What makes the character portrayal attractive?

to what extent does the media character's diversity affect audience engagement and character meaningfulness?

Student Name: Sizhe Dang
Student Number: 601652

Supervisor: Dr. Julia Kneer

Abstract

The stereotypical character portrayal in media has existed for a very long time. The female was described with negative feminine characteristics and always waiting for the rescue. The minority character even hardly appeared on the screen in history. However, more and more counter-stereotype characters have recently appeared in the mainstream, for instance, the female superhero *Captain Marvel (Boden & Fleck, 2019)* or the colored character representations in the *House of the Dragon* (Sapochnik et al., 2022). The previous study showed that the audience engaged with the non-stereotypical characters more than the stereotypical characters (Żerebecki et al., 2022). However, the role of the diversity of character portrayal was not clear. Therefore, the study elaborates on the research question: to *what extent does the media character's diversity affect audience engagement and character meaningfulness*? To answer the question, an online survey with an experimental design was applied with the question of perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationships, character realism, and character meaningfulness. Four main characters from the film Thor: Love and Thunder (Waititi, 2022) were selected as the stimulus material, which include male, female, lesbian and gay characters. The result showed that the female characters have more masculine personality traits than male characters, which indicated that the stereotypical female representation of over-affiliated males was disappearing. Moreover, the audiences tend to develop parasocial relationships with the characters portrayed with positive masculine and feminine characteristics. However, it also showed that although the audience does not prefer the negative portrayal of gendered traits, the negative personality traits still make the character realistic and encourage the audience to think. In addition, the study found that the portrayal of LGBTQ characters still stays at the stereotypical stage, especially for gay characters. Audiences show more acceptance of lesbian than gay characters. Furthermore, the result supported that the recognizability consists of more aspects of familiarity to help the audience find the actual similarity with the characters.

Keywords: gender stereotypes, diversity, character portrayal, recognizability, media engagement

Table of contents

Chapter 1. Introduction

The unequal character portrayals of gender, sexual orientation, and race have existed for a long time in media. In 2021, Mazières et al. did a content analysis of 3700 films from 1985 to 2018, and the result showed that only 34% percent of characters were female. In addition, the female character always shows an emotional image rather than independence in the previous mainstream media (Haines, 2016). In terms of gender identity, in the previous time, limited LGBTQ characters were included in the traditional media product. Until the mid-1990s, LGBTQ characters started to be represented in media products (Padva, 2008). However, the portrayal of LGBTQ characters contained stereotypes; for instance, they were depicted as comic relief, criminals, or ill (Scharrer et al., 2022). Moreover, the characters of color were not prevalently and equally represented in media products. For instance, the image of black characters was always "bossy" or "criminal" in media products (Cox & Ward, 2019; Dixon, 2017).

However, a prominent number of diverse characters have been positively represented in mainstream films recently. For instance, *Captain Marvel (Boden & Fleck, 2019)*, *Black Widow* (Shortland, 2021) in Marvel Cinematic Universe, and *Wonder Woman* (Jenkins, 2017) in the D.C. series were portrayed as intelligent, brave, and independent to counter the stereotypical depiction (Tavares, 2022; Hall, 2022). Moreover, the actors of the House Velaryon in the series *House of the Dragon* (Sapochnik et al., 2022) were all black. It not only showed the cast diversity in recent mainstream media but also further supported that the colored characters are powerful, independent, and result-orientated, which means they are treated equally with white characters (Smalls, n.d.). The character portrayals break the stereotypical image of colored characters who were subordinate to white people.

One study (Żerebecki et al., 2022) showed that audiences are more interested in and engaged with non-stereotypical characters. They also found that the audience's personality in terms of gendered traits can predict their engagement with media characters. However, we do not know which role the characters' diversity plays in engagement. Besides the categories of role diversity, the paper also aims to find out how media engagement links to character engagement in terms of character meaningfulness and character realism. Therefore, the

research question was formulated: t*o what extent does the media character's diversity affect audience engagement and character meaningfulness*?

For scientific relevance, although the previous study explored the media characters by using the approach of gendered personality, less LGBTQ characters were studied by using this approach. Therefore, in the current research, the minority characters will be included. Thus, this research will fill this gap and allow participants to assess the gender traits of characters to determine the characters' diversity. In addition to gender identity, another new media engagement theory: the MSR scale, will be introduced to assess the relationship between different media engagement. The scale uses the concept of recognizability to explore the similarity between the character and the audience. However, the scale was only applied to the minority characters before. Therefore, this research will use this scale to analyze both majority and minority characters in order to explore the representative of this scale.

For societal relevance, firstly, this research can help the film industry to understand how audiences define the meaning of role diversity and how it triggers them to engage with the character. It will help production teams create more attractive and diverse personas in the media and ultimately increase engagement. Secondly, according to Morgan et al. (2009), the media always reflect life in society. Therefore, by doing this research, people will learn more about the mainstream perception of society and how to change this unequal situation by using media products.

The paper first introduces the research question, background, and academic and social relevance. Secondly, a theoretical framework will be discussed in chapter two, which includes gender identity, character portrayals, recognizability and perceived similarity, parasocial relationship and character engagement theories. Followed by the methodology in chapter three, which will demonstrate the research design, sample and procedures. In chapter four, the result, which proceeds from SPSS, will be reported. The last chapter will discuss an interpretation of the results, limitations, and future suggestions will be combined.

Chapter 2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Portrayal of character and impact on audience

2.1.1 Gender identity

For decades, gender differences in media entertainment have been shown to largely conform to stereotypes (Reich, 2021). For instance, males were depicted more as competent and rational, while females were warm and expressive (Broverman et al., 1972). In addition to that, in terms of the number of character diversity, males are overrepresented more than female characters, colored characters are underrepresented more than white, and younger characters are more than older characters (Daalmans & Ter Horst, 2017). Moreover, the character portrayal deviated from the biological sex was also depicted as unhappy and pathetic (Walsh et al., 2008). Thus, Walsh et al. (2008) argued that the patriarchal ideology is permanently embedded in the media and entertainment content.

The stereotypical image is permeated in the character portrayals, and it sometimes becomes detrimental to the general audience. In recent research, the authors (Santoniccolo et al., 2023) explored the relationship between stereotype representation and its effect in various cultural contexts. The result showed that the gendered stereotype representation was still common in some contexts. The contact with stereotypes further cultivated the belief in gender stereotypes and the norm of gender roles. It eventually leads to fostering violence and discrimination in men and lower self-confidence in women.

However, the stereotypical depiction in entertainment cannot be only explained by the differences in biological sex. Gender is one of the first and most obvious ways to distinguish oneself from others among groups (Martin & Ruble, 2010). The traditional ideas of conceptualizing masculinity and femininity only as opposite traits, which contribute to an ideology of gender, are only about men and women (Bockting, 2008). However, the cognition of stereotypes started to develop at the age of three (Signorella et al., 1993). Moreover, the process of the development of gender identity (the process of identifying the individual as a man, woman, or another identity) was not a simple issue rather than complex (Koenig & Eagly, 2014); the process was continually developed and enlarged with the cultural contexts, social contact, and various observations (Koenig & Eagly, 2014). Thus, the simple biological sex is insufficient to understand and evaluate the stereotype representation in society.

In many ways contributing to the understanding of stereotypes, media is one of the essential sources for the general audience in society (Rolle et al., 2014). In sports news, the media always focus on the appearance of the female character instead of their athletic performance (Chisholm, 2002). Whereas, when it comes to the male athletes, one of the most prominent topics is the high expectation of the performance (Eagleman, 2002). The different depictions of gender in sports news showed the media's power, reinforcing society's perceptions of gendered stereotypes. Another research (Herrett-Skjellum & Allen, 1996) concentrated on the relationship between television consumption and the audience's attitude toward stereotypes. The result showed that the acceptance of stereotypes in women increases with the amount of time spent watching television. Moreover, Tartaglia and Rollero (2015) indicated that the mirror effect in the advertisement explains the cultural difference and reflects the value of society. The research explored the difference in gender representation in advertisements in the Netherlands and Italy. The result showed that Italy, as a more masculine and gender-unequal country, tends to objectify females in advertisements more than the femininized country, the Netherlands. All examples mentioned above indicate that the gendered stereotype representation in media consistently influences the perception of the audience in society. Simultaneously, the audience perception reinforced and be reflected in the media. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the formation of stereotypes and their vast influence on the audience. Furthermore, it is clear that stereotype representation in media cannot be discussed without audience engagement (which will be elaborated on in the following section).

Spence et al. (1975) mentioned that personality traits are the core of stereotypes. The author also suggested that individuals can perform different personalities opposite their sex (Spence, 1993). From the sociocultural approach, gender development is affected by interrelated social systems (e.g., parental, peer, media, and social institutions). Moreover, the critical approach also suggests that race, class, or sexuality need to be considered when discussing gender (Reich, 2021). From an empirical perspective, some studies suggested that different gender traits can explain the complexity and diversity of individual behavior in different media consumption. For instance, Kneer (2019) indicated that gender trait has a more significant impact on game-related concepts than biological sex. It suggests that gender

traits add valuable information on biological sex. Moreover, Żerebecki et al. (2022) proposed that gender traits can predict an individual's media engagement.

Therefore, no matter the theoretical approach or the empirical evidence, it proved again that merely biological sex could not explain the stereotype in the research. A more comprehensive approach should be applied in the gender study and the media engagement area. Thus, when we analyze characters' portrayals, we should use a wider angle, naming gender identity to evaluate them rather than merely relying on biological sex.

The most widely used measurement for assessing gender identity in the past was the scale Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) developed by Bem (1941), which contains two dimensions of masculine and feminine traits. As we already know, the distinct gendered stereotype representation in media also links with the portrayal of masculinity and feminine characteristics. However, this measure is not valid across cultures and does not precisely reflect masculine and feminine concepts (Twenge, 1997). In the past, positive masculinity and femininity are assigned to the male and female characters, respectively. The female characters were depicted as warm and patient, representing the attractive feminine characteristic (Broverman et al., 1972). However, the depiction even amplified the housewife stereotype representation of females (Russell, 1991), limiting the female image and weakening their social abilities and responsibilities.

In 2013, Berger and Krahé proposed that each gender identity should have both positive and negative aspects. From the conceptual perspective, individuals simultaneously incorporate strengths and weaknesses when assessing themselves. Moreover, from the empirical perspective, the individual-construction is somehow influenced by social groups, in which individuals tend to combine positive and negative traits from a specific group. Therefore, by doing several quantitative research, they improved a new instrument PN-SRI to measure gender identity based on the BSRI, which contains four aspects: positive masculinity, negative masculinity, and positive femineity, negative femineity. These gender stereotypes are similar to different aspects of positive and negative masculinity and femininity. Since gender identity overlaps with various social categories, it brings more nuances to individuals (Żerebecki et al., 2022). Therefore, different gender traits can also create subtle differences in media characters and make them more diverse. In addition to that,

gendered personality trait also plays a role in the perception of characters. Media characters were always portrayed with fixed personality traits to represent a type of individual (Buchbinder, 2014). Therefore, the research will assess the character with the help of perceived personality traits assigned by the participants.

2.1.2 Portrayal of stereotype in media

As motioned before, historically, female representation in media is often disproportionate, less than male characters in terms of numbers. The media lack older and minority female characters and females without real-life bodies or appearances (Zuckerman et al., 2005). Moreover, the stereotypes of female depiction in media are not consistently accurate and distribute the right message to the audience (Goodall, 2012). For instance, some of the female characters are over-sexualized and passive. Some of the female characters use their sexual attractiveness to distract male characters in order to obtain information, or some of the female characters always rely on male characters to help them solve difficulties (Wood, 2011; Zuckerman et al., 2005; Jenni, 2016). To link the stereotype representation of a females with the gendered traits, the stereotypical female was weak, over-dependent on others, and had many negative feminine traits, for instance, naïve or disoriented. However, if the audiences constantly connect with the misrepresentation of females in media, the result would be detrimental for female viewers as well as male audiences (Wood, 2011). For instance, in a recent research (Gestos & Campbell, 2018), the authors found that the female characters in video games were over-sexualized, their clothes were scantily clad, and their female sexual characteristics were amplified. The result showed that long-time exposure to stereotypical female characters led male as well as female audiences to become suspicious about females' social abilities in real life. Moreover, male characters will have more acceptance of sexual harassment. In comparison, the female audience will be more self-doubted and self-objectification. Simultaneously, female audiences will easily have body anxiety and eating disorders in terms of negative physical harnesses. This research raised the discussion of whether the diverse, positive, non-stereotypical representation of female characters will increase self-esteem, well-being, and self-body image. Thus, the diverse representation of characters can also be discussed in other media format area such as television or film.

The same issue of stereotypical character representation in media also commonly exists in minority groups. Clark (1969) developed a four-stage framework for the representation of minority social groups in TV, including non-representation, ridicule, regulation, and respect. Moreover, Berry (1980) demonstrated three periods of representation of Black in TV: the stereotypical age, the new awareness, and the stabilization. In 2006, Raley and Lucus did a content analysis of the prime-time network television program from 2001 to identify the representation of LGBTQ+ characters based on the framework developed by Clark and Berry. It shows that some of the gay and lesbian characters have already surpassed the stage of non-representation and ridicule and further moved forward to the regulation or even respect stage based on the theory of Clark (1969). However, most of the gay and lesbian characters stay at the stereotypical age, according to the theory of Berry (1980). Research (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009) showed that gay characters in media have more femineity characteristics than heterosexual males and lesbians. In contrast, lesbians have more masculine attributes than heterosexual females and gays. For instance, gay character in media was portrayed as femininity with the traits of being oversensitive, disoriented, and emotional (Rothmann, 2013; Hart, 2003). This again proved the conclusion conducted by Kite and Deaux (1987) in their research. However, Blashill and Powlishta (2009) also indicated that homosexual characters have more androgynous characteristics than their heterosexual counterparts. By comparing the self-rated characteristic of the homosexual group with the heterosexual group result of stereotypical perception from the research, the homosexual group indicated that they simultaneously have masculine and femineity characteristics, which means, they perceived themselves as androgynous (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009). Therefore, the limited and cross-gender-type portrayal of gay and lesbian lead to their stereotypical representation in media (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009).

In line with the similar negative effect of stereotype representation of the female character, the exposure of stereotypical minorities representations also create a negative effect on the general audiences. The one-dimensional and stereotypical depiction of LGBTQ in traditional media limits teenagers' expectations for their future and also without opportunity for critics (Gillig & Murphy, 2016). Brown et al. (2009) also proved that homophobia is

correlated with the acceptance of negative depictions of LGBTQ stereotypes instead of positive representation.

These influences of contact with the character stereotype representation also relate to the cultivation theory. The media effect of cultivation was first introduced in the 1970s by George Gerbner. The theory assumes that media products cultivate specific beliefs in individuals: the real world is influenced by how it is portrayed on television, and the audience was unconsciously perceived it similarly (Morgan et al., 2009). Shrum (2009) mentioned that the cultivation effect could be a heuristic process, from quantity to quality, meaning that the individual retrieves the memory from the representation they frequently saw in the media. Another way of generating a cultivation effect was the message itself from media is strong enough to make individuals foster attitudes, values and beliefs. Therefore, in logic, the positive representation of gender and sexual orientation may increase the acceptance of non-stereotypical images.

In recent years, some studies showed that more and more counter-stereotypical characters were represented in media. One study discussed the latest change and improvements in female character representation in media (Sink & Mastro, 2017). They found that male characters are more objectified than female characters in recent media. Moreover, the type of occupation of female characters is increasing. Although the author indicated little change in female characters regarding the number proportion and their femineity characteristic, the slight changes are still meaningful as it shows the media tried to break the stereotypical female character representations.

The increasing representation and the positive portrayal of LGBTQ+ characters also emerged and developed. Stone (2022) mentioned that the stories in media do not merely focus on the character's sexuality has emerged in recent years. According to Żerebecki et al. (2023a), gay representation in media can be divided into two categories: gay uniqueness and gay sameness. Representation of gay uniqueness refers to the gay character challenging the socially-accepted assumption of standard behaviors from heteronormativity. Although some academic articles criticize the portrayal in media is confronting the social expectation, some characters can fight for themselves even if they are under discrimination (Avila-Saavedra, 2009; Dhaenens, 2012). Therefore, unique gay stories sometimes are portrayed in media

(Żerebecki et al., 2023a). The other representation of gay sameness means that the gay character is similar to others in society. In other words, gay characters do not differ from heterosexual characters in terms of their identities or behaviors. A study indicates that homosexuals and heterosexuals can be portrayed as the same (Vanlee et al., 2018). Several studies mentioned that the gay character in media did not highlight the difference or specialty of gay characters intentionally; instead, the media depicted them as normal people (i.e., Martin, 2015). The positive and integrated representation of minorities can help viewers to treat them the same as majorities (Żerebecki et al., 2023a). Thus, the authors (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009) also suggest that to decrease the negative attitude toward the LGBT group, instead of completely erasing the previous stereotypical portrayal, the media may create a more comprehensive image of gay and lesbian (i.e., gay has masculine characteristic and lesbian has femineity characteristic).

To summarize, the stereotypical portrayal of characters still exists in different media formats. However, multiple studies indicated that the change and development of diverse character representation for females and minorities started appearing. Moreover, biological sex is not the only predictor to define a person. Therefore, gender, as well as sexual orientation, needs to be observed from a more comprehensive angle rather than using simple masculinity or femininity to distinguish. Moreover, the cultivation theory indicates that long-time exposure to the stereotypical character in media will increase the acceptance of constrained gender roles. While the above evidence also suggested that the cultivation effect can potentially increase the acceptance of minorities and non-stereotypical representation by featuring a more positive and diverse image. In previous research, the author always has the assumption of the stereotype of characters. However, in the current research, the participants will report how they defined the character in terms of the character's gender traits. Furthermore, the research will further analyze whether the character breaks the stereotype and to what extent the audience engages with the character. In the next section, several media engagement theories will be elaborated.

