

Understanding Motivations and Engagement Outcomes of Social Media Television Coviewing

Di Wu, Eunice Eun-Sil Kim*

M.A., College of Journalism and Communications, University of Florida, U.S.A.
*Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Ewha Woman's University, Korea**
diwu214@ufl.edu, eunicekim@ewha.ac.kr

Abstract

In today's media environment, TV programmers and advertisers must strive ever harder to attract the attention of audiences. Yet what may be even more crucial is engaging audiences in conversations on social media and nourishing stronger relationships. To provide insights into how to improve audience experiences through social media television coviewing (STVC) behaviors, this study investigates audience motivations for using social networking sites (SNSs) while watching sports program (i.e., social media television coviewing—STVC) and examines relationships between identified motivations and key audience engagement outcomes. The results reveal four motivations for STVC behaviors: sports-related interaction seeking, information seeking, convenience seeking, and socializing. Further, results reveal that sports-related interaction seeking, information seeking, and socializing motivations are significant predictors of satisfaction, investment, and commitment to the program. Audience engagement outcomes are not predicted, however, by convenience seeking or by variables pertaining to SNS-use regarding STVC behaviors.

Keywords: *Social media television coviewing; second screening; social networking sites (SNSs); audience engagement.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The prevalence today of smartphones and similar devices has significantly influenced audiences' TV viewing behavior. Indeed, such devices have given rise to simultaneous media consumption around TV programming (so-called "second screening"). More than four out of five tablet and smartphone owners in the United States look at second screens while watching TV programs [1]. Since second screening has become, for many viewers, an integral part of their TV-viewing experience, TV programmers and advertisers are taking an interest in the phenomenon.

Second-screening behavior can be divided into two categories—browsing the Internet for content related to the TV program and doing so for content unrelated to it. During commercial breaks, viewers may search for additional information about the show (discovering more about the actors or reading blogs about the show) or do unrelated activities like checking email. This study is interested in the trend of viewers engaging with

content on social networking sites (SNSs) relevant to the TV programming, so-called “social media TV coviewing” (STVC) behavior [2] or “social TV participation” [3, 4, 5]. The study aims to determine the potential influence of such behavior on viewership and audience engagement. Viewers’ coviewing experiences via SNSs can facilitate their engagement with TV programs because such experiences allow them to provide their personal opinions and create some influential conversations around the program. When viewers produce content about TV programming on SNSs, they are likely to increase their engagement and develop bonding relationships with the TV program [6,7]. Because social interactions occur among viewers on SNSs (i.e., viewer-to-viewer interaction), STVC is understood to have strong influences on enhancing TV viewership and audience engagement [1,8].

Social TV participation is a complex process, with different audience motivations underlying that participation. To this end, the present study attempts to tap into STVC behaviors by (a) exploring why viewers participate in these social TV activities and (b) examining how those motivations lead to engagement outcomes—satisfaction, investment, and commitment. This study focuses on STVC behaviors during live sporting events, and a high-profile one in particular—the Super Bowl. We survey a sample in the United States shortly after their having watched Super Bowl 50. The Super Bowl’s advertising revenue and its influential impact on audience engagement made it worth studying as the context for this study.

The study holds significance for both academic and practical fields. Despite the academic attention given to the second screening phenomenon in general, little is known about audiences’ second screening behavior on social media around TV programs (STVC) and its consequences with regard to audience engagement. Therefore, this research can fill the literature gap by looking into the impact of STVC on audience engagement outcomes. For TV programmers and sponsors, STVC is no doubt a trend worth watching, as they are looking for better metrics to measure audience engagement. Understanding audiences’ underlying motivations for engaging in STVC behaviors provides important insights into how to successfully engage with audiences. Moreover, the engagement outcomes led by STVC can provide an industry guide to help practitioners design effective multi- and cross-media strategies and better serve the needs of their audiences by making accurate marketing decisions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. STVC during the Super Bowl

Second screening behavior, in general, refers to the use of a digital device (i.e., a smart phone or laptop) while watching TV. Television-viewing behavior itself has social elements—TV content as a conversation trigger and TV as a medium that physically brings people together [9]. Television coviewing on social media extends the social impact even further given that social media allow viewers to enjoy the social experience together while being apart and to engage in creating the content they watch. For TV programmers and producers, second screening behavior offers an ideal outlet for facilitating user interaction on social media around a program even as the show is airing. Moreover, marketers and advertisers are utilizing second screens to raise brand awareness and develop loyal fans.

