scholars. BYU Television provides a unique resource to scholars looking to understand the role that media plays in religion and that religion plays in media. A
starting point would be to find better ways to measure religiosity as it relates to viewing patterns, or provide a clearer understand of the similarities and difference between religiosity and spirituality as they relate to media selection, use and gratifications.
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Appendix A

Survey Instrument

Why I Watch BYU Television
Graduate Student Project - BYU Television Viewer Survey
Winter 2002

Your participation will be of great help to a BYU graduate student, thanks for taking the time to complete the research survey. The survey is being conducted as part of a master’s thesis by a graduate student in the Department of Communications on the Provo, Utah campus of Brigham Young University. The results will also be shared with the staff of BYU Television.

The purpose of the study is to explore why viewers watch BYU Television and what they hope to gain from their viewing experience as compared to their experiences watching commercial television. Commercial television refers to broadcast or cable networks such as ABC, Fox, CBS, The Discovery Channel, ESPN, HBO, Lifetime, TNT, etc. that include commercial advertisements.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and answering the 67 questions should take about 10 minutes. There are no anticipated risks for participating in this study. The information collected will be analyzed and presented as statistical data without any individual identification; your participation is anonymous.

Please answer all the questions on the survey. Incomplete surveys are not useable. Please submit only one completed survey per person. This survey is intended for those 18 years of age and older.
If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact: BYU Television Viewer Services at www.byutv.org or call toll free 1-866-662-9888, or contact Diena Simmons by email at: diena_simmons.byu.edu or by calling 1-801-378-8450 or call Dr. Thomas A. Griffiths at 1-801-378-9228. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the IRB Board, Shane Schulthies, (801) 422-5490, 120B RB, BYU. Thank you again for your help.

SECTION ONE: WATCHING BYU TELEVISION
Please tell us a little bit about how often, and what you like to watch, on BYU Television.

1. First, about how many times each week do you tune into BYU Television?
   - Daily
   - Several times a week
   - Once a week
   - 4-8 times a month
   - Seldom
   - Never
   - Don’t know

2. When you watch BYU Television about how many shows do you watch?
   - One
   - Two
   - Three
   - Four
   - More than four
   - Don’t know

3. How many shows, if any, did you watch on BYU Television yesterday?
   - One
   - Two
   - Three
   - Four
   - More than four
   - None
   - Don’t know
4. The following is a short list of shows broadcast on BYU Television. For each show, please indicate how often you watch.

**BYU Devotionals / Forums**
- ○ Regularly
- ○ Sometimes
- ○ Seldom
- ○ Never
- ○ Don’t know

**Discussions on the Book of Mormon**
- ○ Regularly
- ○ Sometimes
- ○ Seldom
- ○ Never
- ○ Don’t know

**BYU Sporting Events**
- ○ Regularly
- ○ Sometimes
- ○ Seldom
- ○ Never
- ○ Don’t know

**BYU Education Week**
- ○ Regularly
- ○ Sometimes
- ○ Seldom
- ○ Never
- ○ Don’t know
LDS General Conference

- Regularly
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never
- Don’t know

Family Times

- Regularly
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never
- Don’t know

Musical Performances

- Regularly
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never
- Don’t know

Documentaries

- Regularly
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never
- Don’t know

How-to or craft programs

- Regularly
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never
- Don’t know
SECTION TWO: REASONS FOR WATCHING

The following is a list of reasons other people gave us for watching BYU Television. We’re interested in relating these reasons to why you watch programs on BYU Television. Please let us know how important these reasons are to you.

5. A reason people gave us for watching BYU Television is, “to give me something to talk about.” How important is this reason to you?
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Not very important
   - Not important at all
   - Don’t know

6. How often have these programs actually given you something to talk about?
   - Always
   - Most of the time
   - Some of the time
   - Never
   - Don’t know

7. Would you say that the reason “to give me something to talk about” is more important when you watch?
   - BYU Television
   - Commercial television
   - About as important for both
   - Don’t know

8. Another reason people gave us for watching BYU television is “to be entertained.” How important is that reason to you?
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Not very important
   - Not important at all
   - Don’t know
9. How often have you been entertained by programs on BYU television?
   O Always
   O Most of the time
   O Some of the time
   O Never
   O Don’t know

10. Is being entertained more important when you watch?
    O BYU Television
    O Commercial television
    O About as important for both
    O Don’t know

11. The next reason is, “to bring the spirit into my home.” To you, is this reason?
    O Very important
    O Somewhat important
    O Not very important
    O Not important at all
    O Don’t know

12. How often has watching BYU Television brought the spirit into your home?
    O Always
    O Most of the time
    O Some of the time
    O Never
    O Don’t know

13. Is this reason more important when you watch?
    O BYU Television
    O Commercial television
    O About as important for both
    O Don’t know
14. I watch BYU Television "to relax." How important is this reason?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don't know

15. How often have those programs made you feel relaxed?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don't know

16. Is this more important when you watch?

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don't know

17. "Because I expect to get help with challenges in my life." How important is this reason to you for watching BYU Television?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don't know

18. How often have the programs helped with challenges in your life?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don't know
19. Is this more important when you watch?