2.2 Character engagement

This section will discuss the three media engagement theories, including recognizability, parasocial relationship, and character meaningfulness.

2.2.1 Recognizability and perceived similarity

The concept of perceived similarity was first developed by McCroskey et al. (1975), and it was always used to measure the level of the audience's commonality with the media. Although the concept was expanded and more prosperous later, the main dimensions of the perceived similarity were background, appearance, and attitude. The questions to define perceived similarity always focus on the demographic, naming social class, gender, sexual orientation, which in a general way of thinking the perceived similarity (Hoeken et al., 2016).

As mentioned by the authors (Cohen et al., 2018), the acceptance of a book do not have a significant difference in whether the readers are similar or dissimilar with the protagonist in terms of demographic (i.e., gender, nationality, age). This situation can also be applied to the media character. For instance, one previous study (Hall, 2022) showed no significant influence of gender similarity on audience engagement. Although the research argued that audiences have the same race as the character indicates a higher engagement rate, the most significant influence concentrated on Black/African American participants. Moreover, audiences from the majority group cannot identify themselves from the minority character in media easily due to the different appearance or situation (Żerebecki et al., 2023c). Some challenged (Webster & Campbell, 2022; Cohen & Hershman-Shitrit, 2017) that audiences compare their deeper self-perception with the media character to find the similarity. Thus, it is hard for the audience to differentiate the actual similarity. Therefore, demographic similarity may not be sufficient to assess the level of audience engagement.

In 2008, Montoya et al. did a meta-analysis to evaluate the relationship between perceived similarity and attraction. One of the data collection criteria was that the sample paper should focus on the similarity of attitudes or personality traits instead of physical attributes. The study showed that the relationship between perceived similarity and attraction is bidirectional and positively correlated. The authors also further explained that it was due to the effect of self-esteem and cognitive biases leading to attraction. The reason for generating the feeling of similarity was complex rather than simply telling from the demographic.

Therefore, the psychological process of engaging with the media character cannot clearly be explained using the perceived similarity. Moreover, Żerebecki et al. (2023b) indicated that viewers do not seek similarity in media characters. Instead, the perceived similarity helps them to build a connection and engagement with the character. Therefore, instead of similarity, the authors suggested recognizability as an alternative concept in future research on media engagement.

Recently, Żerebecki et al. (2023c) further developed the concept of recognizability, and they defined the relationship between the audience and the character as familiarity instead of similarity. For instance, it is hard for majority groups to identify themselves from the minority. However, they still can recognize some familiar aspects of minorities. The difference between minority groups and majority groups could be their appearance or life experience, which could be noticeable (Żerebecki et al., 2023c). Therefore, rather than only focusing on demographics, the authors (Żerebecki et al., 2023c) further expand the different dimensions of familiarity, including personality, experiences, and attitude. The authors (Żerebecki et al., 2023c) argued that recognizability makes it easier for participants to consider similar aspects or relationships with the character regarding their behavior, situation, and personality. The recognizability scale was already utilized to test the minority characters and their relationship with audience engagement, and it also proved that it was indeed a concept separate from other media engagement theories (i.e., perceived similarity, wishful identification). However, the scale lack of utilization on the majority characters. Therefore, the current study will further apply this scale to test the character of the majority groups.

To summarize, the perceived similarity describes the process of likeness with character in a general way which also highly relies on the specific attribute, for instance, demographic. While recognizability uses familiarity, meaning that the individuals recognize themselves in a character of some similar aspect in terms of situation, personality, and attitude. The current research aims to explores the relationship between the diversity of character portrayals and audience engagement. Therefore, two majority characters and two LGBTQ characters were included. In addition, the characters of the research material present diverse characteristics rather than traditional stereotypical representation. Thus, whether the recognizability is more

comprehensive than perceived similarity to explore audience engagement, as it contains more aspects of familiarity, can be tested by this research.

2.2.2 Parasocial relationship

In history, the character's behaviors more or less affect the audience's reaction from a phycology perspective, in which parasocial relationship is one of the reactions (Steinet al., 2022). Parasocial interaction theory was first introduced by Horton and Wohl (1956), representing an intimate relationship between the individual and the media characters. The understanding of parasocial relationships has recently developed a lot. Dibble et al. (2016) suggested that the parasocial relationship includes cognitive, affective, and conative elements. Moreover, the parasocial relationship is a long-term, one-sided intimate relationship between media users and the media characters, which always influences the audience beyond the media product itself and extends it to their real-life relationship and experience (Dibble et al., 2016). The effect of parasocial contact is similar to real-life contact, which can influence the individual's behavior or even their attitude to life (Schiappa et al., 2005). In addition, it also influences the individual's relationship in real life, for instance, friendship or romance (Tukachinsky, 2010).

Previous literature indicated that perception similar to the character is one of the most critical indicators for forming parasocial relationships (Giles, 2002). Moreover, the similarity in terms of visual and shared attitudes and social background also leads to increased parasocial relationships (Turner, 1993). In addition, Cohen and Hershman-Shitrit (2017) proposed that personality similarity is likely essential for forming a parasocial relationship. They also demonstrated that more personality similarity creates a stronger bond of parasocial relationships. A stronger parasocial relationship was shown in the more attractive characters than others (Tukachinsky et al., 2020).

Various studies proved that parasocial relationship is positively associated with liked characters. However, Rosaen and Dibble (2016) indicated that focusing only on the liked character is limited and problematic as people have different opinions and form parasocial relationships with different people. Then, they found that an individual also develops a parasocial relationship with disklike characters, although the degree is weaker than the likable

character. Thus, logically, the audience also develops parasocial relationships with majority and minority characters. For instance, research (Bond, 2019) used the television program "Folks" as stimulus material to explore the relationship between heterosexual groups and the parasocial relationship with the LGBTQ character. The result showed that the parasocial relationship increases with contact with the diverse representation of LGBTQ characters. The research also indicated that the participant could develop a parasocial relationship with an LGBTQ character regardless of the character's sexual orientation; the more important reason is that the participants can find the similarity, socially attractive, or authentic from the character (Bond, 2019).

2.2.3 Character realism

Besides the intimate relationship between the audience and the media character, the audience's perception of the film may also be influenced by the character. A previous study found that the level of popularity of media products related to engagement with the character (Kim & Sintas, 2021). In a meta-analysis (Schippa, 2007), the authors explained several motives for forming a parasocial relationship. For instance, the audiences can easily create a parasocial relationship with a character with similar values or tastes. Moreover, an individual can also form a parasocial relationship with a character who is found desirable. In addition, the level of the parasocial relationship increases with the degree of realism represented in media.

Perceived realism does not equal real-world truth (Pouliot & Cowen, 2007). However, it can be explained as "the extent to which audiences perceive these scenes as similar to real life" (Moore et al., 2023, p5). According to Pouliot and Cowen (2007), there are two dimensions of the construct of perceived realism. The first one is factual realism, which refers to whether the situation and people in the film are made up or not. For instance, the set-up or the character reflects the real world. The second dimension is psychological, which criticizes how the situation or the character in the film is similar to the audience's life.

In a study, the authors (Pouliot & Cowen, 2007) summarized that part of the audience's reaction, and their intention of the study is determined by the expectation and schemas they obtained from the previous watching experience. Audiences develop a set of conventions of

genre, belief, reality status, and people (Huston et al., 1995). Several studies indicated that the content perceived as realistic more affects the audience's cognition and reaction than the content perceived as unreal (Huesmann et al., 1983; Murray & Dacin, 1996).

The findings from Żerebecki et al. (2023b) indicated that the audience prefers the character portrayed as real and multi-faced human beings. In addition, the authors revealed that the audience has expectations to see the character change over time and grow after experiencing a hard situation. Furthermore, the audience has a strong affiliation with the character whose behaviors show that they are realistic in life and have complex personalities. As such, the current study also expects a positive relationship between perceived realism with the parasocial relationship.

2.2.4 Character meaningfulness

The motivation of people to seek entertainment activities is mainly because they want to obtain a positive affective state, which also means hedonic experience, always refers to enjoyment or pleasure (Zillmann, 1988; Schneider et al., 2016). Moreover, hedonic experience is the core of entertainment and the primary research model of entertainment experience (Schneider et al., 2016; Tamborini, 2021). However, in the past years, some researchers have extended entertainment research to the other dimension: eudaimonic, which focuses on meaningfulness and self-realization (Schneider et al., 2016; Tamborini, 2021). Oliver and Bartsch (2010) further linked the two types of positive entertainment experience: enjoyment and appreciation with hedonic gratification and eudaimonic fulfillment. Hedonic indicates subjective well-being and positive feelings, whereas eudaimonic indicates psychological well-being and emphasizes the feelings of finding truth and meaning in life and personal growth (Schneider et al., 2016; Oliver & Raney, 2011; Keyes et al., 2002).

Oliver and Bartsch developed a new scale that includes two factors: enjoyment and appreciation. They criticized that the scale they developed was not meant to separate enjoyment and appreciation as two opposite concepts (Oliver & Bartsch, 2011). However, they suggested that some entertainment shows both a high level of enjoyment and appreciation, whereas some only show a high level of enjoyment or appreciation exclusively (Oliver & Bartsch, 2011).

Some researchers (Żerebecki et al., 2023b) conduct an in-depth interview with 20 teenagers in Poland and found that viewers seek attractive characters irrespective of race or sexual orientation. The study further suggests that the viewers are more engaged with the counter-stereotypical character with complex phycology, different personality traits, and a growing process, as the viewer will have the opportunity to learn from other groups and get entertainment. Therefore, creating characters with diverse attributes will prompt the audience to choose to consume them as it fulfills the character's hedonic and eudaimonic motivations.

2.3 Hypotheses

As mentioned by Tukachinsky et al. (2020), the perceived similarity is always a predictor of other concepts of media engagement and is singled out by researchers in studies. Similarly, Żerebecki et al. (2023c) stated that the recognizability also has to be separated from other media engagement theories as it associates with a positive attitude to LGBTQ people in real life, for instance, wishful identification and parasocial relationship. Therefore, the hypothesis builds upon the assumption that the relationship between perceived similarity and recognizability should be correlated.

H1: Perceived similarity increases with a) personality, b) situational, and c) attitudinal recognizability.

As aforementioned, the perceived similarity is one of the most important predictors for forming parasocial relationships, especially the personality similarity (Giles, 2002). Moreover, audiences tend to form parasocial relationships with liked and disliked characters, though the relationship with liked characters is stronger (Rosaen & Dibble, 2016). In addition, the authors (Żerebecki et al., 2023c) demonstrated that the parasocial relationship was positively associated with recognizability. Thus, in the current research, the hypothesis was formed based on the assumption that the parasocial relationship is positively influenced by positive perceived gendered personality traits, perceived similarity, and recognizability and negatively influenced by negative perceived gendered traits.

H2: Parasocial relationship increases with a) positive masculinity, b) positive femininity, c) personality, d) situational and e) attitudinal recognizability, f) perceived similarity and decreases with g) negative masculinity and h) negative femininity.

In the current study, the paper is not aimed to evaluate whether the setting corresponds to the actual status; instead, the paper is interested in the individual opinions of the realism and similarity of the character and the film. The identification with the motivation of watching television is consistently positively correlated with the affinity of television and the reality of television content (Rubim, 1981).

H3: Character realism increases with a) positive masculinity, b) positive femininity, c) personality, d) situational and e) attitudinal recognizability, f) perceived similarity, and g) parasocial relationship and decreases with h) negative masculinity and i) negative femininity.

Moore et al. (2023) found that perceived realism positively correlated with romantic endorsement. The study also indicated that perceived realism mediates the media content and the degree of engagement (Moore et al., 2023). Moreover, the audience indicated that they prefer the character with complex and realistic characteristics as they can learn and get entertained by it (Żerebecki et al., 2023b). Thus, in this research, the author hypothesizes that:

H4: Character enjoyment increases with a) positive masculinity, b) positive femininity, c) personality, d) situational and e) attitudinal recognizability, f) perceived similarity, g) parasocial relationship, and h) character realism and decreases with i) negative masculinity and j) negative femininity.

H5: Character appreciation increases with a) positive masculinity, b) positive femininity, c) personality, d) situational and e) attitudinal recognizability, f) perceived similarity, g) parasocial relationship, and h) character realism and decreases with i) negative masculinity and j) negative femininity.

Chapter 3. Method

3.1 Method justification

The research aimed to determine whether significant relationships existed between the diversity of character portrayal and audience engagement, which included perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship, character realism, and character meaningfulness. Moreover, the research topic is an exploratory topic. It is clear that the researchers tried to measure the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variables. Thus, according to Babbie (2016), the method of quantitative research was appropriate for the current research. In addition, the quantitative method helped to test the given hypotheses.

Firstly, the survey was selected as the approach for the data collection. A survey is a good approach for measuring an individual's attitude and orientation in a large population in a short period (Babbie, 2016). In addition, the survey design helps describe the general characteristic of a large population (Babbie, 2016). The current research aimed to explore the individual's opinion of how they perceive and engage with the diverse character portrayal. The perceived gendered personality traits or the recognizability can be categorized as the individual's attitude. Thus, constructing a standard survey could help the researcher to collect data in the same form (Babbie, 2016).

Secondly, in this research, the online survey platform Qualtrics was particularly used as the tool for collecting data. The method of online survey also helped to reach specific communities (Babbie, 2016). Moreover, the online environment also creates a comfortable place for the respondents to respond. For instance, in this research, the LGBTQ community or the Marvel fan group might help increase the questionnaire's finish rate and reliability.

Thirdly, the survey is a flexible way of collecting data and analyzing data (Babbie, 2016). The design of the survey allows the flexibility of asking questions and also provides the space to consider how to analyze the data. In addition to that, as the method of the survey demonstrates all items in a standard way, therefore, the survey is strong in reliability (Babbie, 2016). It reduces the bias of the observation from researchers (Babbie, 2016).

3.2 Research design

The data was collected from the online survey with an experimental design. Before starting the survey, the participants were informed about the research topic, which aimed to determine the relationship between character perception and character engagement. Then, the participants informed the consent information, which the data would be protected strictly and only used for academic purposes. Moreover, the data would be collected anonymously and voluntarily. Then the participants were informed of the survey duration time.

The questionnaire was designed into three parts. In the first part, the participants were asked to answer general information about Thor film consumption. Only participants who watched this film could continue this survey. In the second part, participants were shown one picture of the four main characters from the film, also with a short description of the character to aim the participants to recall the content of the film. Which character participants engaged with was randomly assigned. The participants were asked to answer their perceptions of the character's gendered personality traits. In the third part, the research assessed the participants' relationship with the film characters, which included the respondent's recognizability and the similarity of the presented character, parasocial relationship, the character's meaningfulness, and the realism of the characters. Followed by the questions to collect the participant's demographic.

Thus, the questionnaire was followed in the order of a) introduction, b) consent information, c) general information on film consumption, d) character perceptions and e) character engagement. In total, the survey took approximately 8 to 10 minutes.

Before distributing the survey to the public, the author invited ten people to go through the survey to make sure the survey flow was working correctly and the content was understandable. The survey was also adjusted by the feedback. The language of the survey contained English and Chinese. The English version was the main and original version to reach the international audience, especially in the Western country. The Chinese version was a source to help people who cannot understand English in Chinese communities.

SPSS was the selected tool to analyze the data further and generate the results. The data proceeded further in SPSS, including cleaning data, factor analysis, and reliability test as the data preparation for the following analysis. Several one-way ANOVA and hierarchy

regression analyses were conducted to define the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables.

3.3 Stimulus material

The film Thor: Love and Thunder (Waititi, 2022) was one of the successful films representing the progression of diversity in the MCU, especially the portrayal of characters (Bernath, 2022). The appearance of Mighty Thor, a female character who can lift Thor's Mjolnir, even forced Thor to become the subordinate role in the fighting scene (Child, 2022). The lesbian character King Valkyrie and the gay character Korg represented the minority communities. Therefore, the four protagonists in this film were suitable to use as stimulus material in this research.

The characters can represent the different diversity of character portrayals. The type of diversity includes gender and sexual orientation. Moreover, some of the characters also break the traditional stereotype representation. Thor is a male superhero and is portrayed as powerful, justice, and sometimes arrogant. In this film, Thor is experiencing his way of finding the true himself after the Battle of the Earth. He showed a decadent and vulnerable side which was in contrast with the usual him. In contrast, Mighty Thor is a female superhero and is portrayed as brave and intelligent but sometimes power-hungry. Mighty Thor was a scientist before, named Jane Foster. She was currently fighting with her cancer. She thought Mjolnir might cure her cancer, and then she became the Mighty Thor. Moreover, King Valkyrie is a female who is logical and decisive. She was entrusted by Thor to become the king of New Asgard and promised Thor that New Asgard would change. Under her governance, the New Asghard was continually changing positively. She also showed her affiliation with women in the film, representing a lesbian character. In addition, Korg is a male superhero who is tender, passionate, and sensitive. He can also represent as a minority/LGBTQ+ character since his homosexual identity was portrayed explicitly in the film.

3.4 Sampling

The unit of analysis in this research was people aged 18 or above. The age limit help to avoid any ethical issue regarding juvenile participants. The only strict criterion for the participants was that the respondent must have watched the film Thor: Love and Thunder before. Participants need to recall the film's character and plot to finish the survey with good quality. No further limitation on the demographic background.

The research used purposive sampling and snowball sampling methods. Firstly, the researcher distributed the survey on different social media channels, for instance, Facebook, Instagram, and Weixin. Moreover, the survey was published on the online discussion website, for example, Reddit, targeting the LGBTQ community to add diversity to the respondents, Marvel and superhero fan groups to get opinions from the fan communities, as well as movie fan groups to get responses from the general audience. In addition, the researcher shared the survey with friends who fulfill the sample criteria to finish the survey and asked them to distribute it to more participants who watched the film.