When it comes to a high-profile sporting event, like the Super Bowl, audiences while watching the game are highly active on social media. Audiences invest emotionally in the Super Bowl such that they show high excitement for the event and enjoy the viewing experience. Sports fandom plays a significant role in the emotional involvement with the Super Bowl [10], which brings fans together offline at sports bar or at parties as well as drives active social impact in online environments.

Audiences use social media simultaneously as a second-screen to gain additional information and seek social interaction while watching the Super Bowl [10]. Audiences' social media activities during the Super Bowl lie in many aspects, such as commentary on game itself, commentary on halftime show, or commentary on commercials. One of the most popular mobile applications used during Super Bowl 50 are social networking apps, suggesting that audiences coviewed the program on social media by sharing their opinions about the game or reading comments from other users. Furthermore, audiences generate high levels of social engagement on social media, that is, "the degree of interactions or connections that a viewer develops with television content" (p.241) [3].

2.2. Motivations to Engage in STVC Behaviors

TV coviewing via SNSs can be driven by various types of motivations. With the rise of audience autonomy, audiences have control over not only the content they want to view but their media consumption across platforms. Instead of viewing content via single screen behavior, audiences choose social media as a second screening to facilitate their TV viewing experience. However, several studies across a wide range of media-multitasking contexts have found the effects of second screen viewing on depriving individuals of their cognitive resources [11]. Because individuals in general tend to make less demanding media choice behaviors [12], it is important to understand the unique set of audience motivations for engaging STVC behaviors, performing with limited cognitive resources, in order to improve audience's experience and fulfill various audience needs in a rapidly changing multimedia environment.

The uses and gratifications (U&G) approach, as a user-oriented perspective, has been prominently used to probe into people's media choice behavior by analyzing needs and gratification [13]. In the U&G perspective, audiences are seen as active and purposeful; and their use of media is motivated or driven by particular reasons and different needs [13,14]. In addition, the U&G approach has been applied to analyze viewers' motivations for using different platforms to watch TV [15,16,17,18]. Previous studies have suggested that the action of media multitasking across various media is done out of a cognitive need (i.e., information seeking) [1,17]. One of the important motivations for STVC behaviors may be information seeking, as viewers seek out on their second screen information relevant to the shows, actors/actresses, or show producers appearing on their primary screen. Other motivations for STVC behaviors include relaxation, escape, entertainment, passing the time, and excitement [3], and these motivations are applicable to STVC during sporting events [19]. Previous studies have identified convenience seeking as a key motivation for SNS use [20], because users seek to access information anywhere, faster and effectively. STVC behaviors during a sports event allow the viewers to stay up-to-date with the program with less effort [19]. In addition, audiences enjoy having instant conversations and exchanging opinions with other TV viewers on SNSs as well as interacting with celebrities and TV programmers; they enjoy developing connections with the TV program [3, 8, 21]. Based on a review of the literature, the current study seeks to explore motivations for STVC:

RQ1: What are the motivations for engaging in STVC behaviors?

2.3. Engagement Outcomes of STVC

Previous research suggests that interacting with SNSs on a second screen leads to high engagement with TV programming [1,6,7,8]. Similarly, social media usage while watching TV programs has a significant impact on the outcomes of STVC [1, 8]. Following Lin and her colleagues [7], the current study focuses on three

engagement outcomes: satisfaction, investment, and commitment. Satisfaction, in the context of STVC, is examined regarding the emotional aspect of a TV program. This aspect is defined as an affective reaction to a TV program derived from the viewers' TV viewing experience and that reflects the gratification of motivations for watching the program [22]. TV program satisfaction, thus, includes the viewers' emotional responses to and evaluations of the programming [23], and viewers' satisfaction level may increase as a result of gratifying their STVC experience [2]. Investment is understood as the viewer's perception of the degree of resources they have put into their TV-viewing experience, including financial, cognitive, emotional, behavioral, or time investments [7]. Since audiences have control over the content they consume and share, viewers who choose to engage in STVC behaviors are more engaged and likely to invest in the programs [24,25]. Commitment is a sense of attachment to a TV program, which could lead to program loyalty [6]. Research suggests that STVC experiences add commitment to the program and the broadcasting channel [6]. Because little is known about the impact of social media coviewing behaviors in the context of a sports program, the current study tests the influence of social media use associated with STVC behaviors (i.e., STVC frequency and SNS usage time during the Super Bowl) on viewers' engagement with the program. STVC behaviors are a trend programmers want to understand as they seek better metrics to measure audience engagement. Thus, the following hypotheses are put forth:

H1: SNS usage frequency related to STVC behaviors is positively related to the viewers' (a) satisfaction, (b) investment, and (c) commitment to the TV program.