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know

20. “To give me something to think about.” How important is this reason?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know

21. How often have these programs actually given you something to think about?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don’t know

22. Is it more important when you watch?

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know

23. “To give me something to watch while I’m doing other things.” How important is this reason?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know
24. How often do you do other things while you watch BYU Television?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don’t know

25. Do you do other things more often when you watch?

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know

26. “To learn more about how to live my life.” How important is this reason?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know

27. How often have you learned about how to live your life from watching BYU Television?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don’t know

28. Is this reason more important when you watch?

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know
29. Watching BYU Television "helps relieve for a while some of the work or family pressures I feel." How important is this reason?

☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not very important
☐ Not important at all
☐ Don't know

30. How often have these programs helped relieve some of the work or family pressures you feel?

☐ Always
☐ Most of the time
☐ Some of the time
☐ Never
☐ Don't know

31. Is this more important when you watch?

☐ BYU Television
☐ Commercial television
☐ About as important for both
☐ Don't know

32. "To develop my tastes and interests." How important is this reason?

☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not very important
☐ Not important at all
☐ Don't know

33. How often have programs on BYU Television developed your tastes and interests?

☐ Always
☐ Most of the time
☐ Some of the time
☐ Never
☐ Don't know
34. **Is this more important when you watch?**

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know

35. **“To help me in my relationships with others.” How important is this reason?**

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know

36. **How often have these programs helped you in your relationships with others?**

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don’t know

37. **Is this more important when you watch?**

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know

38. **“For a change of pace from what’s on commercial television.” How important is that reason?**

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know
39. How frequently have these programs seemed to be a change of pace from what's on commercial television?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don’t know

40. “To help me teach others.” How important is this reason to you?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know

41. How often have these programs helped you teach others?

- Always
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never
- Don’t know

42. Is this more important when you watch?

- BYU Television
- Commercial television
- About as important for both
- Don’t know

43. “To help me feel connected to people and things I value.” Is this reason important to you?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- Don’t know
44. Does watching BYU Television help you feel connected?
   - Always
   - Most of the time
   - Some of the time
   - Never
   - Don’t know

45. Is this more important when you watch
   - BYU Television
   - Commercial television
   - About as important for both
   - Don’t know

46. "Having a safe channel, where I don’t have to worry about what my family will see or hear." Is this reason important to you?
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Not very important
   - Not important at all
   - Don’t know

47. Do you worry about what your family will see or hear on BYU Television?
   - Always
   - Most of the time
   - Some of the time
   - Never
   - Don’t know

48. Is this more important when you watch?
   - BYU Television
   - Commercial television
   - About as important for both
   - Don’t know
49. “To keep me company when I am by myself.” Is this reason important to you?

○ Very important
○ Somewhat important
○ Not very important
○ Not important at all
○ Don’t know

50. Do you turn on BYU Television to keep you company?

○ Always
○ Most of the time
○ Some of the time
○ Never
○ Don’t know

51. Is this more important when you watch?

○ BYU Television
○ Commercial television
○ About as important for both
○ Don’t know

SECTION THREE: ABOUT YOU

The final few questions are about you. Please remember, your responses are anonymous.

52. When I turn on the television, I click around until I find something that interests me....

○ Always
○ Sometimes
○ Seldom
○ Never
○ Don’t know
53. I pray...
   - Often
   - Sometimes
   - Never

54. I watch television about....
   - 8-10 hours a day
   - 7-9 hours a day
   - 4-6 hours a day
   - 2-3 hours a day
   - 0-2 hours a day

55. I attend religious services...
   - Never
   - Seldom
   - Sometimes
   - Often

56. When I turn on the television it’s to watch a specific program...
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Sometimes
   - Seldom
   - Never

57. I contribute financially to a church, synagogue, mosque or other religious institution...
   - Never
   - Seldom
   - Sometimes
   - Often

58. I read scriptures or other holy writings...
   - Often
   - Sometimes
   - Seldom
   - Never
59. I contribute my time to a church, synagogue, mosque or religious institution...

   ○ Often
   ○ Sometimes
   ○ Seldom
   ○ Never

60. I plan in advance what to watch on television...

   ○ Never
   ○ Seldom
   ○ Sometimes
   ○ Often

61. Yesterday I watched television for about...

   ○ 8-10 hours
   ○ 7-9 hours
   ○ 4-6 hours
   ○ 2-3 hours
   ○ 0-2 hours

62. My age is ...

   ○ 18-34
   ○ 35-49
   ○ 50-64
   ○ 65 or older
   ○ under 18

63. The last grade of school I completed was ...

   ○ 8th grade of less
   ○ Some high school
   ○ Completed high school
   ○ Some college or trade school
   ○ College undergraduate degree
   ○ Some graduate work
   ○ Doesn’t apply to me
64. My gender is...