3.5 Sample

A total number of 264 participants finished the survey. After cleaning data, 25 outlier responses were deleted from the analysis as the response was missing more than two values in one scale or chose the same options for the whole survey. Thus, 239 validated responses were included in the research. Regarding the gender of the respondents, 45.6% of respondents were male, 46.0% of respondents were female, 5.4% of respondents disclosed as non-binary/third gender, followed by other (0.4%) and prefer not to say (2.5%). In terms of LGBTQ identification, 31.1% of respondents identified themselves as LGBTQ person, 56.7% of respondents were non-LGBTQ persons, and 12.2% of respondents preferred not to say. Regarding nationality, most of the respondents ($N = 90$) were from China, with a percentage of 37.7%. Followed by the participants ($N = 74$) from the United States of America (25.5%) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (5.4%). Moreover, most of the respondents ($N = 111$) indicated that the highest education level they have completed was a bachelor's degree, with a percentage of 46.4%. Followed by the master's degree (25.5%) and college without a degree (17.6%). In addition, the average age of the respondents was 29.13 years, with the oldest respondent being 60 and the youngest respondent being 18.

3.6 Measurements

Perceived gendered personality traits The scale was adapted from Berger and Krahé (2013) and 24 items were included in the four subscales. The participants were asked to answer their perceptions of the character's personality (e.g., I perceived that [character name] is empathic). The 7-point Likert scale was used to answer the questions (e.g., *1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree*).

Recognizability. The Minority Character Recognizability Scale (MSR) developed by Żerebecki et al. (2023c) was used to assess the recognizability in this research. The participants were asked whether they recognized the characters as themselves. Three subscales with 20 items of the questionnaire were included. The example questions are "I recognize the strengths of [character name] as strengths that I have", "I recognize my life in the life of [character name]", and "I recognize the decisions of [character name] as decisions that I could make" to assess personality, situational, and attitudinal recognizability separately. The answer to the questions was based on the 7-point Likert scale (e.g, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).

Perceived similarity. The concept was measured with a five-item scale and was adapted from McCroskey et al. (2006). The 7-point Likert scale was used to answer questions (e.g, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). An example item included "This person behaves like me". (Cronbach's α = .90)

Parasocial relationship. The scale was taken from Hall (2019) and 12 items were included in this questionnaire. Hall (2019) adapted these items from previous research (Barriga, 2011; Rubin et al., 1985; Hartmann et al., 2008). The participants were asked to answer how they evaluate their relationship with the characters they see in stimulus materials (e.g., If this character appeared in a new movie, I would watch it). The 7-point Likert scale was used as the answer to questions (e.g., *1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree*).

Character realism. The scale contains 5 items which was adapted from a study by Rubin (1981). The original scale was designed to measure the realism of TV content. The participants were asked to answer their perceptions of whether the character exists in real life (e.g., the character presents things as they really are in life). The 7-point Likert scale will be

used to answer the questions (e.g., *1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree*). Two items were reverse coded as the preparation for the further analysis.

Character meaningfulness. The participants were asked to answer how they enjoyed and inspired by the character in stimulus material. The scale was originally from Meier and Neubaum (2019), who combined and improved two scales from Oliver & Bartsch (2010) and Krakowiak & Tsay (2011). The researcher adapted the scale, and 10 items were included in this scale to assess the influence of characters on the film, (e.g., I found it was fun for me to watch this character; I think it's good that the character encourages me to think). The 7-point Likert scale was used to answer the questions (e.g., *1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree*).

Demographics. The participants were asked to answer their age, identified gender (male, female, non-binary/third gender, or prefer not to say), LGBTQ identification (yes, no, prefer not to say), nationality and education level.

Film consuming. The questionnaire also assessed participants' exposure to Thor: Love and Thunder. The participants were asked to answer whether they watched the film before.

3.7 Reliability of measurements

During the data preparation process, factor analyses and reliability tests were conducted on the measurements. The factor analyses help to ensure and verify the internal consistency of the items in the subscales and the suitability of the measurements in this research. The results are reported below:

Perceived gendered personality traits. The 24-item questionnaire was all 7-point Likert scale based. The factor analysis using the Extraction method of Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation with a fixed number of factors (= 4.00) was conducted, KMO = .85, $\chi2$ ($N = 239, 276$) = 2766.78, $p < .001$. The resultant model explained 61.6% of the variance in gender identity. The factor analysis, together with the reliability test result, is presented in Table 1. The factor labels were based on the original scale from Berger and Krahé (2013):

Negative masculinity. This factor contained 6 items, accounting for 16.4% of the variance after rotation. The factor is about the disadvantage of masculinity, such as arrogant, inconsiderate and power-hungry.

Positive masculinity. It includes 6 items (i.e., analytical, logical and objective) about the positive attribute of masculinity. This factor explained 15.8% of the total variance.

Negative femininity. This factor contained 6 items, accounting for 15.6% of the variance after rotation. The factor is about the weakness of femininity, including oversensitive, overcautious and self-doubting.

Positive femininity. This factor contained 6 items (i.e., loving, tender, empathic) and explained 13.7% of the total variance. The factor is about the advantage of femininity.

Table 1

Factor and reliability analysis of scales for 'Perceived gendered personality traits' (N = 239)

Items	Negative masculinity	Positive masculinity	Negative femininity	Positive femininity
Arrogant	.85			
Boastful	.76	(-.31)		
Ostentatious	.73			
Power-hungry	.67			(-.36)
Harsh	.68			(-.35)
Inconsiderate	.66			(-.39)
Logical		.82		
Analytical		.80		
Rational		.79		
Objective		.71		
Practical		.70		
Solution-focused		.63		(.39)
Oversensitive			.82	
Disoriented			.73	
Overcautious			.70	
Self-doubting			.70	
Anxious			.68	
Naïve			.67	
Loving	(-.36)			.81
Passionate				.80
Empathic	(-.43)			.64
Emotional			(.32)	.59
Sensitive	(-.35)		(.40)	.56
Tender	(-.44)		(.36)	.49
R^2	0.24	.18	.13	.07
Cronbach's α	.86	.85	.84	.85

Recognizability. The factor analysis was conducted on the 20 items questionnaire. The answer to the questions was based on the 7-point Likert scale. The factor analysis used the method of Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation based on the fixed number of factors (= 3.00), KMO = .93, χ2 (N = 239, 190) = 3089.78, p < .001. The resultant model explained 65.4% of total variance of recognizability. The factor analysis combined with the reliability test is presented in Table 2. The factor was labeled based on the original scale according to Żerebecki et al. (2023c):

Situational recognizability. The factor contained 7 items and accounted for 24.1% of the variance after rotation. The factor is about recognizing oneself in the character's situation, life experiences, and past experiences.

Attitudinal recognizability. There were 8 items combined into this factor about recognizing oneself in the opinion, problem solutions and decisions of the characters. For instance, The factor explained 22.4% of the total variance.

Personality recognizability. It contained 5 items (i.e., "I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have) and accounted for 18.9% of the total variance. The factor is about recognizing oneself in character's personality, strengths, weakness.

Table 2

Factor and reliability analysis of scales for 'Recognizability' (N = 239)

Items	Situational recognizability	Attitudinal recognizability	Personality recognizability
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me.	.81		
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences.	.79		
I recognize the problems that this character has as the problems that I could have.	.77		
I recognize my life in the life of this character	.76		(.36)
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in	.75		
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me	.69	(.36)	
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life.	.62	(.37)	
I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have.		.80	
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have.		.73	(.32)
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have.		.72	
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make.	(.35)	.71	
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow	(.38)	.69	
I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have		.67	
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have.		.63	(.36)
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have	(.37)	.45	(.43)
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have	(.30)		.81
I recognize myself in this character			.79
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have			.76
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have			.75
I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show.	(.32)	(.39)	.59
R^2	.49	.10	.07
Cronbach's α	.91	.90	.89

Perceived similarity. The items were picked from the original scale based on McCroskey et al. (2006), and a confirmative factor analysis was executed. The questions were based on the 7-point Likert scale and were entered into the factor analysis using the method of Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation based on the fixed number of factors (= 1.00), *KMO* = .81, χ2 (*N* = 239, 10) = 791.32, *p* < .001. All 5 items were loaded into one factor. The factor explained 71.1% of the total variance. An example of the question is [character name] treats people like I do. The factor analysis and reliability test results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Factor and reliability analysis of scales for 'Perceived similarity' (N = 239)

Items	Similarity
I think this character is like me	.87
This character has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine	.85
This character behaves like me	.85
This character shares my values	.84
This character treats people like I do	.81
R^2	.71
Cronbach's α	.90

Parasocial relationship. Although the scale was used and tested in the study (Hall (2019), factor analysis was conducted on the 12 items questionnaire to ensure consistency. The answer to the question was based on the 7-point Likert scale. The factor analysis used the method of Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation based on the fixed number of factors (= 1.00), KMO = .94, $\chi2$ (N = 239, 66) = 2298.52, p < .001. The resultant model explained 62.7% of the total variance. The factor analysis and reliability test result were showed in Table 4.

Table 4

Factor and reliability analysis of scales for 'Parasocial relationship' (N = 239)

Items	Parasocial relationship
I am interested in this character	.90
I find this character fascinating	.89
This character is engaging to watch	.89
I would like to know more about this character	.88
I would miss character if he or she did not appear in future movies	.85
If this character appeared in a new movie, I would watch it	.82
I have looked forward to watching this character in new movies	.81
If I saw a story about this character in a magazine or online, I would read it	.77
I would like to meet this character in person	.70
I feel sorry for this character when they make a mistake	.70
This character seems to understand things that I want to know	.68
I feel I know this character very well	.55
R^2	.63
Cronbach's α	.94

Character realism. To aid the further analysis, two items in this scale were reverse coded. The 5 items of character realism variable based on the 7-point Likert scale were conducted with the method of Principle Components Analysis with Varimax rotation based on the fixed number of factors (= 1.00), $KMO = .71$, $\chi 2$ ($N = 239$, 10) = 299.98, $p < .001$. The resultant model explained 48.2% of total character realism. However, one reversed item, "The character does not show life as it really is," did not load into the factor. Therefore, the item was deleted in the further analysis. The reliability test was conducted, and Cronabch's α was merely .35. However, if the reversed item "If I see the character in the film, I can't be sure he/she really is that way" was deleted, Cronabch's α will raise to .79. To ensure the high quality of internal consistency and reliability, the item was deleted. Thus, three items were maintained in the scale to measure the character's realism. The factor analysis and reliability test results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Factor and reliability analysis of scales for 'Character realism' (N = 239)

Items	Character realism
The character presents things as they really are in life	.79
The character lets me really see how other people live	.87
The character let me see what happens in other place as if I were really there	.80
R^2	.48
Cronbach's α	.79

Character meaningfulness. The original scale was designed to evaluate the enjoyment and appreciation of the film, and the items were loaded into two factors. In this research, the author adapted this scale to test the meaningfulness of the character. All questions were based on a 7-point Likert scale. To ensure the internal consistency of the adapted items, a factor analysis was conducted. The factor analysis using the method of Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation based on the fixed number of factors (= 2.00), $KMO = .90$, $\chi 2$

($N = 239, 45$) $= 2342.32$, $p < .001$. The resultant model explained the 77.59% of total variance after rotation. The factor analysis and reliability test are shown in Table 6. The factor was labeled based on the original scale.

Character enjoyment. The factor contained 5 items and accounted for 44.8% of the total variance. The factor is about the fun and entertainment of the character.

Character appreciation. It contained 5 items, for instance. The factor explained 34.9% of the total variance. The factor is about the character leading the audience into deep understanding.

Table 6

Factor and reliability analysis of scales for 'Character meaningfulness' (N = 239)

Items	Character enjoyment	Character appreciation
It was fun for me to watch this character	.90	
I had a good time watching this character	.90	
The character was entertaining	.85	
It made me happy to watch the character	.84	(.35)
I felt good watching the character	.78	(.45)
I like the character because the character enriches my way of thinking		.91
I think it's good that the character encourages me to think		.85
The character was thought-provoking.	(.33)	.74
I found this character to be very meaningful	(.56)	.67
I was moved by this character	(.57)	.65
R^2	.67	.13
Cronbach's α	.95	.91

Chapter 4. Results

Before testing the hypothetical relationships between the character portrayals and the character engagement, two pretests were conducted to explore the difference in gender identity and recognizability in different characters. Followed by the pretest, several hierarchy regressions were applied to test the hypotheses.

4.1 Stimulus material check concerning perceived gendered personality traits of characters

Four one-way ANOVA were conducted to explore whether there was a significant difference in terms of the perceived gender identity from participants among different characters. The character as the IV and the different gender identity as the DV. When the positive masculinity as the DV, the result showed that there were significant differences between the four different characters, $F(3, 235) = 12.90$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta2 = .14$. Turkey post-hoc comparisons revealed that the participants perceived that Mighty Thor's positive masculinity score ($M = 5.09$, $SD = 1.13$) was significantly higher than Thor ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.88$), $p < .001$, and Korg ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 1.08$), $p < .001$. Moreover, Valkyrie ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.23$) was significantly higher that Thor ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.88$) $p = .010$ and Korg ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.88$), $p < .001$. In terms of negative masculinity as the DV, the result also showed that there were significant differences between the characters, $F(3, 235) = 7.49$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta2 = .09$. The Turkey pos-hoc indicated that Thor's negative masculinity characteristic ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 1.04$) was significantly higher than Mighty Thor ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.31$), $p < .001$ and Korg ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.65$), $p = .007$. While the positive femininity as the DV, the result showed that there were significant differences between characters as well, $F(3, 235) = 6.04$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta2 = .07$. Turkey post-hoc showed that Thor ($M = 5.02$, $SD = 0.97$) has the highest score on positive femininity. In contrast, Valkyrie ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.96$) has the lowest score on it. Valkyrie was significantly lower than Thor ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.96$), $p = .001$, Mighty Thor ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 0.99$), $p = .003$, and Korg ($M = 4.83$, $SD = 1.32$), $p = .034$. Lastly, when the negative femininity as the DV, the result still showed a significant difference between characters, $F(3, 235) = 11.42$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta2 = .10$. Korg ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.05$) has the highest score of negative femininity whereas Valkyrie ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.14$) has the lowest. In terms of the result of the Turkey post hoc,

Valkyrie (M = 2.71, SD = 1.14) was significantly lower than Korg (M = 3.66, SD = 1.05), p < .001 and Thor (M = 3.62, SD = 1.16), p < .001.

4.2 Difference of recognizability among different characters

Three one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore whether were significant differences between characters in terms of recognizability, naming personality recognizability, situational recognizability, and attitudinal recognizability. The character as the IV and the recognizability as DV. When personality recognizability as DV, the result showed no significant differences in personality recognizability in four characters. Participants recognized their personality in Mighty Thor (M = 3.88, SD = 1.23) higher than the other three characters, but the difference was not significant. In terms of situational recognizability, the result revealed that there were significant differences between characters, F (3, 235) = 3.34, p = .020, partial η2 = .04. The pos-hoc comparisons showed that participants recognize their situation in Mighty Thor (M = 3.83, SD = 1.28) more than Korg (M = 3.11, SD = 1.23), p = .020. Other comparisons did not reach significantly. For attitudinal recognizability, the result did not reach significant. Therefore, there were no significant differences in attitudinal recognizability between characters.

4.3 Impact of recognizability on perceived similarity

Before the hypothetical test, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to reveal the differences in how participants perceived the similarity of themselves with the characters. Although the result indicated that the participants found more similarity in Mighty Thor (M = 4.04, SD = 1.30) than the other three characters, there was no significant difference in perceived similarity found in different characters. Therefore, a multiple regression was conducted to analyze all cases. The perceived similarity is the dependent variable, and the personality, situational and attitudinal recognizability as the predictors to test H1. The model was found to be significant, F (3, 235) = 285.18, p < .001, R^2 = .79. Personality recognizability (β = .32, p < .001) as well as attitudinal recognizability (β = .61, p < .001), as a predictor were found significant. Whereas situational recognizability did not reach significance. Thus, H1a and H1c has to be accepted, while H1b has to be rejected.

4.4 Impact of perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity on parasocial relationship

In order to make sure whether further analysis needs to be discussed in different characters, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the difference in parasocial relationships between different characters. The result showed that there were significant differences between characters, $F(3, 235) = 3.88$, $p = .010$, partial $\eta2 = .05$. Moreover, the Turkey post-hoc revealed that the participants built a parasocial relationship with Thor ($M = 5.05$, $SD = 1.16$), $p = .008$ and Valkyrie ($M = 4.92$, $SD = 1.16$), $p = .042$ was significantly higher than Korg ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.13$).

To test H2, a hierarchy regression was conducted with parasocial relationships as a criterion. The perceived gendered personality traits of positive masculinity, negative masculinity, positive femininity, and negative femininity were entered in the first block, and personality, situational and attitudinal recognizability were added in the second block. Also, the perceived similarity was added in the third block. When perceived gendered personality traits were used as a single predictor, the model reached significance, $F(4, 234) = 29.63$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were positive predictors, while negative femininity was a negative predictor of building parasocial relationships. However, adding personality, situational and attitudinal recognizability significantly improved the model, $F_{change}(3, 231) = 17.12$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity remained as positive predictors, and negative femininity remained as a negative predictor of parasocial relationships. Moreover, personality recognizability and attitudinal recognizability were positive predictors. In the third model, perceived similarity did not improve the model, and the result did not reach significance. Positive masculinity (H2a), positive femininity (H2b), and attitudinal recognizability (H2e) remained as significant positive predictors, and negative femininity (H2h) remained as a significant negative predictor of parasocial relationship. Thus, H2a, H2b, H2e and H2h were accepted, while H2c, H2d, H2f, H2g were rejected.