H2: SNS usage time related to STVC behaviors is positively related to the viewers' (a) satisfaction, (b) investment, and (c) commitment to the TV program.

Understanding TV viewers' underlying motivations for STVC provides important insights into how to successfully engage with their target audiences. Moreover, an examination of how and which motivations for STVC behaviors lead to engagement outcomes could help practitioners better serve the needs of their audiences and design effective multimedia strategies in SNSs. Thus, the current study poses the following research question:

RQ2: What is the relationship between motivations for STVC and the three engagement outcomes?

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample and Procedure

An online survey was conducted over a 1-week period approximately a month after the airing of Super Bowl 50. The study recruited participants through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Mturk was deemed appropriate for the study because it provides the sample diversity in terms of age and ethnicity, which outperforms a convenience sample [26].

The introductory description of the survey clearly stated that it was intended to understand audiences who used SNSs while watching Super Bowl 50, and the participants were informed that consent to participate was implied by their understanding of the qualification to participate in the study and the completion of the questionnaire. Qualifying participants were only those ($n = 390$) who indicated they used SNSs to interact with content related to Super Bowl 50 while watching it (i.e., those who used SNSs to comment, post, watch/read,

or share Super Bowl content). Next, participants were asked to indicate the SNSs they used simultaneously while watching the Super Bowl and their activities on SNSs. Finally, they answered a series of questions regarding their SNS usage, level of involvement with SNSs, motivation for STVC behaviors, and engagement outcomes.

Among 390 respondents (female: 42.8%, age $M = 30$, ranging from 18 to 43), more than three-fourths (77.2%) consisted of Caucasians/Whites; the remainder consisted of Asian/Asian Americans (8.7%), Hispanic/Latinos (4.6%), African Americans (7.7%), Multiracial (1.5%), and Native Americans (0.3%). A majority of the participants (71.3%) were active SNS users, using SNSs for at least 30 minutes a day. The SNS used most by the participants for the Super Bowl coviewing was Facebook (81%), followed by Twitter (47.4%), Instagram (16.4%), and Snapchat (7%).

3.2. Measures

Motivations for STVC: Scale items for motivations for STVC during the Super Bowl were derived from earlier studies on second screening [1,8] and STVC behaviors [3, 19]. This resulted in 17 items about motivations to STVC during the Super Bowl. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each item on a seven-point Likert-type scale. More details of the measures can be found in Table 1.

SNS use regarding STVC behaviors: Participants' SNS use associated with STVC behaviors was operationalized using two measures of SNS use during Super Bowl 50; that is, STVC frequency and SNS usage time. Participants were asked to indicate which SNSs they had used simultaneously while watching Super Bowl 50. Frequency of STVC behaviors was assessed using one item on a seven-point scale by asking how often the participants used the SNSs while watching the program ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 1.25$; 1 = "very rarely," 7 = "very frequently") [7]. SNS usage time was measured by minutes or hours spent for SNSs while watching Super Bowl 50 (about 4 hours long) on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 = "less than 10 minutes" to 7 = "3 hours or more" ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.66$).

Engagement outcomes: Participants' level of satisfaction was assessed toward the Super Bowl using three items [7]. For example, the participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with four statements ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 1.13$, $\alpha = .80$). Guo and Chan-Olmsted's four-item scale [3] was used to measure the viewers' perception of investment in Super Bowl 50 ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 1.28$, $\alpha = .83$). Commitment was measured using four items [7] ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.20$, $\alpha = .82$). All engagement outcomes were assessed on seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = "strongly disagree," 7 = "strongly agree").

As one of the control variables, the extent to which the participants integrated SNSs into their lives (i.e., SNS involvement) was measured using a six-item SNS intensity scale [27]. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 1.08$, $\alpha = .88$) on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = "strongly disagree," 7 = "strongly agree").