- Female
- Male

65. My religious preference is...

- Protestant
- Catholic
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Evangelical Christian
- LDS
- Other
- None

66. Our combined annual household income is approximately...

- Less than $15,000
- $15,000-$25,000
- $26,000-$35,000
- $36,000-$50,000
- $51,000-$75,000
- $76,000-$100,000
- More than $100,000
- Does not apply to me

67. We have the following media playback devices in our home (please check all that apply)...  

- A stand-alone DVD player
- DVD player in our computer, videogame system or other device
- A stand-alone CD player
- A CD player in our computer
- A digital television set (HD TV)
YOU’RE DONE!
THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUBMISSION!

We would really value your comments and suggestions in addition to the survey you just took. Feel free to e-mail us!

byutv@byu.edu

© 2002. All Rights Reserved.
BYU Broadcast Services
A Service of Brigham Young University
Appendix B

Solicitation of Survey Participation

Web Announcement

The following text was announcement was posted on the BYU Television web site home page, www.byutv.org

Please click here to participate in a survey about television viewing being conducted by a graduate student in the BYU Department of Communications. Information from the survey will help us serve you better. Thank you for your help.

On-air Announcement

Below is the script from an on-air announcement broadcast on BYU Television. Visually the announcement included an announcer, images of the BYU Television web site and the web address.

We need your help. BYU Television has agreed to participate in a study of why viewers watch certain television channels and what they hope to gain from
their viewing experience. The study is being conducted by a graduate student in the BYU Department of Communications. Please help by completing the survey available through our website. Log onto byutv.org and click on the survey link. The results will be shared with BYU Television and help us serve you better. Thank you for your help.
Appendix C