Table 7

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R^2 for perceived gendered personality traits,

recognizability and perceived similarity as predictors for parasocial relationships (all case)

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Positive masculinity	.43***	.21**	.21**
Negative masculinity	.02	.04	.05
Positive femininity	.33***	.20**	.19**
Negative femininity	-.13*	-.16**	-.16**
Personality recognizability		.15*	.10
Situational recognizability		.04	.02
Attitudinal recognizability		.31***	.21*
Perceived similarity			.18
	$R^2 = .34$	$\Delta R^2 = .12$	$\Delta R^2 = .01$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .102$

Note. $*p < .050$, $** p < .010$, $*** p < .001$

As mentioned before, there were significant differences in parasocial relationships among different characters. Therefore, the same hierarchy regression analysis was conducted again but split cases based on the characters.

In terms of Thor, when perceived gendered personality traits was the single predictor, the model reached significance, $F (4, 57) = 8.48$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity are shown as positive predictors, while negative masculinity and negative femininity as negative predictors. However, adding three types of recognizability significantly improved the predictive value of the model significantly, $F_{change} (3, 54) = 3.27$. The negative masculinity remained as the negative predictor, and the attitudinal recognizability as the positive predictor for building parasocial relationships for Thor. In the third model, adding perceived similarity in the third block did not improve the model, $F_{change} (1, 53) = 3.84$. The situational recognizability was found to be a positive predictor for building parasocial relationships, whereas other predictors were insignificant.

As for Mighty Thor, when perceived gendered traits was the single predictor, the model reaches significance, $F (4, 59) = 10.29$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were the positive predictors. However, adding recognizability in the second block significantly improved the model, $F_{change} (3, 56) = 4.74$. Positive masculinity remained as the positive

predictor and no other significant predictors. In the third model, the perceived similarity was added in the third block, but no improvement of the model, F_{change} (1, 55) = 2.45. The positive masculinity remained as the positive predictor, and the situational recognizability became the positive predictor as well for building a parasocial relationship with Mighty Thor.

Also, a significant result was found when perceived gendered personality traits was the single predictor for building a parasocial relationship with Valkyrie, F (4, 55) = 9.34. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were positive predictors. Recognizability added in the second block significantly improved the model, F_{change} (3, 52) = 9.89. Positive masculinity remained the positive predictor, and negative femininity became the negative predictor. Personality recognizability and attitudinal recognizability were positive predictors as well. In the third model, F_{change} (1, 51) = .35. The positive femininity and the personality recognizability remained positive predictors, and negative femininity remained the negative predictor.

Lastly, as for Korg, when perceived gendered personality traits was a single predictor, the model reached significance, F (4, 48) = 9.28. Positive masculinity was the positive predictor of creating parasocial relationships. Adding recognizability in the second block improved the model, F_{change} (3, 45) = 4.50. Positive masculinity remained the positive predictor, and attitudinal recognizability also became the positive recognizability. Added the perceived similarity in the last block did not improve the model, F_{change} (1, 44) = .56. However, positive masculinity still remained a positive predictor of building a parasocial relationship with Korg.

Table 8

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R² for perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability and perceived similarity as predictors for parasocial relationships (compare groups based on characters)

	Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Thor	Positive masculinity	.26*	.10	.07
	Negative masculinity	-.25*	-.24*	-.19
	Positive femininity	.38**	.18	.14
	Negative femininity	-.23*	-.17	-.13
	Personality recognizability		.15	.06
	Situational recognizability		-.25	-.32*
	Attitudinal recognizability		.44**	.22
	Perceived similarity			.43
		$R^2 = .37$	$\Delta R^2 = .10$	$\Delta R^2 = .04$
		$p < .001$	$p = .028$	$p = .055$
Mighty Thor	Positive masculinity	.48***	.28*	.28*
	Negative masculinity	.02	-.05	-.09
	Positive femininity	.32*	.17	.16
	Negative femininity	.02	-.03	.01
	Personality recognizability		.05	-.11
	Situational recognizability		.28	.30*
	Attitudinal recognizability		.14	-.07
	Perceived similarity			.36
		$R^2 = .41$	$\Delta R^2 = .12$	$\Delta R^2 = .02$
		$p < .001$	$p = .005$	$p = .123$
Valkyrie	Positive masculinity	.57***	.32**	.32**
	Negative masculinity	-.10	-.01	.02
	Positive femininity	-.02	-.09	-.09
	Negative femininity	-.16	-.23*	-.25*
	Personality recognizability		.34*	.31*
	Situational recognizability		.06	.06
	Attitudinal recognizability		.25*	.19
	Perceived similarity			.11
		$R^2 = .40$	$\Delta R^2 = .22$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$
		$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .555$
Korg	Positive masculinity	.52***	.29*	.30*
	Negative masculinity	.06	-.01	-.02
	Positive femininity	.43**	.26	.23
	Negative femininity	-.08	-.14	-.16
	Personality recognizability		.03	-.03
	Situational recognizability		.07	.06
	Attitudinal recognizability		.39*	.27
	Perceived similarity			.20
		$R^2 = .44$	$\Delta R^2 = .13$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$
		$p < .001$	$p = .008$	$p = .459$

Note. *$p < .050$, ** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$

4.5 Impact of perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationships on character realism

A one-way ANOVA was conducted with character realism as the dependent variable and character as independent variables to explore the difference between different characters, which also helped to prepare to get an overview before test H7. The result showed that there were no significant differences between different characters, $F(3, 235) = 2.23$, $p = .086$, partial $\eta2 = .03$. Although the participants perceived that the Mighty Thor ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.20$) was more realism than the other three characters, the difference was not significant. Thus, a hierarchy regression analysis was conducted by considering all cases based on characters. The perceived gendered personality traits were added in the first block, and three types of recognizability were added in the second block. The perceived similarity was entered in the third block, and parasocial relationships was entered in the fourth block. When perceived gendered personality traits as the single predictor, the model reached significant, $F(4, 234) = 19.87$. Positive masculinity and negative femininity were positive predictors. Adding recognizability in the second block improved the model, $F_{change}(3, 231) = 32.45$. The positive masculinity and negative femininity remained as positive predictors. Moreover, situational and attitudinal recognizability as positive predictors makes participants feel the character was realistic. In addition, adding perceived similarity in the third block also improved the model, $F_{change}(1, 230) = 4.97$. Positive masculinity, negative femininity and situational recognizability remained as significant positive predictors. However, the attitudinal recognizability changed to insignificant predictors, and perceived similarity became the significant positive predictor to create character realism. In the fourth model, parasocial relationship were found to be a significant positive predictor to make participants feel the realism of characters, $F_{change}(1, 229) = 12.15$. Moreover, the positive masculinity and negative femininity and situational recognizability still remained as significant positive predictors. Therefore, H3a, H3d, H3g were accepted, while H3b, H3c, H3e, and H3f has to be reject.

Table 9

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R^2 for perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, and parasocial relationships as predictors for character realism

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Positive masculinity	.47***	.24***	.24***	.19**
Negative masculinity	.07	.04	.06	.05
Positive femininity	.07	-.06	-.07	-.12
Negative femininity	.19**	.12*	.12*	.15**
Personality recognizability		-.01	-.07	-.10
Situational recognizability		.40***	.39***	.38***
Attitudinal recognizability		.21**	.07	.03
Perceived similarity			.23*	.19
Parasocial relationships				.22**
	$R^2 = .25$	$\Delta R^2 = .22$	$\Delta R^2 = .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .03$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .027$	$p = .001$

Note. *$p < .050$, ** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$

4.6 Impact of perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship and character realism on character enjoyment

Firstly, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to find the significant differences of character enjoyment between different characters. The result reached significant, $F (3, 235) = 3.27$, $p = .022$, partial $\eta2 = .02$. Thus, there were significant differences in character enjoyment between different characters. The Turkey post-hoc comparison revealed that Thor ($M = 5.45$, $SD = 1.19$) has the highest character enjoyment and was significantly higher than Korg ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.35$). However, no other significant differences between characters were found. Then, a hierarchy regression analysis was conducted by considering all cases to test H4. When perceived gendered personality traits was the single predictor, the model reached significance, $F (4, 234) = 23.99$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were found as significant positive predictors. While negative femininity was a significant negative predictor. Added recognizability in the second block improved the model, $F_{change} (3, 231) = 10.49$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity remained significant positive predictors, and negative femininity remained significant negative predictor. Moreover, Attitudinal

recognizability became a significant positive predictor. However, when added perceived similarity in the third block, the model did not reach significance, F_{change} (1, 230) < .01. There is no change in the significant predictors to create character enjoyment. In the fourth block, the parasocial relationship was entered and the model improved, F_{change} (1, 229) = 443.06. All perceived gendered personality traits were insignificant predictor, whereas attitudinal recognizability and the parasocial relationship became the significant positive predictor. The perceived similarity was found to be a significant negative predictor. The character realism was entered in the fifth block, and the model did not reach significance, F_{change} (1, 228) = .56. Therefore, the attitudinal recognizability and parasocial relationship remained significant positive predictors of forming character enjoyment, and perceived similarity remained a significant negative predictor. Thus H4e, H4g has to be accepted, while H4a, H4b, H4c, H4d, H4f, H4h, H4i and H4j has to be rejected.

Table 10

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R^2 for perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationships and character realism as predictors for character enjoyment

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Positive masculinity	.34***	.15*	.15*	-.03	-.02
Negative masculinity	-.02	<.01	<.01	-.04	-.04
Positive femininity	.35***	.24***	.24***	.08	.07
Negative femininity	-.15*	-.16**	-.16**	-.02	-.02
Personality recognizability		.10	.10	.01	.01
Situational recognizability		-.03	-.03	-.05	-.04
Attitudinal recognizability		.32***	.32**	.14*	.14*
Perceived similarity			.01	-.15*	-.14*
Parasocial relationships				.88***	.88***
Character realism					-.03
	$R^2 = .29$	$\Delta R^2 = .09$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .41$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .961$	$p < .001$	$p = .457$

Note. *$p < .050$, ** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$

As mentioned above, there were significant differences of character enjoyment between different characters, therefore, a same hierarchy regression analysis was conducted but with split data to compare different groups based on characters.

For the character Thor, when perceived gendered personality traits as the simple predictors, the model reached significance, $F(4, 57) = 7.53$. positive femininity was a significant positive predictor, while negative femininity was a negative predictor. When added recognizability in the second block, the model was insignificant, $F_{change}(3, 54) = 2.19$. Positive femininity and negative femininity remained positive and negative predictors, respectively. Moreover, attitudinal recognizability was found to be the positive predictor of forming character enjoyment. In the third model, the perceived similarity was included and improved the model, $F_{change}(1, 53) = 5.04$. Positive femininity was found to remain a significant positive predictor. In terms of recognizability, situation recognizability was found to be a significant negative predictor, and attitudinal changed to an insignificant predictor. In addition, the perceived similarity was the significant positive predictor for the participants to form enjoyment with Thor. In the fourth model, the parasocial relationships was entered and significantly improved the model, $F_{change}(1, 52) = 70.76$. Positive femininity remained a significant positive predictor, and forming parasocial relationships with Thor was also found to be a significant positive predictor for creating enjoyment with Thor. No other predictors were found significant. In the last model, the character realism was entered and did not reach significance, $F_{change}(1, 51) = 2.14$. Therefore, only positive femininity and the parasocial relationship remained significant positive predictors for generating character enjoyment with Thor.

In terms of Mighty Thor, when perceived gendered personality traits as the single predictors, the model reached significant, $F(4, 59) = 14.23$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were found to be significant positive predictors. When added recognizability in the second block, the model was improved, $F_{change}(3, 56) = 5.34$. positive masculinity and positive femininity remained positive predictors. Also, attitudinal was found to be a significant positive predictor. The perceived similarity was entered in the third block and did not improve the model, $F_{change}(1, 55) = .03$. Only positive masculinity and positive femininity remained significant positive predictors. No other predictors showed significance. In the

fourth model, the parasocial relationship was found to be a significant positive predictor, and the predictive value of the model improved significantly F_{change} (1, 54) = 90.26. Attitudinal recognizability was found to be another positive predictor as well. In the fifth model, character realism was included and did not improve the model, F_{change} (1, 53) = .41. Therefore, only parasocial relationship and attitudinal recognizability remained significant positive predictors of forming enjoyment with Mighty Thor, and other predictors were insignificant.

As for Valkyrie, when perceiving gendered traits as a single predictor, the model reached significance, F (4, 55) = 7.55. Positive masculinity was the significant positive predictor. By adding recognizability in the second block, the model was improved, F_{change} (3, 52) = 4.25. Positive masculinity remained a significant positive predictor. Personality recognizability also became a significant positive predictor. When entered perceived similarity in the model, the model did not reach significance, F_{change} (1, 51) = 0.04. Therefore, only positive masculinity and personality recognizability remained significant positive predictors, and no other significant predictors. When the parasocial relationship was added to the model as a predictor, the model improved, F_{change} (1, 50) =.155.94 Therefore, the parasocial relationship was a significant positive predictor for generating enjoyment of Valkyrie, and no other significant predictors were found. In the last model, the character realism was added, but it did not improve the model, F_{change} (1, 49) = .01. Only the parasocial relationship remained a significant positive predictor; other predictors were insignificant.

In terms of Korg, the model reached significance when perceived gendered traits as the single predictor, F (4, 48) = 5.15. Positive masculinity was the significant positive predictor. By adding recognizability, the model improved, F_{change} (3, 45) = 3.46. Attitudinal recognizability was a significant positive predictor. The perceived similarity was entered in the third block; the model did not improve, F_{change} (1, 44) = .04. Also, all predictors showed as insignificant. In the fourth model, the parasocial relationship was included in the analysis and improved the model, F_{change} (1, 43) = 56.07. However, only the parasocial relationship was the significant positive predictor for generating enjoyment with Korg. In the last model, character realism was entered, but the model did not reach significance, F_{change} (1, 42) = .61. Therefore,

only parasocial relationships remained a significant positive predictor for creating enjoyment

of Korg.

Table 11

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R² for perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationships and character realism as predictors for character enjoyment (compare groups based on characters)

	Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Thor	Positive masculinity	.13	.02	-.02	-.07	-.04
	Negative masculinity	-.12	-.11	-.05	.10	.09
	Positive femininity	.51***	.36*	.32*	.21*	.19*
	Negative femininity	-.30*	-.23*	-.18	-.08	-.05
	Personality recognizability		.05	-.05	-.10	-.12
	Situational recognizability		-.27	-.36*	-.11	-.04
	Attitudinal recognizability		.41*	.15	-.03	-.04
	Perceived similarity			.51*	.17	.20
	Parasocial relationships				.79***	.81***
	Character realism					-.14
		$R^2 = .35$	$\Delta R^2 = .07$	$\Delta R^2 = .05$	$\Delta R^2 = .31$	$\Delta R^2 = .01$
		$p < .001$	$p = .100$	$p = .029$	$p < .001$	$p = .149$
Mighty Thor	Positive masculinity	.43***	.25*	.25*	.04	.03
	Negative masculinity	-.14	-.18	-.18	-.12	-.13
	Positive femininity	.36**	.25*	.25*	.13	.13
	Negative femininity	.01	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.04
	Personality recognizability		-.12	-.14	-.05	-.06
	Situational recognizability		.21	.21	-.01	-.01
	Attitudinal recognizability		.30*	.28	.34**	.33**
	Perceived similarity			.03	-.23	-.23
	Parasocial relationships				.74***	.72***
	Character realism					.06
		$R^2 = .49$	$\Delta R^2 = .11$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .25$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$
		$p < .001$	$p = .003$	$p = .876$	$p < .001$	$p = .523$
Valkyrie	Positive masculinity	.51***	.32*	.32*	-.01	-.01
	Negative masculinity	-.11	-.04	-.05	-.07	-.07
	Positive femininity	-.05	-.11	-.11	-.01	-.01
	Negative femininity	-.20	-.25	-.25	<.01	<.01
	Personality recognizability		.33*	.34*	.03	.03
	Situational recognizability		-.01	-.01	-.07	-.06
	Attitudinal recognizability		.16	.18	-.02	-.02
	Perceived similarity			-.04	-.15	-.15
	Parasocial relationships				1.02***	1.02***
	Character realism					-.01
		$R^2 = .36$	$\Delta R^2 = .13$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .39$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$
		$p < .001$	$p = .009$	$p = .850$	$p < .001$	$p = .937$
Korg	Positive masculinity	.39**	.16	.16	-.11	-.13
	Negative masculinity	-.06	-.12	-.11	-.10	-.12
	Positive femininity	.32	.16	.17	-.03	-.04
	Negative femininity	-.06	-.12	-.11	.03	.01
	Personality recognizability		.02	.04	.07	.09
	Situational recognizability		.03	.03	-.03	-.06
	Attitudinal recognizability		.43*	.47	.24	.23
	Perceived similarity			-.07	-.24	-.26
	Parasocial relationships				.87***	.85***
	Character realism					.09
		$R^2 = .30$	$\Delta R^2 = .13$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$	$\Delta R^2 = 32$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$
		$p = .002$	$p = .024$	$p = .838$	$p < .001$	$p = .440$

Note. $*p < .050$, $** p < .010$, $*** p < .001$

4.7 Impact of perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity,
parasocial relationship and character realism on character appreciation

Before testing the hypothetical analysis, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to reveal the difference in character appreciation between different characters. This analysis also helps to decide whether the hierarchy regression analysis needs to be discussed further in different characters. The result showed that there were significant differences between different characters, $F(3, 235) = 3.69$, $p = .013$, partial η2 = .05. The Turkey post-hoc comparison revealed that Mighty Thor ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 1.26$) had the highest score on character appreciation, which also significantly higher than Korg ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.39$). No other significant difference in terms of character appreciation between other characters. Then a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to test H5. The perceived gendered personality traits were added in the first block, and recognizability was added in the second block. While perceived similarity was added in the third block, followed by the parasocial relationship in the fourth block. Lastly, character realism was entered in the fifth block. Character appreciation is the dependent variable. When the perceived gendered personality traits as the single predictor, the model reached significance, $F(4, 234) = 30.57$. Positive masculinity, negative masculinity, and positive femininity were the significant positive predictors. When added recognizability, the model improved, $F_{change}(3, 231) = 26.45$. Positive masculinity and negative masculinity remained as significant positive predictors. However, positive femininity was not significant anymore. Instead, negative femininity was found as a significant negative predictor. Situational recognizability and attitudinal recognizability were significant positive predictors. In the third model, the perceived similarity did not improve the model, $F_{change}(1, 230) = .72$. Therefore, the significant predictors did not change, and other predictors remained insignificant. By adding parasocial relationship, the model improved, $F_{change}(1, 229) = 128.16$. Positive masculinity, negative masculinity, and situational recognizability remained significant positive predictors. Moreover, parasocial relationships was also found to be a significant positive predictor. In the last block, character realism was a significant positive predictor, and the predictive value of the model improved significantly, $F_{change}(1, 228) = 31.65$. Positive masculinity, negative masculinity, and the parasocial relationship remained

significant positive predictors. Therefore, H5a, H5g and H5h has to be accepted, while H5b, H5c, H5d, H5e, H5f, H5i and H5j has to be rejected.