4. RESULTS

4.1. Motivations for STVC

Regarding RQ1, a principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was carried out on 17 items to determine the underlying structure of motivations for STVC while watching Super Bowl 50. Only principle components were selected with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 and variance explained by each component.

Three items with low factor loading scores ($\leq |0.40|$) and one item with higher than 0.4 cross-loading on multiple factors were deleted, and the PCA was rerun with 13 items. The analysis yielded a four-component solution accounting for 72.32% of total variance. The results showed high loading scores ($\geq |0.70|$) for all identified components.

As shown in Table 1, all motivation factors showed good reliability with alpha ranging from .79 to .89. The first component, “sports-related interaction seeking,” consisted of three items and accounted for 34.51% of the variance. The second component, “information seeking” included three items and explained 16.70% of the variance. The third component, “convenience seeking” with three items accounted for 10.78% of the variance. Finally, the fourth component, “socializing” accounted for 10.33% of the variance. Specific items and loadings are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Motivations for STVC behaviors while watching the Super Bowl 50 (EFA; $n = 390$)

	1	2	3	4
Sports-related interaction seeking				
To receive specific information about a situation while watching the Super Bowl.	.86	.16	.12	-.07
To share my thoughts about the Super Bowl.	.84	.02	.08	.04
To respond to sports professionals on social media.	.74	-.03	.20	.16
To interact with other audiences.	.71	.17	.22	.08
Information seeking				
To obtain additional information about the Super Bowl (information about the teams, athletes, etc.).	.06	.82	.03	.15
To relax myself.	.17	.76	.20	-.10
To get more up-to-date information (e.g. scores, the cued-up performance, etc.).	.03	.76	.10	.24
To increase my understanding of the Super Bowl.	.07	.75	.18	.21
Convenience seeking				
Because it was easy to receive information related to the Super Bowl through social media.	.13	.09	.88	.11
Because using social media while watching the Super Bowl is a pleasant rest.	.17	.16	.88	.05
Because it was a fast way to share information about the Super Bowl.	.29	.22	.72	.07
Socializing				
To interact with athletes on social media while watching the Super Bowl.	.09	.17	.07	.92
To chat away with friends.	.06	.21	.13	.90
Eigenvalue	4.49	2.17	1.40	1.34
% Variance	34.51	16.70	10.78	10.33
Cumulative %	34.51	51.21	61.99	72.32

To further validate the items of the four motivational constructs of STVC during Super Bowl 50, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on a random half of the sample using AMOS 21.0. On the basis of the EFA results, 13 items were tested, and two additional items were deleted due to low factor loading

score ($\lambda = .63$ and $.65$). The final CFA was conducted with 11 items. As shown in Table 2, the results of CFA confirmed the four-factor structure revealing acceptable factor loading estimates (ranging from $.69$ to $.98$). All observed indicators were statistically significant ($p < .05$) on their corresponding latent factors [38]. The overall model goodness-of-fit values met acceptable criteria ($\chi^2/df(38) = 2.82$, RMSEA = $.95$, NFI = $.90$, CFI = $.93$, and IFI = $.93$, SRMR = $.08$). To estimate the reliability of the model constructs, the Cronbach's α coefficients and composite reliability (CR) were calculated for all measurement items. In addition, to assess convergent and discriminant validity, the study used average variance extracted (AVE), maximum shared variance (MSV), and average shared variance (ASV). AVEs of each construct were all above $.50$, which suggested convergent validity. We obtained discriminant validity, because AVE scores were greater than MSV and ASV [28].

Table 2. The results of CFA, reliability, and validity analysis ($n = 202$)

	Factor Loadings	CR	AVE	MSV	ASV
Sports-related interaction seeking ($\alpha = .80$)		0.85	0.58	0.19	0.08
To receive specific information about a situation while watching the Super Bowl.	0.85				
To share my thoughts about the Super Bowl.	0.74				
To interact with other audiences.	0.69				
Information seeking ($\alpha = .79$)		0.79	0.70	0.18	0.12
To obtain additional information about the Super Bowl (information about the teams, athletes, etc.).	0.78				
To get more up-to-date information (e.g. scores, the cued-up performance, etc.).	0.73				
Convenience ($\alpha = .84$)		0.55	0.80	0.19	0.12
Because using social media while watching the Super Bowl is a pleasant rest.	0.88				
Because it was easy to receive information related to the Super Bowl through social media.	0.84				
Because it was a fast way to share information about the Super Bowl.	0.71				
Socializing ($\alpha = .89$)		0.91	0.84	0.18	0.07
To interact with athletes on social media while watching the Super Bowl.	0.85				
To chat away with friends.	0.98				

Notes. CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted; MSV = maximum shared variance; ASV = average shared variance.