BYU Television Sample Week Broadcast Schedule: March 31 through April 6, 2002

Please note that the broadcast time is provided in terms of a 28-hour clock. The broadcast day begins at 4:00 a.m. (0400) and ends at 4:00 a.m. (2800) Mountain Standard Time. The broadcast week for BYU Television is Sunday through Saturday.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker/Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2724</td>
<td>Joseph B. Wirthlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 2000</td>
<td>Scott L. Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>Family Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0630</td>
<td>The Mormon Tabernacle Choir and Orchestra Easter Concert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3719</td>
<td>Elaine Michaelis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Lamb of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>The Mormon Tabernacle Choir and Orchestra Easter Concert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2007</td>
<td>Marvin J. Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1997</td>
<td>Susan Easton Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1999</td>
<td>Brent L. Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Music and the Spoken Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Worship Service #0081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3719</td>
<td>Elaine Michaelis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>BYU- Hawaii Devotional #101</td>
<td>President J. Richard Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Lamb of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Easter Song</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>The Sisters of Bethany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>The Mormon Tabernacle Choir and Orchestra Easter Concert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Lamb of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Times &amp; Seasons #0102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2508</td>
<td>M. Russell Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Brides on the Homefront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1998</td>
<td>William O. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Book of Mormon Lecture Series</td>
<td>Donald W. Parry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:30</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #1902</td>
<td>Gordon B. Hinckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:00</td>
<td>LDS General Young Women’s Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Speaker/Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0430</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0409</td>
<td>Virginia U. Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>CES Fireside #0001</td>
<td>M. Russell Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>Education Week 1999</td>
<td>S. Michael Wilcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>BYU Devotional # 2003</td>
<td>Russell M. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>LDS Classics: Cipher in the Snow/ Uncle Ben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0306</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Smoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Family Times #0104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Times &amp; Seasons #0103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 2001</td>
<td>M. Jeffrey Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Pearl of Great Price Discussions #0101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3315</td>
<td>Gerald Lund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Saturday’s Warrior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>BYU Sports 2002</td>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse / Sonoma State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon # 0024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon # 0025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>BYU Devotional # 2929</td>
<td>Dallin H. Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>LDS Classics: Emmett Smith/ The Mailbox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0303</td>
<td>Wendy L. Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Family Times # 0102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>Center Street # 0049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1998</td>
<td>Camille Fronk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Book of Mormon Lecture Series</td>
<td>Jeffrey R. Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>BYU Devotional # 3706</td>
<td>David A. Bednar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>American Prophet: The Story of Joseph Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Speaker/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>CES Fireside #0002</td>
<td>L. Tom Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1999</td>
<td>Mark L. McConkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>Discussion on the Book of Mormon # 0026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Discussion on the Book of Mormon # 0027A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2007</td>
<td>Marvin J. Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Of Souls, Symbols and Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0307</td>
<td>Patricia T. Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>BYU Forum #3722</td>
<td>Robert B. Sloan, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 2001</td>
<td>E. Dale LeBaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Pearl of Great Price Discussions #0102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>BYU Devotional # 3318</td>
<td>Merrill and Marilyn Bateman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Shakes, Rattle &amp; Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0404</td>
<td>Jane Dudley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Family Times #0129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Center Street #0055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1997</td>
<td>Wayne E. Brickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>LDS Classics: Johnny Lingo / Christmas Snows, Christmas Winds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>BYU Devotional # 3604</td>
<td>Merrill and Marilyn Bateman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Minerva Teichert: A Mission in Paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0304</td>
<td>Virginia U. Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Family Times #0103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>Center Street #0050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 1998</td>
<td>Russell M. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Book of Mormon Lecture Series</td>
<td>Donald W. Parry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3711</td>
<td>Merrill and Marilyn Bateman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>Immanuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BYU Activities on Wednesday, April 3, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>BYU Genealogy Conference #0102</td>
<td>Scott W. Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>CES Fireside #0053</td>
<td>Henry B. Eyring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>BYU Education Week 2000</td>
<td>Jack S. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0027B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2009</td>
<td>Neal A. Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>A Place for All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0308</td>
<td>Camille Fronk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Family Times #0106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Times &amp; Seasons #0104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0608</td>
<td>Charles B. Beckert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Pearl of Great Price Discussions #0103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3319</td>
<td>Stephen R. Covey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Stella Simikova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0405</td>
<td>Kathleen H. Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Family Times #0130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Center Street #0056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0027A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3007</td>
<td>Gordon B. Hinckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Letting God Have His Way: A Conversation About C. S. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230</td>
<td>BYU Genealogy Conference #0105</td>
<td>Jayare Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>Center Street #0051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0304</td>
<td>John Bytheway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Book of Mormon Lecture Series</td>
<td>Donald Parry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #1002A</td>
<td>Dallin H. Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>The Kingdom and the Crown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Speaker/Meeting Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>BYU Genealogy Conference #0103</td>
<td>Curt Witcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>CES Fireside #0004</td>
<td>Howard W. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0502</td>
<td>Randal A. Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2012</td>
<td>Jeffrey and Patricia Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Yellowstone: America’s Eden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0309</td>
<td>Gladys Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Family Times #0107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Times &amp; Seasons #0105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0609</td>
<td>James B. Faust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Peal of Great Price Discussions #0104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3320</td>
<td>Jack H. Gosling, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Visions of Eternity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0403</td>
<td>Maren Mouritsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Family Times #0131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Center Street #0057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0129</td>
<td>Todd B. Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0027B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3015</td>
<td>Dallin H. Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Saints in Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0406</td>
<td>Carol Mikita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0408</td>
<td>Sandra Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Family Times #0105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>Center Street #0052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0305</td>
<td>Calvin B. Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Book of Mormon Lecture Series</td>
<td>Emanuel Tov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #1008</td>
<td>Thomas S. Monson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>LDS Perspectives on the Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Speaker/Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>BYU Genealogy Conference #0104</td>
<td>Jayare Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>CES Fireside #0005</td>
<td>Thomas S. Monson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0530</td>
<td>The Faith and Families Report #0108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0503</td>
<td>A. Lynn Scoresby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Discussions on the Book of Mormon #0102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #2015</td>
<td>James E. Faust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Polly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0310</td>
<td>Sheri L. Dew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Times &amp; Seasons # 0106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0610</td>
<td>Joann Hibbert Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Pearl of Great Price Discussions # 0105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>BYU Sports 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Softball / Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>BYU Women’s Conference #0407</td>
<td>Steve Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Family Times #0132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Center Street # 0058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0220</td>
<td>Jack B. Christianson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>LDS Perspectives on the Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #3711</td>
<td>Merrill and Marilyn Bateman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Mormon Tabernacle Choir Concert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>BYU Genealogy Conference #0101</td>
<td>David Dilts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Family Times # 0106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>Center Street #0053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>American Prophet: The Story of Joseph Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>CES Fireside #0001</td>
<td>M. Russell Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>BYU Education Week #0104</td>
<td>Kenneth Higbee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>BYU Women's Conference #0417 Carole Hillam</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0430</td>
<td>BYU Women's Conference #0418 Jolene Merica</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>Sperry Symposium #0502 Barbara Smith</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>BYU Devotional #1912 Jeffrey and Patricia Holland</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>America Sews with Sue Hausman</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>More Than Memories</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>Culinary Creations with Mary Crafts</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Jerry Yarnell School of Fine Painting</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>BYU Women's Conference #0306 Mary Ellen W. Smoot</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>LDS General Conference (Live)</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>LDS General Conference packaged break feed</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>LDS General Conference (Live)</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>