Table 12

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R^2 for perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationships and character realism as predictors for character appreciation (all cases)

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Positive masculinity	.54***	.29***	.29***	.17***	.12**
Negative masculinity	.15*	.15**	.15**	.13**	.11**
Positive femininity	.23**	.09	.08	-.03	.01
Negative femininity	-.06	-.11*	-.11	-.02	-.07
Personality recognizability		.12	.09	.04	.06
Situational recognizability		.16*	.16*	.14**	-.04
Attitudinal recognizability		.31***	.26**	.14	.13
Perceived similarity			.09	-.01	-.07
Parasocial relationships				.57***	.51***
Character realism					.28***
	$R^2 = .34$	$\Delta R^2 = .17$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .18$	$\Delta R^2 = .04$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .398$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

Note. *$p < .050$, ** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$

As mentioned before, there were significant differences in character appreciation among different characters; therefore, the same hierarchy regression analysis was conducted again but with split data based on characters. For the character Thor, when gendered traits as the single predictor, the model reached significant, $F (4, 57) = 6.81$. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were significant positive predictors. When added recognizability, the model was improved, $F_{change} (3, 54) = 3.73$. Only positive masculinity remained a significant positive predictor, and other predictors were all found to be insignificant. By adding perceived similarity in the third block, the model improved again, $F_{change} (1, 53) = 6.89$. Only perceived similarity was found to be the significant positive predictor, and no other predictors were found to be significant. Then, when entering parasocial relationships in the fourth block, the model improved significantly as well, $F_{change} (1, 52) = 45.54$. Negative masculinity was found to be a positive predictor of formulating character appreciation with Thor. Also,

parasocial relationships was another significant positive predictor. Lastly, character realism was s significant positive predictor for creating character appreciation with Thor, F_{change} (1, 51) = 11.71. Negative masculinity and parasocial relationship remained significant positive predictors, and character realism was found to significantly influence the character appreciation of Thor in a positive direction.

In terms of Mighty Thor, when the perceived gendered traits as the single predictor, the model reached significant, F (4, 59) = 9.75. Positive masculinity and positive femininity were positive predictors. By adding recognizability, the model improved, F_{change} (3, 56) = 4.07. Only positive masculinity remained a significant positive predictor, and no other significant predictors were found. Adding perceived similarity in the third block did not improve the model, F_{change} (1, 55) = .80. Therefore, no change in the predictors. When entered the parasocial relationship, the model was improved, F_{change} (1, 54) = 43.67. Only parasocial relationship was the significant positive predictor to formulate appreciation with Mighty Thor. Finally, character realism was a significant positive predictor and improved the predictive value of the model significantly, F_{change} (1, 53) = 5.60. The parasocial relationship remained the significant positive predictor.

As for Valkyrie, the perceived gendered traits as the simple predictor made the model reach significant, F (4, 55) = 6.48. Positive masculinity was the significant positive predictor. The model improved by adding the recognizability, F_{change} (3, 52) = 10.43. Positive masculinity remained the significant positive predictor. Also, personality and attitudinal recognizability became significant positive predictors. When perceived similarity entered the third block, the model did not reach significance, F_{change} (1, 51) = .98. Positive masculinity, personality, and attitudinal recognizability remained significant positive predictors. In the fourth model, the parasocial relationship was included in the analysis, and the model improved, F_{change} (1, 50) = 35.78. The parasocial relationship was the only significant positive predictor. Lastly, the character realism improved the model again when entered in the fifth block, F_{change} (1, 49) = 14.50. Perceived similarity, parasocial relationship, and character realism were the significant positive predictor of creating character appreciation with Valkyrie.

Lastly, for Korg, when perceived gendered traits as the single predictor, the model reached significant, $F(4, 48) = 8.18$. Positive masculinity and negative masculinity were the significant positive predictors. When added recognizability in the second block, the model improved, $F_{change}(3, 45) = 7.99$. Positive masculinity and negative masculinity remained significant positive predictors. The attitudinal recognizability also became a significant positive predictor. However, adding perceived similarity in the third block did not improve the model, $F_{change}(1, 44) = .02$. Positive masculinity, negative masculinity, and attitudinal recognizability remained as the significant positive predictors. No other significant predictor was found. In the fourth model, the parasocial relationship was added and improved the model, $F_{change}(1, 43) = 18.50$. Only negative masculinity remained the significant positive predictor. Moreover, the parasocial relationship was a significant positive predictor as well. In the fifth block, the character realism was entered, but the model did not reach significance, $F_{change}(1, 42) = 2.44$. negative masculinity and parasocial relationships remained positive predictors.

Table 13

Standardized Coefficient Beta and R^2 for perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationships and character realism as predictors for character appreciation (compare groups based on characters)

	Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Thor	Positive masculinity	.45***	.25*	.21	.16	.10
	Negative masculinity	.02	.06	.12	.25**	.27**
	Positive femininity	.29*	.08	.03	-.07	-.02
	Negative femininity	-.04	-.04	.02	.11	.03
	Personality recognizability		.16	.05	<.01	.04
	Situational recognizability		.03	-.07	.15	-.01
	Attitudinal recognizability		.33	.03	-.12	-.08
	Perceived similarity			.58*	.28	.22
	Parasocial relationships				.68***	.63***
	Character realism					.31**
		$R^2 = .32$	$\Delta R^2 = .12$	$\Delta R^2 = .06$	$\Delta R^2 = .23$	$\Delta R^2 = .05$
		$p < .001$	$p = .016$	$p = .011$	$p < .001$	$p = .001$
Mighty Thor	Positive masculinity	.47***	.28*	.28*	.08	.05
	Negative masculinity	.09	.03	<.01	.07	.01
	Positive femininity	.36**	.23	.22	.11	.11
	Negative femininity	-.05	-.09	-.07	-.08	-.11
	Personality recognizability		-.01	-.11	-.03	-.07
	Situational recognizability		.26	.27	.06	.02
	Attitudinal recognizability		.19	.06	.11	.10
	Perceived similarity			.21	-.04	-.04
	Parasocial relationships				.70***	.59***
	Character realism					.26*
		$R^2 = .40$	$\Delta R^2 = .11$	$\Delta R^2 = .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .22$	$\Delta R^2 = .03$
		$p < .001$	$p = .011$	$p = .376$	$p < .001$	$p = .022$
Valkyrie	Positive masculinity	50***	.24*	.24*	.02	-.02
	Negative masculinity	-.16	-.06	-.10	-.12	.10
	Positive femininity	.01	-.07	-.07	-.01	.07
	Negative femininity	.02	-.07	-.05	.12	.09
	Personality recognizability		.30*	.35*	.14	.15
	Situational recognizability		.13	.13	.10	-.02
	Attitudinal recognizability		.28*	.40*	.27	.20
	Perceived similarity			-.19	-.26	-.31*
	Parasocial relationships				.68	.61***
	Character realism					.34***
		$R^2 = .32$	$\Delta R^2 = .26$	$\Delta R^2 = .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .17$	$\Delta R^2 = .06$
		$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .328$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Korg	Positive masculinity	.57***	.31*	.31*	.15	.10
	Negative masculinity	.47**	.36*	.36*	.37**	.32*
	Positive femininity	.32	.10	.11	-.01	-.03
	Negative femininity	.01	-.08	-.07	.01	-.02
	Personality recognizability		.02	.03	.05	.09
	Situational recognizability		.17	.17	.14	.07
	Attitudinal recognizability		.43*	.45*	.31	.30
	Perceived similarity			-.04	-.14	-.17
	Parasocial relationships				.52***	.49***
	Character realism					.18
		$R^2 = .41$	$\Delta R^2 = .21$	$\Delta R^2 < .01$	$\Delta R^2 = .12$	$\Delta R^2 = .02$
		$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .889$	$p < .001$	$p = .126$

Note. *$p < .050$, ** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$

Chapter 5 Discussion and conclusion

By using quantitative research, the study investigated the research question: to *what extent does the media character's diversity affect audience engagement and character meaningfulness*? After doing several one-way ANOVA and hierarchy regression analysis, the research revealed whether the character portrayal breaks the traditional stereotype representation and how gender identity as one of the predictors affect several media engagement. Moreover, the research also tried to define the relationship between different media engagement theories. In addition, the research did not assign the personality to each of the characters; instead, it let the participants evaluate how they perceived the character's gendered personality. The research also utilized the latest developed scale of recognizability as a predictor to explore its relationship with other media engagement theories. In the following section, several findings will be discussed by interpreting the results and the relationship between the findings and the existing literature.

5.1 Perceived gendered traits and character portrayal

The research first demonstrated the difference in perceived gendered personality traits between different characters. The result showed a variety of significant differences between characters, which is also in line with the fact that some online articles named Thor: Love and Thunder are the most queer and diverse film in the MCU (Child, 2022). Moreover, it also shows that the mainstream media has been trying to break the stereotype portrayals and increase the diverse representation in recent years (Hall, 2022). The result met the expectations as different characters were experiencing different situations and performing different personality traits. Interestingly, the research found that the participants perceived the female characters as having more positive masculine characteristics than the male characters, meaning that the female characters in Thor: Love and Thunder are more logical and solution-focused. This result shows that the stereotypical female portrayal of women is weak is changing.

However, in terms of the characteristic of negative masculine, Thor was the character who got the highest score on it, which is in contrast with the expectation. By analyzing the plot of the film, Mighty Thor was the one who could lift Mjolnir and lead the team to victory.

Thus, logically, the author perceived that Mighty Thor would be a character with both positive and negative masculinity characteristics. However, Thor is the primary character for the whole Thor series, and his personality and situation vary in each film. For instance, in the first two films of the Thor series, Thor is always shown as a serious male image who is strong, analytical, and sometimes arrogant. Therefore, his performance in another film may potentially influence the participant's perceptions of other films. Nevertheless, a surprising finding was that the participants perceived that Thor has the highest performance on positive femininity. But the result is also reasonable as Thor was experiencing a confused situation and trying to find the meaning of his life and his true self. Thus, his tenderness and sensitivity could be noticeable and memorable for the audience.

The most interesting finding was that Korg and Valkyrie as the LGBTQ representation in this film; the participants did not recognize a big difference in their portrayal compared with the stereotypical LGBTQ portrayals. Valkyries has the lowest score on both positive and negative femininity, while Korg has the highest score on negative femininity. As mentioned in the previous study (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009), stereotypically, gay characters always be depicted as they have more feminine characteristics than lesbians. In contrast, lesbian has more masculine attributes than gay. As a result, although the MCU started featuring minority characters in their superhero communities, the representation of LGBT is still in the stereotypical age, as Berry proposed (1980).

To conclude, the character portrayal in the film Thor: Love and Thunder indeed break some of the stereotypical representation, including the supportive role of female and the always powerful male. However, the portrayal of minorities was still in the primary stage and did not break the stereotype.

5.2 Recognizability and character portrayal

The research also explored the different recognizability among different characters. The only significant difference was the situational recognizability between Mighty Thor and Korg. Although there was no significant difference between the character in terms of personality and attitudinal recognizability, the participant could recognize themselves in Mighty Thor the most in terms of personality recognizability and attitudinal recognizability. Perhaps this could

be explained that Mighty Thor was experiencing severe cancer, but she still keeping find the solution and fighting it. When she became the powerful superhero, although her body was getting weaker daily, she insisted on fighting for victory. Her situation may recall the participant's memories regarding their past experience of counter-illness or figure out a dilemma. It also showed that Mighty Thor could be a successful female character as the audience could recognize themselves from her, and she can somehow reflect the audience's real life. As Żerebecki et al. (2023b) mentioned, the viewers prefer to choose the characters with complex personalities and growing after the hard situation.

5.3 recognizability and perceived similarity

According to Żerebecki et al. (2023c), recognizability, naming personality recognizability, situational recognizability, and attitudinal recognizability positively correlate with perceived similarity. However, in the current research, only personality recognizability and attitudinal recognizability positively influence the perceived similarity (=H1a, H1c), whereas situational recognizability did not (H1b). However, this could be explained that the film in the research was science fiction; the audience cannot completely have the same experience or situation as depicted in the film. Therefore, it is also hard for the participant to find the actual similarity regarding the situation. Thus, the relationship between situational recognizability and perceived similarity was not significant.

5.4 perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity and parasocial relationship

By doing the hierarchy regression analysis, the result showed that the parasocial relationship was positively influenced by positive masculinity, and positive femininity and negatively influenced by negative femininity (= H2a, H2b, H2h). There is no relationship between negative masculinity and parasocial relationship ($\neq$ H2g). The result showed that the audience tends to have connections with the character with the positive gendered characteristics and has a preference for specific character attributes. For instance, the character be objective, analytical, and passionate instead of oversensitive. However, if the character has more negative femininity traits, the audience has less parasocial relationships

with the character. The result was not surprising as it was in line with the finding from Rosaen and Dibble (2016) that people develop parasocial relationships with disliked characters and the degree was less than the likable character.

There is no significant relationship between perceived similarity and parasocial relationship (≠ H2f). The result was surprising as it conflicts with the previous studies that the perception of similarity is one of the most important predictors of building a parasocial relationship with the character in the media (Giles, 2002). However, in the current research, attitudinal recognizability could be a significant predictor for forming a parasocial relationship instead of perceived similarity (= H2d). Therefore, it also shows that the phycology process of engaging with the media product could be complex, including cognitive bias and several reasons (Montoya et al., 2008). It also supported that the recognizability scale has more aspects of familiarity than perceived similarity (Żerebecki et al., 2023c).

To look more into the details of each character of their parasocial relationship with the audience, the audience also has different expectations of different characters. Although, for all four characters, the perceived similarity was not the predictor for developing parasocial relationships, some of the gender identity or recognizability could be a significant predictor. For female characters, positive masculinity was the positive predictor for building parasocial relationships with Mighty Thor and Valkyrie. Moreover, negative femininity negatively influences the audience to develop parasocial relationships with Valkyrie. This could be explained by the stereotypical low status of women being replaced by strong and successful "girl power" (Gauntlett, 2008). For Thor, situational recognizability was the only predictor, which is also negative for forming parasocial relationships. Perhaps, this could be explained by his current situation. He was in a difficult situation where he lost his friend and himself. His situation of facing difficulties did not trigger attraction. In contrast, situational recognizability was a positive predictor for Mighty Thor. This may be because Mighty Thor's action when facing difficulties changed her situation, and then her current situation encouraged the audience.

An interesting finding was that positive masculinity was the only significant predictor for building parasocial relationships with Korg. It also means that at this stage, the recognizability or similarity cannot help the audience generate parasocial relationships with

Korg. However, if the portrayal of Korg has more positive masculine attributes, then the character will have more connection with him. It also means that the portrayal of Korg is not well-written as other characters since the participants did not recognize themselves or find similarities with him. Although the director of the film promotes his film by announcing that this film is super gay (Child, 2022), the gay character portrayal was not successfully connected with the audience. Another finding on Korg was that he got the lowest score on the parasocial relationship (as well as on character enjoyment and character appreciation). This indeed indicated that Korg was not a preferable character for the audience. In contrast with Valkyrie, who has the highest score on parasocial relationships (second highest on character enjoyment and character appreciation), it was clear that Valkyrie was a preferable character. Although both Korg and Valkyrie represent the minority in this film, the portrayal of Valkyrie was more successful. Moreover, this also reflects the situation of society in that people have more acceptance of lesbians than gays. This is also because of the precarious manhood theory (Vandello et al., 2008), as heterosexual males try to prove it repeatedly (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). The masculine identity is more important for heterosexual males than femininity for heterosexual females (Galdi et al., 2022). Gay communities were seen as a threat to homosexual males, as homosexual males will show more prejudice in order to affirm their masculinity (Vandello & Bosson, 2013).

5.5 Perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship and character realism

An interesting finding was that negative femininity was a positive predictor for character realism ($\neq$ H3i). It means that if the character has more negative aspects of feminine characteristics, the audience will perceive more that the character is real. The result could be explained by considering that negative femininity was a negative predictor of developing parasocial relationship as mentioned before. Although people do not like the character with negative feminine attributes, the audience understands that oversensitive, overcautious, and self-doubting exist in real life. Only depicting the positive aspect of masculinity and femininity are not sufficient for people to perceive that the character is real.