4.2. Relationship among STVC Motivations, STVC-related SNS Use, and Engagement Outcomes

To answer the two research hypotheses and RQ2, the study conducted two-step hierarchical regression analyses to determine the extent to which the four identified motivations (i.e., sports-related interaction seeking, information seeking, convenience seeking, and socializing) and SNS use associated with STVC behaviors (i.e., STVC frequency and SNS usage time) predicted viewers' satisfaction, investment, and commitment. In the

first step, the study entered age, gender, and SNS involvement and in the second step it entered the four motivations and STVC-related SNS use variables. The results showed that age and gender were not significant for any of the engagement outcome variables. SNS involvement was found to have a significant influence on commitment ($\beta = .17, t = 2.67, p < .01$).

As shown in Table 3, when the effects of confounding variables were controlled for, neither STVC frequency nor SNS usage time was found to be a strong predictor of satisfaction, investment, and commitment (all $p > .05$). Therefore, H1 and H2 were not supported.

Regarding motivational factors, the two strongest predictors of satisfaction were found to be socializing ($\beta = .19, t = 3.40, p < .001$) and information seeking ($\beta = .19, t = 3.09, p < .01$), followed by sports-related interaction seeking. However, convenience seeking ($p = .12$) was not found to be a significant predictor. As for investment, socializing was found to be the strongest predictor ($\beta = .22, t = 3.97, p < .001$). Both information seeking ($\beta = .21, t = 3.58, p < .01$) and sports-related interaction seeking ($\beta = .18, t = 2.90, p < .01$) were found to be significantly associated with investment as well. However, convenience was not found to be a significant predictor of investment ($p = .57$). The strongest predictor of commitment was found to be information seeking ($\beta = .19, t = 3.12, p < .01$), followed by socializing ($\beta = .16, t = 2.82, p < .01$) and sports-related interaction seeking ($\beta = .14, t = 2.19, p < .01$). Similar to the findings reported for satisfaction and investment, results showed convenience seeking to not be a significant predictor of commitment ($p = .14$).

Table 3. Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for social interaction seeking, information seeking, convenience seeking, and socializing on STVC behaviors ($n = 390$)

	Satisfaction				Investment				Commitment			
	B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	B	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1			.08	.07			.16	.11			.13	.12
Age	.01	.03			.01	.06			-.01	.05		
Gender	.12	.05			.32	.12*			.21	.09		
SNS involvement	.31	.29***			.42	.34***			.40	.35***		
Step 2			.22	.20			.28	.26			.24	.22
Age	.003	.02			.01	.05			-.01	.06		
Gender	1.01	-.004			.16	.06			.09	.04		
SNS involvement	.09	.08			.14	.12			.19	.17**		
STVC Usage	-.07	-.11			.003	.004			-.04	-.05		
STVC Frequency	.03	.04			.02	.02			-.01	-.01		
Sports-related interaction seeking	.14	.15*			.18	.18**			.13	.14*		
Information seeking	.16	.19**			.20	.17**			.17	.19**		

Convenience seeking	.09	.10	.04	.03	.09	.09
Socializing	.13	.19***	.16	.22***	.11	.16**

Notes. Gender: 0 = Female, 1 = Male

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The rapid growth of digital technologies has revolutionized the way viewers interact with TV programs; that is, through simultaneous media use. Of the great interest is television coviewing behavior on social media which refers to the use of social media while watching TV to engage with the content or conversation related to the TV programming. This study has attempted to understand STVC behaviors, particularly during a sports event, by exploring the motivations for STVC for a live sports event. In addition, the study has examined the impact of STVC on key engagement outcomes.