The research showed a significant relationship between parasocial relationships and character realism (= H3g). This means people have more affiliation with the character portrayed as real. This result is perfectly in line with the statement that parasocial relationship levels positively relate to character realism (Schippa, 2007). In addition, the research also found that there was also a significant relationship between situational recognizability and character realism (= H3d). As mentioned above, the parasocial relationship increases with attitudinal recognizability (= H2d). By linking those two findings, audiences will generate parasocial relationships if the character shares a similar value or attitudes. Whereas, if the audience can find the similarity regarding their past experience, life changes, and problems they could have with the characters, they will perceive that the character is real in life.

5.6 Perceived gendered personality traits, recognizability, parasocial relationship, character realism and character meaningfulness

Firstly, the result showed that parasocial relationships was a positive predictor for character enjoyment and character appreciation (= H4g, H5g). The result was not surprising, as Schippa (2007) indicated that individuals form parasocial relationships with desirable characters. However, the research found that there is no significant relationship between character realism and character enjoyment (≠ H4f). This means that whether the audience will get entertainment or a good feeling about the character is not because the character is portrayed as real in life. In contrast, character appreciation is positively influenced by character realism (= H5h). Although only appreciation was found to be significant, the result is not very surprising. Oliver and Bartsch (2011) already mentioned that enjoyment or appreciation did not appear simultaneously in all cases. Some of the characters did bring enjoyment to the audience. However, it cannot let the audience to thinking. Therefore, in the current research, the character portrayal encouraged the audience to think but was not fun for the audience to watch. Perhaps, another reason can explain this situation. According to the use and gratification theory, escaping reality is one of the main reasons that people watch TV. However, if the audience still sees the reality of life on television, they may not find it interesting and cannot get gratification. However, the reality does encourage the audience to reflect. Moreover, positive masculinity and negative masculinity were the positive predictors

for character appreciation (= H5a, ≠ H5i). This means that masculine traits, no matter whether positive or negative, encourage the audience to think.

In terms of different characters, the research found that there is also no relationship between character realism and character enjoyment. This could be explained that the film is science fiction; the depiction of the character and the plot are not based on real life. Therefore, the audience cannot obtain hedonic gratification based on the realism of the characters. There should be other variables that can trigger the character's enjoyment of science fiction films. However, the research found that the parasocial relationship positively predicted character appreciation for all characters except Korg. This finding further support that Korg is not as preferable as other characters.

5.7 Limitation and future suggestion

By exploring the existing literature, the research could be conducted with a method with high reliability and validity. By applying a thorough analysis, the result could help to answer the research question. However, the research still contains several imitations.

Firstly, the film used in the research was science fiction. Although the characters were diverse in gender, sexual orientation, and representation, the character was not created based on real life. Moreover, the result also shows no significant relationship between situational recognizability and perceived similarity. Therefore, it indicated that the film used in the research might make it hard for the participants to completely recognize themselves or the actual similarities in the characters. Therefore, in future research, scholars could the films which rich in different character representations but also close to real life.

Secondly, the impression of characters done by other films in the MCU was not clear. All the characters in the film was somehow exposed to the other film MCU, especially for Thor, who was the main character in the whole Thor series and also featured a lot in the Avengers series. Therefore, the response from the participants could be influenced by the characters' portrayals in other films, which could affect the result.

Thirdly, the research was short-term research, meaning that the data was collected within one month. However, according to Dibble et al. (2016), the parasocial relationship is a long-term relationship between media users and media characters. As the participant's opinions

may vary all the time, therefore, short-term research may not get the most reliable answers to the questions.

Lastly, the design of using an English survey as the primary version and translating the survey into Chinese aimed to reach more people with diverse cultures. However, the participant's nationality was concentrated in Chinese and American. Moreover, the scales used in this research were all developed in English. Therefore, there may have a situation of misunderstanding because of cultural bias. The reliability of the result may be influenced. Moreover, the proportion of LGBTQ participants was only 31.1%, which still was a small portion. Therefore, the sample was not as representative as possible.

5.8 Scientific and social impact

Based on the gender identity scale of PN-SRI, the research showed that the characters in nowadays films broke some traditional stereotypes. Moreover, research also proved a significant relationship between gender identity and media engagement. In addition, by further analyzing the relationship between different media engagement theories, some significant predictors for character enjoyment and appreciation were also found. Moreover, the research also utilized the newest scale of recognizability and again proved that the scale has more aspects of familiarity than perceived similarity, as mentioned by Żerebecki et al. (2023c). The recognizability scale also worked well on the majority characters.

Several suggestions could also be given to the filmmakers. Firstly, the audience has a high acceptance of non-stereotypical female characters; they do recognize themselves or generate a parasocial relationship with the female character with masculinity characteristics. Thus, increasing the proportion of counter-stereotypical females in the films may increase the popularity of the film. Secondly, although the proportion of LGBTQ characters was increasing, the portrayal of gay characters was not well-written as other characters. Therefore, the film industry should pay more attention to how to portray the gay character in order to increase the acceptance of gay characters in films.

5.9 Conclusion

In this section, several key takeaways will be discussed. Firstly, in the current research, the recognizability scale was applied, and the result showed that there is a significant relationship between personality and attitudinal recognizability with perceived similarity. The result also showed that recognizability could be a distinct concept from other media engagement theories. Secondly, the stereotypical portrayals in media were decreasing, especially the portrayals of female characters. The audience also showed a huge engagement with the female character, who has more masculine traits than feminine traits. Thirdly, although the number of LGBTQ characters was increasing than before, the portrayal was insufficient and stayed in the stereotypical age, especially for the gay character. The result showed that people are more engaged with lesbian characters than gay characters. Therefore, the portrayal of LGBTQ characters needs to be improved in the future.

References

Avila-Saavedra, G. (2009). Nothing queer about queer television: Televized construction of gay masculinities. *Media, Culture & Society*, *31*(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443708098243

Babbie, E. (2016). The basics of social research (7th edition). Cengage Learning.

Barriga C. A. (2011). Enjoyment and Thoughtfulness as Responses to Moral Ambiguity in Fictional Characters. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Boston, MA.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155–162. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036215

Berger, A., & Krahé, B. (2013). Negative attributes are gendered too: Conceptualizing and measuring positive and negative facets of sex-role identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*(6), 516–531. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1970

Bernath, J. (n.d.). *Diversity's progression in the Marvel Cinematic Universe*. Lomabeat. https://lomabeat.com/diversitys-progression-in-the-marvel-cinematic-universe/

Blashill A. J., Powlishta K. K. (2009). Gay stereotypes: The use of sexual orientation as a cue for gender-related attributes. *Sex Roles*, *61*(11–12), 783–793. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9684-7

Bockting, W. O. (2008). Psychotherapy and the real-life experience: From gender dichotomy to gender diversity. *Sexologies, 17*(4), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sexol.2008.08.001

Boden, A., & Fleck, R. (Directors). (2019). *Captain Marvel* [Film]. Marvel Studios.

Bond, B. J. (2021). The development and influence of parasocial relationships with television characters: A longitudinal experimental test of prejudice reduction through parasocial contact. *Communication Research*, *48*(4), 573-593. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650219900632

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1972.tb00018.x

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S.

(1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, *28*(2), 59–78.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1972.tb00018.x

Brown, M. J., & Groscup, J. L. (2009). Homophobia and Acceptance of Stereotypes About
Gays and Lesbians. *Individual Differences Research*, *7*(3).

Bryant, J., & Oliver, M. B. (Eds.). (2009). *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*.
Routledge.

Buchbinder, D. (2014). Deciphering men: reading the masculine in Modern
Family. *Qualitative Research Journal*. *14*(1), 16–27. https://doi-
org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1108/QRJ-03-2014-0003

Child, B. (2022, July 11). Thor: Love and Thunder – the 'super-gay' tone, female Thor and
Russell Crowe – discuss with spoilers. *The Guardian*.
https://www.theguardian.com/film/2022/jul/11/thor-love-and-thunder-the-super-gay-
tone-female-thor-and-russell-crowe-discuss-with-spoilers-chris-hemsworth-natalie-
portman

Chisholm, A. (2002). Acrobats, contortionists, and cute children: The promise and perversity
of US Women's gymnastics. *Signs: journal of women in culture and society*, *27*(2), 415–
450.

Cohen, J., & Hershman-Shitrit, M. (2017). Mediated relationships with TV characters: The
effects of perceived and actual similarity in personality traits. *Scientific study of
literature*, *7*(1), 109–128. https://doi.org/10.1075/ssol.7.1.05coh

Cohen, J., Weimann-Saks, D., & Mazor-Tregerman, M. (2018). Does character similarity
increase identification and persuasion? *Media Psychology*. *21*(3), 506–528.
https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2017.1302344

Cox, V., & Ward, L. M. (2019). A holistic view of Black women on scripted TV: A content
analysis. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *45*(6–7), 540–570.
https://doi..org/10.1177/0095798419887072

Daalmans, S. & Ter Horst, C. (2017). Diversity reflected? Analyzing the representation of
gender, age, ethnicity and sexual orientation on Dutch prime time
television. *Communications*, *42*(2), 253–268. https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2017-
0019

Dhaenens, F. (2012). Gay male domesticity on the small screen: Queer representations of gay homemaking in six feet under and brothers & sisters. *Popular Communication: The International Journal of Media and Culture*, *10*(3), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2012.682936

Dibble JL, Hartmann T and Rosaen SF (2016) Parasocial interaction and parasocial relationship: conceptual clarification and a critical assessment of measures. *Human Communication Research 42*(1): 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12063

Dixon, T. L., & Linz, D. (2000). Race and the misrepresentation of victimization on local television news. *Communication Research*, *27*(5), 547–573. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365000027005001

Eagleman, A. N. (2015). Constructing gender differences: Newspaper portrayals of male and female gymnasts at the 2012 Olympic Games. *Sport in Society*, *18*(2), 234-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2013.854509

Gauntlett, D. (2008). *Media, gender and identity: An introduction*. Routledge.

Gestos, M., Smith-Merry, J., & Campbell, A. (2018). Representation of women in video games: A systematic review of literature in consideration of adult female wellbeing. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *21*(9), 535–541. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2017.0376

Giles DC (2002) Parasocial interaction: a review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychology 4*(3): 279–305. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0403_04

Gillig, T., & Murphy, S. (2016). Fostering support for LGBTQ youth? The effects of a gay adolescent media portrayal on young viewers. *International Journal of Communication*, *10*, 23.

Goodall, H. (2012). Media's Influence on Gender Stereotypes. *Media Asia*, *39*(3), 160–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/01296612.2012.11689932

Haines, E. L., Deaux, K., & Lofaro, N. (2016). The times they are a-changing… or are they not? A comparison of gender stereotypes, 1983–2014. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *40*(3), 353–363. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316634081

Hall, A. E. (2022). Audience responses to diverse superheroes: The roles of gender and race in forging connections with media characters in superhero franchise films. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *6*(3), 414–425. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000363

Hall, A. E. (2019). Identification and parasocial relationships with characters from Star Wars. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 8*(1), 88–98. https://doi.org/0.1037/ppm0000160

Hart, K. P. R. (2003). Representing gay men on American television. *Television: Journal of Men's Studies*, *9*(1), 59-79. https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.0901.59

Hartmann T., Stuke D., Daschmann G. (2008). Positive parasocial relationships with drivers affect suspense in racing sports spectators. *Journal of Media Psychology*, *20*(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105.20.1.24

Herrett-Skjellum, J., & Allen, M. (1996). Television programming and sex stereotyping: A meta-analysis. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *19*(1), 157–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1996.11678930

Hoeken, H., Kolthoff, M., & Sanders, J. (2016). Story perspective and character similarity as drivers of identification and narrative persuasion. *Human Communication Research, 42*(2), 292–311. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12076

Jenkins, P. L. (Director). (2017). *Wonder Woman* [Film]. Warner Bros. Pictures; DC Films; Atlas Entertainment; Cruel and Unusual Films.

Keyes, C. L., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: the empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *82*(6), 1007–1022. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.1007

Kim, J., & Sintas, J. L. (2021). Social TV viewers' symbolic parasocial interactions with media characters: A topic modelling analysis of viewers' comments. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100129

Kinnunen, J. (2016). Badass bitches, damsels in distress, or something in between?: representation of female characters in superhero action films.

Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*, 83–96.

Kneer, J., Franken, S., & Reich, S. (2019). Not only for the (tom) boys: Gender variables as predictors for playing motivations, passion, and addiction for MMORPGs. *Simulation & Gaming*, *50*(1), 44–61. https://doi.org /10.1177/1046878118823033

Koenig, A. M., & Eagly, A. H. (2014). Evidence for the social role theory of stereotype content: observations of groups' roles shape stereotypes. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *107*(3), 371. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037215

Krakowiak, K. M., & Tsay, M. (2011). The role of moral disengagement in the enjoyment of real and fictional characters. *International Journal of Arts and Technology*, *4*(1), 90–101. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJART.2011.037772

Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. N. (2010). Patterns of gender development. *Annual review of psychology*, *61*, 353–381. https://doi.org.10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100511

Mazières, A., Menezes, T., & Roth, C. (2021). Computational appraisal of gender representativeness in popular movies. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *8*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00815-9

McCroskey, L. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2006). Analysis and improvement of the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily. *Communication Quarterly*, *54*(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370500270322

Meier, Y., & Neubaum, G. (2019). Gratifying ambiguity: Psychological processes leading to enjoyment and appreciation of TV series with morally ambiguous characters. *Mass Communication and Society*, *22*(5), 631–653. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2019.1614195

Montoya, R. M., & Horton, R. S., & Kirchner, J. (2008). Is actual similarity necessary for attraction? A meta-analysis of actual and perceived similarity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *25*(6), 889–922. https://doi.org.10.1177/0265407508096700

Oliver, M. B., & Bartsch, A. (2011). Appreciation of entertainment. *Journal of Media Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000029

Oliver, M. B., & Raney, A. A. (2011). Entertainment as pleasurable and meaningful: Identifying hedonic and eudaimonic motivations for entertainment consumption. *Journal of Communication*, *61*(5), 984–1004. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01585.x

Oliver, M. B., & Bartsch, A. (2010). Appreciation as audience response: Exploring entertainment gratifications beyond hedonism. *Human Communication Research*, *36*(1), 53–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2009.01368.x

Padva, G. 2008. "Educating The Simpsons: Teaching Queer Representations in Contemporary Visual Media." *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *5*(3), 57–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650802162227.

Reich, S. (2021). A systematic gender perspective on entertainment theory. *The oxford handbook of entertainment theory*, 81–102.

Rolle, L., Abbà, S., Fazzino, R., Marino, E., & Brustia, P. (2014). Domestic violence and newspaper: an explorative study. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, *127*, 504–508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.299

Rothmann, J. (2013). Send in the (gay) clowns': Will & Grace and Modern Family as 'sensibly queer. *Acta Academica*, *45*(4), 40–83.

Rubin A. M., Perse E. M., Powell R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, *12*(2), 155–180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1985.tb00071.x

Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. *Communication Research*, *8*(2), 141–165. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365028100800201

Russell, B. (1991). Racial and Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Media: An Analysis. In Freedom, Rights and Pornography (pp. 114–122). Springer Netherlands.

Samlls, A. (n.d.). *'House of The Dragon's' black Velaryons are a refreshing change in 'Game of Thrones' TV Universe*. Okayplayer. https://www.okayplayer.com/culture/house-of-the-dragon-velaryon-black-game-of-thrones.html

Sapochnik, M., Condal, R., Martin, G. R. R., Schmidt, R., Diaz, J., Hess, S., & Gerardis, V. (Executive Producers). (2022–present). *House of the Dragon* [TV series]. GRRM; Bastard Sword; 1:26 Pictures Inc.; HBO Entertainment.

Scharrer, E., Ramasubramanian, S., & Banjo, O. (2022). Media, Diversity, and Representation in the US: A Review of the Quantitative Research Literature on Media Content and Effects. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *66*(4), 723–749. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2022.2138890

Schiappa, E., Allen, M., & Gregg, P. B. (2007). Parasocial relationships and television: A meta-analysis of the effects. In R. Preiss, B. Gayle, N. Burrell, M. Allen, & J. Bryant (Eds.), *Mass media research: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 301–314). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2005). The parasocial contact hypothesis. *Communication Monographs*, *72*(1), 92–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/0363775052000342544

Schneider, F. M., Weinmann, C., Roth, F. S., Knop, K., & Vorderer, P. (2016). Learning from entertaining online video clips? Enjoyment and appreciation and their differential relationships with knowledge and behavioral intentions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *54*, 475–482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.08.028

Shortland, C. (Director). (2021). *Black Widow* [Film]. Marvel Studios.

Shrum, L. J. (2009). Media consumption and perceptions of social reality: Effects and underlying processes. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 50–73). Routledge.

Signorella, M. L., Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1993). Developmental differences in children′s gender schemata about others: A meta-analytic review. *Developmental review*, *13*(2), 147–183. https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1993.1007

Sink, A., & Mastro, D. (2017). Depictions of gender on primetime television: A quantitative content analysis. *Mass Communication and Society*, *20*(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2016.1212243

Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(4), 624–635. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.624

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*(1), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076857

Stone, T. (2020). Gay male characters on TV. In K. Roos (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of gender, media, and communication* (pp. 1–8). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119429128.iegmc152

Tamborini, R., Grady, S. M., Baldwin, J., McClaran, N., & Lewis, R. (2021). The narrative enjoyment and appreciation rationale. *The Oxford handbook of entertainment theory*, 45–62.

Tartaglia, S., & Rollero, C. (2015). Gender stereotyping in newspaper advertisements: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, *46*(8), 1103–1109. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0022022115597068

Tavares, Alexis Lee. (2022). Marvel-ous Women: Black Widow, Scarlet Witch, and the Representation of Female Superheroes. In *BSU Honors Program Theses and Projects.*

Tukachinsky, R. (2010). Para-romantic love and para-friendships: Development and assessment of a multiple-parasocial relationships scale. *American Journal of Media Psychology* 3, 73–94.