This study identifies four motivations for STVC behaviors: sports-related interaction seeking, information seeking, convenience seeking, and socializing. A primary motivation is sports-related interaction seeking. Viewers who engage in STVC connect and discuss with other audience members and sports professionals to exchange their thoughts and opinions about the Super Bowl. Since SNSs allows individuals to connect with other TV viewers, social gratifications might be obtained through the STVC behaviors [8,21]. The Super Bowl is a unique sporting event in the U.S., one that attracts a wide range of viewers, many of whom do not watch football normally. Viewers who take part in second-screen behaviors help magnify its impact by engaging in activities about the event on SNSs. Sports-related interaction, as a unique audience motivation in the context of sports program, can be best applied to understanding motivations for STVC behaviors during the Super Bowl. The Super Bowl attracts SNS users who are willing to invest physically (or financially) and emotionally in the event. Given the significance of sports-related interaction, programmers should include a variety of features on SNSs to provide a venue for sports fandom and to increase audience engagement by facilitating simultaneous interaction among TV viewers as well as between sports professionals or experts and the viewers.

As identified in prior research, information seeking is another strong predictor for STVC for the Super Bowl [19]. Because viewers are motivated to learn more about the sports event itself, they might join STVC to obtain knowledge about sports-related terms and read others' reviews or analyses of the game. Individuals use SNSs to satisfy their learning motives as they provide better contextualized and customized information related to a certain topic, for example, a sports event [19]. Therefore, viewers with a purposeful use of SNSs to obtain information about their interests related to a TV program would feel satisfied with social TV coviewing experiences, which might further contribute to their investment and commitment to the program.

Important predictors of STVC for the Super Bowl include convenience seeking. Because audiences can easily access SNSs via their phones or tablets while watching the TV program, they might engage in STVC to seek convenience and instant gratification. Among a variety of benefits that convenience can offer to the audiences, the potential improvement in obtaining information may be regarded as one of the important values that might have motivated STVC behaviors [20]. That is, convenience includes saving time and effort in seeking information as well as efficiency of information sharing. For STVC behaviors, especially in the context of a sports program, convenience seeking has been found to be an important engagement motive [19].

Included among the key motivations for STVC during the Super Bowl is socializing via SNSs. This indicates that viewers engage in coviewing behaviors via SNSs to communicate and chat with their friends or sports celebrities. In terms of socializing, the findings indicate that SNSs are an outlet for TV viewers to seek social gratification, especially when they watch entertainment programs. SNSs are also a way to enjoy

entertainment and to release tension during an event. Overall, the findings suggest that TV programmers should engage their audience with informative content on SNSs and encourage them to communicate with friends or close acquaintances within their social network or sport celebrities via unique social media features (e.g., sharing photos, filters, or hashtags).

This study has examined the relationship between the identified motivations and key engagement outcomes such as satisfaction, investment, and commitment. The results show that sport-related interaction seeking, information seeking, and socializing are found to be the significant predictors for all engagement outcomes. Both information and sport-related interaction-seeking motivations reflect audiences' need to receive sport-related information or guidance and exchange opinions with other audiences or sports professionals. Those motivated by sport-related information and interaction seeking must be those who are highly involved with the program or those who are willing to continue a long-lasting relationship with the program. Thus, it is feasible to suppose the needs of such audience lead to high engagement with the program. In addition to the two predictors, it is interesting that socializing motives contribute to the key audience engagement outcomes. Socializing includes audiences' needs for communicating with like-minded others, such as friends or close acquaintances, or celebrities that might be related to the needs for entertainment and relaxation, therefore, emotionally directed. Because the initial focus of audience engagement is on an emotional aspect of program engagement, that is, satisfaction with the program as a result of STVC behaviors [30], socializing might play a significant role in predicting satisfaction and consequent engagement outcomes.

What was not found, however, to be a significant predictor of engagement outcomes was convenience seeking. In an earlier study, the convenience motive of social TV co-viewing was positively related with sports channel commitment [19]. The current study, however, yielded results that would seem to undercut such a finding. Perhaps the convenience motivation in the current STVC context—Super Bowl 50, during which audiences expect to briefly receive dynamic updates—is associated with the audiences' gratifications toward the social media technology and not their STVC behaviors. The convenience aspect of SNSs (e.g., speed and ease), although it is found to be a primary motivation for STVC behaviors, might not be strong enough to positively influence the audiences' media experience or further predict their commitment. In addition, the results showed that STVC-related SNS use was not positively associated with engagement outcomes. The findings suggest that merely spending more time on and having frequent access to SNSs while watching the Super Bowl does not necessarily lead to positive and meaningful audience engagement. Engagement outcomes may be predicted to a large extent by the quality and long-term benefits that audiences expect to obtain from engaging in STVC behaviors, for example, social gratifications including feelings of co-presence with other audiences (i.e., social presence) [19]. The results of the current study, when combined with the findings of the previous research, seem to emphasize the importance of providing informative content on SNSs as well as encouraging quality interactions among users and athletes during the sports program.