Turner JR (1993) Interpersonal and psychological predictors of parasocial interaction with differ- ent television performers. *Communication Quarterly*, *41*, 443–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379309369904

Twenge, J. M. (1997). Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis. *Sex roles*, *36*, 305-325.

Waititi, T. (Director). (2022). *Thor: Love and Thunder* [Film]. Marvel Studios.

Walsh, K. R., Fürsich, E., & Jefferson, B. S. (2008). Beauty and the patriarchal beast: Gender role portrayals in sitcoms featuring mismatched couples. *Journal of Popular film and Television*, *36*(3), 123–132.

Webster, G. D., & Campbell, J. T. (2022). Personality perception in Game of Thrones: Character consensus and assumed similarity. *Psychology of Popular Media*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000398

Wood, J. (2011). *Gendered lives communication, gender and culture*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Żerebecki, B. G., Opree, S. J., Hofhuis, J., &Janssen, S. (2023c). Development and validation of Minority Character Recognizability Scale (MRS). *Paper presented at the Etmaal2023,* Enschede, Netherlands, February.

Żerebecki, B. G., Opree, S. J., Hofhuis, J., & Janssen, S. (2023b). Recognizing the similarities and appreciating the differences? Content choices and perceived (dis) similarity with TV show characters among youth. *Psychology of Popular Media*. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000465

Żerebecki, B. G., Opree, S. J., Hofhuis, J., & Janssen, S. (2023a). Successful Minority Representations on TV Count: A Quantitative Content Analysis Approach. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2023.2191287

Żerebecki, B. G., Van der Vliet, E., & Kneer, J. (2022). I want to be you (r friend): An investigation of the effects of gendered personality traits on engagement with different Modern Family characters. *Journalism and Media*, *3*(2), 362–381. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia3020026

Zuckerman, D., & Dubowitz, N. (2005). Clash of the cultures: women and girls on TV and in real life. In E. D. Cole, *Featuring Females Feminist Analyses of Media* (pp. 59–71). Washington: American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/11213-004

Appendix A. Questionnaire

Dear respondent,

Thank you for your interest in this research. We are inviting you to fill in a questionnaire. In this questionnaire, we will show one character image from film Thor: Love and Thunder to you. We would like to ask your perception of the character. The purpose of this study is to investigate to what extent the diversity of the character portrayals on the engagement of character. The questionnaire will take approximately 8-10 minutes to fill in. Please answer each question carefully and honestly, we are sincerely interested in your personal opinions. There are no right or wrong answers.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA
All research data remain completely confidential and are collected in anonymous form. We will not be able to identify you. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts associated with participating in this research.

VOLUNTARY
If you now decide not to participate in this research, this will not affect you. If you decide to cease your cooperation while filling in the questionnaire, this will in no way affect you either. You can cease your cooperation without giving reasons.

FURTHER INFORMATION
If you have questions about this research, in advance or afterwards, you can contact the responsible researcher, {Sizhe Dang}, email: {irismathesis@gmail.com}.

If you understand the information above, are above 18 years old, and freely consent to participate in this study, click the "I agree" button below to start the questionnaire.

○   I agree   (1)

○   I disagree   (2)

> *Skip To: End of Survey If If you understand the information above, are above 18 years old, and freely consent to participat... = I disagree*

Have you watched the film Thor: Love and Thunder?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

End of Block: Media consumption

Start of Block: Block 13

In the following questionnaire, you will see **one** character image from the film Thor: Love and Thunder.
  Please **remember** the character you just saw and answer the following questions.
  You **cannot go back** after you move forward to the next page.

End of Block: Block 13

Start of Block: Thor

After the Battle of Earth, **Thor** is on his way to find himself. After learning that Gorr was taking away the children of Asgard, he teamed with Valkyrie, Korg and Mighty Thor to stop Gorr's plan.

End of Block: Thor

Start of Block: Mighty Thor

In order to cure cancer, Jane Forest came to New Asgard. Surprisingly, she can lift Thor's Hammer and become the Mighty Thor. Later, she joined Thor, Valkyrie, and Korg to fight against Gorr.

Valkyrie was entrusted by Thor to become the king of New Asgard, and promised Thor that New Asgard would change. After Gorr appeared, she teamed with Thor again and fought for their home.

Korg is a Kronan gladiator and a friend of Thor. He clearly demonstrates his LGBTQ attributes in the film.

Display This Question:

If   After the Battle of Earth, Thor is on his way to find himself. After learning that Gorr was takin... Is Displayed

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate your perception of the character's personality.

I perceived that **Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Analytical (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Logical (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Objective (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Practical (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Rational (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Solution-focused (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate your perception of the character's personality.

I perceived that **Mighty Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Analytical (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Logical (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Objective (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Practical (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Rational (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Solution-focused (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate your perception of the character's personality.

I perceived that **Valkyrie** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Analytical (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Logical (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Objective (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Practical (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Rational (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Solution-focused (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate your perception of the character's personality.

I perceived that **Korg** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Analytical (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Logical (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Objective (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Practical (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Rational (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Solution-focused (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

I perceived that **Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Arrogant (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Boastful (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harsh (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inconsiderate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ostentatious (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power-hungry (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Mighty Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Arrogant (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Boastful (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harsh (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inconsiderate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ostentatious (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power-hungry (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Valkyrie** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Arrogant (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Boastful (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harsh (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inconsiderate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ostentatious (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power-hungry (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Korg** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Arrogant (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Boastful (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Harsh (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inconsiderate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ostentatious (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power-hungry (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

I perceived that **Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Emotional (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Empathic (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Loving (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Passionate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tender (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Mighty Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Emotional (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Empathic (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Loving (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Passionate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tender (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Valkyrie** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Emotional (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Empathic (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Loving (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Passionate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tender (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Korg** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Emotional (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Empathic (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Loving (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Passionate (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tender (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

I perceived that **Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Anxious (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Disoriented (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Naïve (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Overcautious (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Oversensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Self-doubting (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Mighty Thor** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Anxious (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Disoriented (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Naïve (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Overcautious (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Oversensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Self-doubting (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Valkyrie** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Anxious (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Disoriented (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Naïve (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Overcautious (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Oversensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Self-doubting (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I perceived that **Korg** is...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Anxious (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Disoriented (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Naïve (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Overcautious (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Oversensitive (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Self-doubting (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Gender trait

Start of Block: Recognizability

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

I recognize...**Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize myself in this character (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

 I recognize...**Mighty Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize myself in this character (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

I recognize...**Valkyrie**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize myself in this character (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

I recognize...**Korg**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize myself in this character (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

| I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

I recognize...**Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

If In order to cure cancer, Jane Forest came to New Asgard. Surprisingly, she can lift Thor's Hammer... Is Displayed

I recognize...**Mighty Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize...**Valkyrie**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If   Korg is a Kronan gladiator and a friend of Thor. He clearly demonstrates his LGBTQ attributes in... Is Displayed

I recognize...**Korg**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Display This Question:

If   After the Battle of Earth, Thor is on his way to find himself. After learning that Gorr was takin... Is Displayed

I recognize...**Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize my life in the life of this character (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize...**Mighty Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize my life in the life of this character (5)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life. (6)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me. (7)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Display This Question:

If   Valkyrie was entrusted by Thor to become the king of New Asgard, and promised Thor that New Asgar... Is Displayed

I recognize...**Valkyrie**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize my life in the life of this character (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize...**Korg**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize my life in the life of this character (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize...**Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

| I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

I recognize...**Mighty Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize...**Valkyrie**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

| I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Display This Question:

If Korg is a Kronan gladiator and a friend of Thor. He clearly demonstrates his LGBTQ attributes in... Is Displayed

I recognize...**Korg**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

| I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Page Break

I recognize...**Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have. (8)

○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○

I recognize...**Mighty Thor**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have. (8)

○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○

I recognize...**Valkyrie**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have. (8)

○　　　○　　　○　　　○　　　○　　　○　　　○

I recognize...**Korg**...

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have. (8)

○　　○　　○　　○　　○　　○　　○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I think the Thor is like me (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Thor behaves like me (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Thor shares my values (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Thor treats people like I do (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Thor has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I think the Mighty Thor is like me (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mighty Thor behaves like me (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mighty Thor shares my values (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mighty Thor treats people like I do (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mighty Thor has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I think the Valkyrie is like me (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Valkyrie behaves like me (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Valkyrie shares my values (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Valkyrie treats people like I do (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Valkyrie has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I think the Korg is like me (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Korg behaves like me (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Korg shares my values (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Korg treats people like I do (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Korg has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Similarity

Start of Block: Parasocial relationshipBased on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

142

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I have looked forward to watching this character in new movies (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If this character appeared in a new movie, I would watch it (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This character seems to understand things that I want to know (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would miss character if he or she did not appear in future movies (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I feel sorry for this character when they make a mistake (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would like to meet this character in person (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I saw a story about this character in a magazine or online, I would read it (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel I know this character very well (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I would like to know more about this character (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am interested in this character (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I find this character fascinating (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This character is engaging to watch (12)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

End of Block: Parasocial relationship

Start of Block: Character engagement

145

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
It was fun for me to watch this character (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I had a good time watching this character (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The character was entertaining (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I found this character to be very meaningful (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I was moved by this character (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
The character was thought-provoking. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It made me happy to watch the character (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I felt good watching the character (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I like the character because the character enriches my way of thinking (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I think it's good that the character encourages me to think (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Character engagement

Based on the character you just saw, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
The character presents things as they really are in life (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I see the character in film, I can't be sure he/she really is that way (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The character lets me really see how other people live (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The character does not show life as it really is (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

The character let me see what happens in other place as if I were really there (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

What is your age?

▼ 18 (18) ... 100 (100)

What gender do you identify with?

○ Male   (1)

○ Female   (2)

○ Non-binary / third gender   (3)

○ Other   (4)

○ Prefer not to say   (5)

Do you identify as an LGBTQ person？

○ Yes   (3)

○ No   (6)

○ Prefer not to say   (5)

What is your original country of nationality?

▼ Afghanistan (1) ... Zimbabwe (1357)

What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?

○ Less than high school degree   (1)

○ High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent)   (2)

○ Some college/university but no degree   (3)

○ Bachelor's degree   (4)

○ Master's degree   (5)

○ Doctoral degree (PhD) & above   (6)

End of Block: Demographics

Appendix B. SPSS Output

Factor analysis-perceived gendered personality traits

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.845
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi–Square	2766.778
	df	276
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.675	23.646	23.646	5.675	23.646	23.646	3.932	16.383	16.383
2	4.349	18.119	41.765	4.349	18.119	41.765	3.791	15.797	32.180
3	3.045	12.689	54.455	3.045	12.689	54.455	3.756	15.649	47.830
4	1.708	7.118	61.573	1.708	7.118	61.573	3.298	13.743	61.573
5	.926	3.860	65.433						
6	.774	3.227	68.660						
7	.743	3.097	71.757						
8	.728	3.033	74.790						
9	.639	2.661	77.451						
10	.588	2.448	79.900						
11	.519	2.161	82.061						
12	.510	2.126	84.187						
13	.474	1.973	86.160						
14	.442	1.840	88.000						
15	.435	1.812	89.812						
16	.380	1.582	91.393						
17	.347	1.444	92.838						
18	.338	1.409	94.247						
19	.288	1.200	95.447						
20	.254	1.059	96.506						
21	.234	.976	97.482						
22	.222	.923	98.405						
23	.209	.873	99.278						
24	.173	.722	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Arrogant	.847			
Boastful	.764	−.313		
Ostentatious	.731			
Harsh	.684			−.350
Power−hungry	.668			−.359
Inconsiderate	.655			−.386
Logical		.821		
Analytical		.799		
Rational		.793		
Objective		.708		
Practical		.702		
Solution−focused		.629		.387
Oversensitive			.821	
Disoriented			.730	
Overcautious			.701	
Self−doubting			.695	
Anxious			.679	
Naïve			.672	
Loving	−.363			.810
Passionate				.797
Empathic	−.425			.640
Emotional			.320	.592
Sensitive	−.346		.402	.561
Tender	−.438		.363	.493

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Reliability negative masculinity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	234	97.9
	Excluded[a]	5	2.1
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.863	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Arrogant	3.73	1.763	234
Boastful	3.99	1.715	234
Harsh	3.61	1.777	234
Inconsiderate	3.15	1.551	234
Ostentatious	3.54	1.706	234
Power-hungry	3.37	2.007	234

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Arrogant	17.66	45.572	.727	.826
Boastful	17.40	48.327	.618	.846
Harsh	17.78	46.869	.656	.839
Inconsiderate	18.24	49.116	.666	.839
Ostentatious	17.85	48.242	.626	.845
Power-hungry	18.02	44.382	.657	.841

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
21.39	65.990	8.123	6

Reliability positive masculinity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	233	97.5
	Excluded[a]	6	2.5
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.854	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Analytical	4.15	1.544	233
Logical	4.46	1.468	233
Objective	4.32	1.544	233
Practical	4.97	1.450	233
Rational	4.49	1.579	233
Solution-focused	5.18	1.391	233

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Analytical	23.42	32.168	.687	.820
Logical	23.11	32.410	.720	.814
Objective	23.25	33.852	.577	.841
Practical	22.61	34.507	.586	.839
Rational	23.08	31.365	.720	.813
Solution-focused	22.39	35.514	.551	.845

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
27.57	46.591	6.826	6

Reliability negative femininity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	239	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.835	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Anxious	3.79	1.657	239
Disoriented	3.40	1.563	239
Naïve	3.41	1.741	239
Overcautious	2.84	1.465	239
Oversensitive	2.99	1.545	239
Self-doubting	3.33	1.676	239

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Anxious	15.96	36.721	.585	.814
Disoriented	16.35	36.330	.660	.799
Naïve	16.34	35.411	.616	.808
Overcautious	16.91	39.803	.501	.829
Oversensitive	16.76	35.916	.697	.791
Self-doubting	16.42	36.203	.605	.810

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
19.75	51.206	7.156	6

Reliability positive femininity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	236	98.7
	Excluded[a]	3	1.3
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.849	6

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Emotional	4.73	1.480	236
Empathic	4.86	1.450	236
Loving	5.04	1.424	236
Passionate	5.34	1.270	236
Sensitive	4.49	1.517	236
Tender	4.15	1.591	236

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Emotional	23.88	32.925	.499	.848
Empathic	23.75	30.054	.719	.807
Loving	23.57	29.395	.788	.793
Passionate	23.27	34.588	.495	.847
Sensitive	24.12	30.522	.642	.821
Tender	24.45	29.653	.659	.818

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
28.61	43.593	6.602	6

Factor analysis recognizability

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.934
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi–Square	3089.779
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.720	48.598	48.598	9.720	48.598	48.598	4.818	24.092	24.092
2	1.913	9.565	58.164	1.913	9.565	58.164	4.488	22.438	46.530
3	1.451	7.256	65.420	1.451	7.256	65.420	3.778	18.890	65.420
4	.824	4.122	69.543						
5	.747	3.734	73.277						
6	.588	2.942	76.218						
7	.518	2.591	78.809						
8	.477	2.387	81.196						
9	.459	2.297	83.492						
10	.424	2.121	85.613						
11	.413	2.066	87.679						
12	.381	1.907	89.586						
13	.372	1.860	91.446						
14	.347	1.736	93.181						
15	.289	1.446	94.627						
16	.268	1.338	95.965						
17	.230	1.152	97.117						
18	.213	1.066	98.184						
19	.200	1.000	99.183						
20	.163	.817	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component		
	1	2	3
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me.	.810		
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences.	.786		
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have.	.772		
I recognize my life in the life of this character	.763		.355
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in	.746		
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me.	.692	.362	
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life.	.621	.374	

I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have.		.796	
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have.		.731	.318
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have.		.720	
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make.	.349	.708	
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow.	.376	.685	
I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have.		.666	
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have.		.633	.361
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have.	.366	.447	.429

	1	2	3
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have	.304		.813
I recognize myself in this character			.791
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have.			.761
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have			.749
I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show.	.317	.386	.594

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

 a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Component Transformation Matrix

Component	1	2	3
1	.615	.584	.530
2	−.728	.679	.095
3	.304	.444	−.843

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Reliability personality recognizability

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	238	99.6
	Excluded[a]	1	.4
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all
variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.889	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have	3.67	1.502	238
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have	3.52	1.503	238
I recognize myself in this character	3.43	1.584	238
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have.	3.79	1.541	238
I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show.	3.95	1.662	238

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I recognize the personality traits of this character as traits that I have	14.70	27.081	.818	.846
I recognize the weaknesses of this character as weaknesses that I have	14.85	28.956	.674	.878
I recognize myself in this character	14.94	26.824	.780	.854
I recognize the strengths of this character as strengths that I have.	14.58	28.119	.712	.869
I recognize the behaviors of this character as behaviors that I could show.	14.42	27.552	.677	.879

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
18.37	42.124	6.490	5

Reliability situational recognizability

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	237	99.2
	Excluded[a]	2	.8
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.914	7

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me.	3.27	1.751	237
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences.	2.88	1.609	237
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have.	3.65	1.660	237
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in	3.05	1.606	237
I recognize my life in the life of this character	3.16	1.612	237
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life.	4.02	1.665	237
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me.	3.82	1.637	237

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I recognize the situations that this character encounters as situations that could also happen to me.	20.57	64.144	.737	.901
I recognize the past experiences of this character as similar to my past experiences.	20.97	66.160	.731	.902
I recognize the problems thatthis character has as the problems that I could have.	20.20	64.660	.767	.898
I recognize the places, in which I see this character as the places I could be in	20.80	66.549	.716	.903
I recognize my life in the life of this character	20.69	64.443	.805	.894
I recognize the topics that this character discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life.	19.83	66.946	.667	.908
I recognize the life changes this character experiences as life changes that could happen to me.	20.03	65.508	.743	.900