In today's media environment, it is crucial for brands to engage their audience in conversation and nourish stronger relationships. Given the growing importance of second-screening, understanding the motivations for STVC and their relationship to key engagement outcomes is expected to be a basis for strategy development. The current study will help TV programmers and advertisers gain some insights into how to improve audience experiences through STVC behaviors and strengthen audience-program relationships.

5.1. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Despite the contributions of the study, some limitations should be noted. First, because the findings of this study are based on a specific sporting event—Super Bowl 50—they may not be generalized to a full spectrum

of STVC motivations, thus limiting their substantive contribution. Given the Super Bowl's impact, STVC behaviors are likely to be quite different from other coviewing experiences via SNSs. The same motivations and patterns of results may not hold for other TV programs or events, such as a music awards show. For future studies, different STVC contexts should be examined to ensure the generalizability of the findings. Second, this study tested coviewing behaviors on SNSs in general, instead of focusing on a specific SNS platform. However, motivations for using SNSs vary across different SNSs, which may lead to different engagement outcomes. Future research should replicate the current study with various types of SNSs (e.g., text-based vs. visual-based). Third, some other variables that were not of interest in this study may explain the variance in STVC behaviors. For example, future studies could include variables such as an audience's familiarity with the program or program genres. Indeed, an audience's pre-perception about the program or certain program genres (e.g., drama, reality show) could lead to different levels of engagement on SNSs. Lastly, it would be more fruitful for a future study to investigate the role of gender in predicting STVC behaviors on SNSs across a variety of program contexts. One interesting result is about the influence of gender on STVC; males are more likely than females to invest time, interest, and/or energy in the Super Bowl. For sports programmers, it is important to note that male audiences tend more to stay and form a long relationship with a program via STVC behaviors. Gender could be considered as a significant variable influencing the impact of program genres or audience motivations.

5.2. CONCLUSION

This study extends and augments knowledge about the underlying motivations behind STVC and engagement outcomes of STVC by analyzing a high-profile sporting event, Super Bowl 50. The findings of the study enhance our understanding of STVC behaviors and the relationship between audience motivations and key engagement outcomes. The findings provide important implications for programmers and advertisers to utilize their resources to engage their audiences through STVC behaviors on SNSs in order to build a strong meaningful relationship between them. Still, much remains to be learned regarding STVC behaviors across different types of programs and SNS platforms.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gil de Zúñiga, H., Garcia-Perdomo, V., & McGregor, S. C. "What is Second Screening? Exploring Motivations of Second Screen Use and Its Effect on Online Political Participation," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 65, No. 5, pp. 793-815, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12174>
- [2] Cohen, E. L., & Lancaster, A. L. "Individual Differences in In-Person and Social Media Television Coviewing: The Role of Emotional Contagion, Need to Belong, and Coviewing Orientation," *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, Vol. 17, No. 8, pp. 512-518, 2014.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2013.0484>
- [3] Guo, M., & Chan-Olmsted, S. M. Predictors of Social Television Viewing: How Perceived Program, Media, and Audience Characteristics Affect Social Engagement with Television Programming. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, Vol. 59, No. 2, pp. 240-258, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2015.1029122>
- [4] Krämer, N. C., Winter, S., Benninghoff, B., & Gallus, C. "How "Social" is Social TV? The Influence of Social Motives and Expected Outcomes on the Usage on Social TV Applications," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 51, pp. 255-262, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.05.005>

- [5] Shin, D. "Defining Sociability and Social Presence in Social TV," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 939-947, 2013.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.07.006>
- [6] Lim, J. S., Hwang, Y., Kim, S., & Biocca, F. A. "How Social Media Engagement Leads to Sports Channel Loyalty: Mediating Roles of Social Presence and Channel Commitment," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 46, pp. 158-167, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.013>
- [7] Lin, J., Sung, Y., & Chen, K. "Social Television: Examining the Antecedents and Consequences of Connected TV Viewing," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 58, pp. 171-178, 2016.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.12.025>
- [8] Simons, N. "TV Drama as a Social Experience: An Empirical Investigation of the Social Dimensions of Watching TV Drama in the Age of Non-Linear Television," *Communications*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 219-236, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2015-0005>
- [9] Wohn, D. Y., & Na, E. "Tweeting about TV: Sharing Television Viewing Experiences via Social Media Message Streams," *First Monday*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 2011.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v16i3.3368>
- [10] Cooper, R & Tang, T. "Gender and Predictors of Multiplatform Media Uses: A Case Study of the Super Bowl," *International Journal of Sport Communication*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 348-363, 2013.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.6.3.348>
- [11] Van Cauwenberge, A., Schaap, G., & van Roy, R. "TV No Longer Commands Our Full Attention: Effects Of Second-Screen Viewing and Task Relevance On Cognitive Load and Learning from News," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 38, pp. 100-109, 2014.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.05.021>
- [12] Wang, Z., Irwin, M., Cooper, C., & Srivastava, J. "Multidimensions of Media Multitasking and Adaptive Media Selection," *Human Communication Research*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 102-127, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12042>
- [13] Rubin, A. M. Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*; 3rd edition: pp. 165-184. 2008.
- [14] Katz, E, Blumler, J. G. & Gurevitch, M. "Uses and Gratifications Research," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 37, pp. 509-523, 1973.
- [15] Giglietto, F & Selva, D. "Second Screen and Participation: A Content Analysis on a Full Season Dataset of Tweets," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 260-277, 2014.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12085>
- [16] Shin, D. H. "What People Do with Digital Multimedia Broadcasting? Path Analysis of Structural Equation Modelling," *International Journal of Mobile Communications*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 258-275, 2008.
- [17] Wang, Z & Tchernev, J. M. "The 'Myth' of Media multitasking: Reciprocal Dynamics of Media Multitasking, Personal Needs, and Gratifications," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 493-513, 2012.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01641.x>
- [18] Yung, K. C. , Juran, K., & McMillan, S. J. "Motivators for the Intention to Use Mobile TV: A Comparison of South Korean Males and Females," *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 147-167, 2009.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2501/S0265048709090477>
- [19] Hwang, Y & Lim, J. "The Impact of Engagement Motives for Social TV on Social Presence and Sports Channel Commitment. *Telematics & Informatics*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 755-765, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.03.006>
- [20] Hicks, A., Comp, S., Horovitz, J., Hovarter, M., Miki, M., & Bevan, J. L. "Why People Use Yelp. com: An Exploration of Uses and Gratifications," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 28, No. 6, pp. 2274-2279, 2012.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.06.034>

- [21] Shim, H., Oh, P., Song, H., & Lee, Y. "An Exploration of Motivations for Two Screening Viewing, Social Interaction Behaviors, and Factors that Influence Viewing Intention," *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 158-164, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2014.0543>
- [22] Godlewski, L. & Perse, E. "Audience Activity and Reality Television: Identification, Online Activity, and Satisfaction." *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 148-169, 2010.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463371003773358>
- [23] Dalakas, V & Langenderfer, J. Consumer Satisfaction with Television Viewing: Insight for the Entertainment Industry. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 47-59, 2007.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1300/J396v29n01_03
- [24] Rusbult, C. "Commitment and Satisfaction in Romantic Association: A test of the Investment Model," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 172-186, 1980.
DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(80\)90007-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(80)90007-4)
- [25] Rusbult, C & Buunk, B. "Commitment Processes in Close Relationships: An Interdependence Analysis," *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 175-204, 1993.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/026540759301000202>
- [26] Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A. W., & Wiebe, E. N. "The Viability of Crowdsourcing for Survey Research," *Behavior Research Methods*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 800-813, 2011.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0081-0>
- [27] Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. "The Benefits of Facebook "friends": Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 1143-1168, 2007.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x>
- [28] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. *Multivariate Data analysis: A Global Perspective*. Upper Saddle River, 2010.
- [29] Hull, K & Schmittl, A. "A Fumbled Opportunity? A Case Study of Twitter's Role in Concussion Awareness Opportunities during the Super Bowl," *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 78-94, 2015.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723514558928>
- [30] Godlewski, L. & Perse, E. "Audience Activity and Reality Television: Identification, Online activity, and Satisfaction," *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No.2, pp. 148-169, 2010.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463371003773358>