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
23.85	87.875	9.374	7

Reliability attitudinal recognizability

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	238	99.6
	Excluded[a]	1	.4
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.899	8

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have.	3.53	1.522	238
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have.	4.44	1.447	238
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow.	4.12	1.503	238
I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have.	4.32	1.368	238
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have.	3.99	1.494	238
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have.	4.30	1.432	238
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make.	4.22	1.528	238
I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have.	4.34	1.489	238

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I recognize this character's approach to life as an approach to life that I have.	29.72	64.235	.605	.893
I recognize this character's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have.	28.81	64.424	.637	.890
I recognize the solutions to problems of this character as solutions I could follow.	29.13	62.963	.674	.887
I recognize this character's opinions about other people as opinions I have.	28.93	64.055	.703	.884
I recognize the thought processes before decisions of this character as thought processes I have.	29.26	61.923	.730	.881
I recognize this character's opinions about social problems as opinions I have.	28.95	63.027	.714	.883
I recognize the decisions of this character as decisions that I could make.	29.03	61.206	.743	.880
I recognize the reactions to stressful situations of this character as reactions that I could have.	28.91	63.401	.662	.888

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
33.25	81.310	9.017	8

Factor analysis similarity

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.812
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi–Square	791.324
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.553	71.052	71.052	3.553	71.052	71.052
2	.669	13.372	84.424			
3	.326	6.524	90.949			
4	.314	6.276	97.224			
5	.139	2.776	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix[a]

	Component 1
I think the this character is like me	.869
This character has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine	.849
This character behaves like me	.848
This character shares my values	.839
This character treats people like I do	.807

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Reliability similarity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	237	99.2
	Excluded[a]	2	.8
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.898	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I think the this character is like me	3.32	1.564	237
This character behaves like me	3.19	1.528	237
This character shares my values	4.21	1.564	237
This character treats people like I do	4.11	1.510	237
This character has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine	4.10	1.481	237

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I think the this character is like me	15.62	26.491	.783	.868
This character behaves like me	15.74	27.209	.753	.874
This character shares my values	14.73	27.013	.743	.877
This character treats people like I do	14.82	28.045	.702	.885
This character has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine	14.84	27.570	.757	.874

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
18.94	41.543	6.445	5

Factor analysis character meaningfulness

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.904
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2342.315
	df	45
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.662	66.616	66.616	6.662	66.616	66.616	4.477	44.771	44.771
2	1.302	13.021	79.637	1.302	13.021	79.637	3.487	34.866	79.637
3	.477	4.772	84.409						
4	.434	4.343	88.752						
5	.338	3.379	92.130						
6	.237	2.366	94.496						
7	.190	1.900	96.396						
8	.168	1.685	98.080						
9	.114	1.136	99.216						
10	.078	.784	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component	
	1	2
It was fun for me to watch this character	.901	
I had a good time watching this character	.895	
The character was entertaining	.848	
It made me happy to watch the character	.840	.347
I felt good watching the character	.782	.454
I like the character because the character enriches my way of thinking		.914
I think it's good that the character encourages me to think		.852
The character was thought-provoking.	.330	.738
I found this character to be very meaningful	.564	.665
I was moved by this character	.567	.653

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Factor analysis parasocial relationship

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.941
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2298.523
	df	66
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.525	62.707	62.707	7.525	62.707	62.707
2	.889	7.411	70.117			
3	.668	5.564	75.682			
4	.591	4.923	80.605			
5	.552	4.602	85.207			
6	.444	3.702	88.909			
7	.394	3.287	92.195			
8	.247	2.057	94.252			
9	.225	1.879	96.131			
10	.193	1.611	97.743			
11	.145	1.210	98.953			
12	.126	1.047	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix[a]

	Component 1
I am interested in this character	.897
I find this character fascinating	.893
This character is engaging to watch	.888
I would like to know more about this character	.880
I would miss character if he or she did not appear in future movies	.847
If this character appeared in a new movie, I would watch it	.819
I have looked forward to watching this character in new movies	.807
If I saw a story about this character in a magazine or online, I would read it	.765
I would like to meet this character in person	.702
I feel sorry for this character when they make a mistake	.695
This character seems to understand things that I want to know	.675
I feel I know this character very well	.552

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Reliability parasocial relationship

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	238	99.6
	Excluded[a]	1	.4
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.944	12

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I have looked forward to watching this character in new movies	5.19	1.527	238
If this character appeared in a new movie, I would watch it	5.26	1.420	238
This character seems to understand things that I want to know	4.41	1.503	238
I would miss character if he or she did not appear in future movies	4.72	1.689	238
I feel sorry for this character when they make a mistake	4.74	1.504	238
I would like to meet this character in person	4.63	1.517	238
If I saw a story about this character in a magazine or online, I would read it	4.56	1.535	238
I feel I know this character very well	4.34	1.425	238
I would like to know more about this character	4.93	1.549	238
I am interested in this character	4.97	1.555	238
I find this character fascinating	4.76	1.602	238
This character is engaging to watch	5.09	1.559	238

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I have looked forward to watching this character in new movies	52.41	176.892	.757	.939
If this character appeared in a new movie, I would watch it	52.34	178.570	.774	.939
This character seems to understand things that I want to know	53.19	182.500	.621	.944
I would miss character if he or she did not appear in future movies	52.87	171.452	.807	.937
I feel sorry for this character when they make a mistake	52.86	181.732	.640	.943
I would like to meet this character in person	52.97	180.978	.654	.942
If I saw a story about this character in a magazine or online, I would read it	53.03	178.159	.719	.940
I feel I know this character very well	53.26	188.438	.499	.947
I would like to know more about this character	52.66	173.093	.846	.936
I am interested in this character	52.63	172.286	.864	.935
I find this character fascinating	52.84	171.291	.862	.935
This character is engaging to watch	52.50	172.546	.854	.936

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
57.60	209.972	14.490	12

Reliability character enjoyment

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	239	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.947	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
It was fun for me to watch this character	5.26	1.395	239
I had a good time watching this character	5.21	1.427	239
The character was entertaining	5.24	1.435	239
It made me happy to watch the character	4.93	1.414	239
I felt good watching the character	4.96	1.437	239

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
It was fun for me to watch this character	20.33	26.887	.893	.929
I had a good time watching this character	20.38	26.406	.908	.926
The character was entertaining	20.35	27.992	.772	.950
It made me happy to watch the character	20.66	27.023	.867	.933
I felt good watching the character	20.63	27.091	.843	.938

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
25.59	41.764	6.463	5

Reliability character appreciation

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	237	99.2
	Excluded[a]	2	.8
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.907	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I found this character to be very meaningful	4.87	1.553	237
I was moved by this character	4.49	1.648	237
The character was thought-provoking.	4.44	1.538	237
I like the character because the character enriches my way of thinking	4.17	1.652	237
I think it's good that the character encourages me to think	4.44	1.544	237

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I found this character to be very meaningful	17.54	30.012	.791	.880
I was moved by this character	17.92	29.328	.774	.884
The character was thought-provoking.	17.97	31.330	.707	.898
I like the character because the character enriches my way of thinking	18.24	28.811	.808	.876
I think it's good that the character encourages me to think	17.97	30.737	.745	.890

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
22.41	45.871	6.773	5

Factor analysis realism

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.713
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi–Square	299.981
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.421	48.424	48.424	2.421	48.424	48.424
2	1.188	23.752	72.176			
3	.546	10.915	83.091			
4	.502	10.037	93.128			
5	.344	6.872	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix[a]

	Component
	1
The character lets me really see how other people live	.872
The character let me see what happens in other place as if I were really there	.804
The character presents things as they really are in life	.792
If I see the character in film, I can't be sure he/she really is that way	−.576
The character does not show life as it really is	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Reliability realism

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	233	97.5
	Excluded[a]	6	2.5
	Total	239	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.348	4

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The character presents things as they really are in life	4.00	1.538	233
The character lets me really see how other people live	3.85	1.541	233
The character let me see what happens in other place as if I were really there	4.03	1.453	233
If I see the character in film, I can't be sure he/she really is that way	3.76	1.432	233

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The character presents things as they really are in life	11.65	6.055	.479	-.120[a]
The character lets me really see how other people live	11.80	5.857	.511	-.172[a]
The character let me see what happens in other place as if I were really there	11.62	6.546	.456	-.057[a]
If I see the character in film, I can't be sure he/she really is that way	11.89	14.536	-.416	.793

a. The value is negative due to a negative average covariance among items. This violates reliability model assumptions. You may want to check item codings.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
15.66	12.045	3.471	4

ANOVA positive masculinity

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: PMasculinity_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	4.2339	.87698	62
Mighty Thor	5.0891	1.12794	64
Valkyrie	4.8517	1.22741	60
Korg	4.0107	1.08204	53
Total	4.5685	1.16392	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: PMasculinity_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	45.588ª	3	15.196	12.900	.000	.141
Intercept	4914.721	1	4914.721	4172.048	.000	.947
Character	45.588	3	15.196	12.900	.000	.141
Error	276.833	235	1.178			
Total	5310.591	239				
Corrected Total	322.420	238				

a. R Squared = .141 (Adjusted R Squared = .130)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: PMasculinity_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	-.8552*	.19341	.000	-1.3556	-.3547
	Valkyrie	-.6178*	.19655	.010	-1.1264	-.1092
	Korg	.2232	.20304	.690	-.3022	.7486
Mighty Thor	Thor	.8552*	.19341	.000	.3547	1.3556
	Valkyrie	.2374	.19504	.617	-.2673	.7421
	Korg	1.0784*	.20158	.000	.5568	1.6000
Valkyrie	Thor	.6178*	.19655	.010	.1092	1.1264
	Mighty Thor	-.2374	.19504	.617	-.7421	.2673
	Korg	.8410*	.20460	.000	.3116	1.3704
Korg	Thor	-.2232	.20304	.690	-.7486	.3022
	Mighty Thor	-1.0784*	.20158	.000	-1.6000	-.5568
	Valkyrie	-.8410*	.20460	.000	-1.3704	-.3116

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.178.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA negative masculinity

Between–Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: NMasculinity_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	4.1785	1.03523	62
Mighty Thor	3.1172	1.30954	64
Valkyrie	3.5911	1.16903	60
Korg	3.3874	1.65134	53
Total	3.5714	1.34994	239

Tests of Between–Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: NMasculinity_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	37.872^a	3	12.624	7.494	.000	.087
Intercept	3028.048	1	3028.048	1797.662	.000	.884
Character	37.872	3	12.624	7.494	.000	.087
Error	395.843	235	1.684			
Total	3482.150	239				
Corrected Total	433.715	238				

a. R Squared = .087 (Adjusted R Squared = .076)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: NMasculinity_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	1.0613*	.23127	.000	.4629	1.6597
	Valkyrie	.5874	.23504	.063	–.0208	1.1955
	Korg	.7911*	.24280	.007	.1628	1.4193
Mighty Thor	Thor	–1.0613*	.23127	.000	–1.6597	–.4629
	Valkyrie	–.4739	.23322	.179	–1.0774	.1295
	Korg	–.2702	.24104	.677	–.8939	.3535
Valkyrie	Thor	–.5874	.23504	.063	–1.1955	.0208
	Mighty Thor	.4739	.23322	.179	–.1295	1.0774
	Korg	.2037	.24465	.839	–.4294	.8367
Korg	Thor	–.7911*	.24280	.007	–1.4193	–.1628
	Mighty Thor	.2702	.24104	.677	–.3535	.8939
	Valkyrie	–.2037	.24465	.839	–.8367	.4294

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.684.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA positive femininity

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: PFemininity_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	5.0177	.97043	62
Mighty Thor	4.9417	.98979	64
Valkyrie	4.2778	.95996	60
Korg	4.8252	1.32357	53
Total	4.7689	1.09433	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: PFemininity_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	20.389[a]	3	6.796	6.035	.001	.072
Intercept	5400.214	1	5400.214	4795.533	.000	.953
Character	20.389	3	6.796	6.035	.001	.072
Error	264.632	235	1.126			
Total	5720.452	239				
Corrected Total	285.021	238				

a. R Squared = .072 (Adjusted R Squared = .060)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: PFemininity_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	.0761	.18910	.978	-.4132	.5654
	Valkyrie	.7400*	.19217	.001	.2427	1.2372
	Korg	.1926	.19852	.767	-.3211	.7063
Mighty Thor	Thor	-.0761	.18910	.978	-.5654	.4132
	Valkyrie	.6639*	.19069	.003	.1705	1.1573
	Korg	.1165	.19708	.935	-.3934	.6265
Valkyrie	Thor	-.7400*	.19217	.001	-1.2372	-.2427
	Mighty Thor	-.6639*	.19069	.003	-1.1573	-.1705
	Korg	-.5474*	.20004	.034	-1.0650	-.0298
Korg	Thor	-.1926	.19852	.767	-.7063	.3211
	Mighty Thor	-.1165	.19708	.935	-.6265	.3934
	Valkyrie	.5474*	.20004	.034	.0298	1.0650

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.126.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA negative femininity

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: NFemininity_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	3.6183	1.15564	62
Mighty Thor	3.2057	1.18178	64
Valkyrie	2.7167	1.14294	60
Korg	3.6635	1.05383	53
Total	3.2915	1.19264	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: NFemininity_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	34.253[a]	3	11.418	8.818	.000	.101
Intercept	2591.089	1	2591.089	2001.181	.000	.895
Character	34.253	3	11.418	8.818	.000	.101
Error	304.273	235	1.295			
Total	2927.833	239				
Corrected Total	338.526	238				

a. R Squared = .101 (Adjusted R Squared = .090)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: NFemininity_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	.4126	.20277	.178	-.1121	.9372
	Valkyrie	.9016*	.20607	.000	.3684	1.4348
	Korg	-.0452	.21287	.997	-.5960	.5056
Mighty Thor	Thor	-.4126	.20277	.178	-.9372	.1121
	Valkyrie	.4891	.20448	.081	-.0400	1.0181
	Korg	-.4578	.21133	.136	-1.0046	.0890
Valkyrie	Thor	-.9016*	.20607	.000	-1.4348	-.3684
	Mighty Thor	-.4891	.20448	.081	-1.0181	.0400
	Korg	-.9469*	.21450	.000	-1.5019	-.3918
Korg	Thor	.0452	.21287	.997	-.5056	.5960
	Mighty Thor	.4578	.21133	.136	-.0890	1.0046
	Valkyrie	.9469*	.21450	.000	.3918	1.5019

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.295.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA perceived similarity

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Similarity_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	3.5355	1.21616	62
Mighty Thor	4.0445	1.29514	64
Valkyrie	3.8108	1.37813	60
Korg	3.7623	1.22792	53
Total	3.7912	1.28761	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Similarity_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	8.229[a]	3	2.743	1.668	.175	.021
Intercept	3412.417	1	3412.417	2075.585	.000	.898
Character	8.229	3	2.743	1.668	.175	.021
Error	386.358	235	1.644			
Total	3829.805	239				
Corrected Total	394.587	238				

a. R Squared = .021 (Adjusted R Squared = .008)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Similarity_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	-.5090	.22849	.119	-1.1003	.0822
	Valkyrie	-.2753	.23220	.636	-.8762	.3255
	Korg	-.2268	.23987	.780	-.8474	.3939
Mighty Thor	Thor	.5090	.22849	.119	-.0822	1.1003
	Valkyrie	.2337	.23041	.741	-.3625	.8299
	Korg	.2823	.23814	.637	-.3339	.8984
Valkyrie	Thor	.2753	.23220	.636	-.3255	.8762
	Mighty Thor	-.2337	.23041	.741	-.8299	.3625
	Korg	.0486	.24171	.997	-.5768	.6740
Korg	Thor	.2268	.23987	.780	-.3939	.8474
	Mighty Thor	-.2823	.23814	.637	-.8984	.3339
	Valkyrie	-.0486	.24171	.997	-.6740	.5768

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.644.

ANOVA personality recognizability

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Personality_recognizability_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	3.5742	1.39012	62
Mighty Thor	3.8844	1.22917	64
Valkyrie	3.6958	1.18072	60
Korg	3.5321	1.39115	53
Total	3.6785	1.29720	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Personality_recognizability_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	4.542^a	3	1.514	.898	.443	.011
Intercept	3205.484	1	3205.484	1902.485	.000	.890
Character	4.542	3	1.514	.898	.443	.011
Error	395.950	235	1.685			
Total	3634.403	239				
Corrected Total	400.492	238				

a. R Squared = .011 (Adjusted R Squared = −.001)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Personality_recognizability_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I−J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	−.3102	.23131	.538	−.9087	.2883
	Valkyrie	−.1216	.23507	.955	−.7299	.4866
	Korg	.0421	.24283	.998	−.5862	.6704
Mighty Thor	Thor	.3102	.23131	.538	−.2883	.9087
	Valkyrie	.1885	.23326	.850	−.4150	.7921
	Korg	.3523	.24107	.463	−.2715	.9761
Valkyrie	Thor	.1216	.23507	.955	−.4866	.7299
	Mighty Thor	−.1885	.23326	.850	−.7921	.4150
	Korg	.1638	.24469	.909	−.4694	.7969
Korg	Thor	−.0421	.24283	.998	−.6704	.5862
	Mighty Thor	−.3523	.24107	.463	−.9761	.2715
	Valkyrie	−.1638	.24469	.909	−.7969	.4694

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.685.

ANOVA situational recognizability

Between–Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Situational_recognizability_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	3.4002	1.36424	62
Mighty Thor	3.8304	1.28202	64
Valkyrie	3.2496	1.39577	60
Korg	3.1132	1.23348	53
Total	3.4139	1.34205	239

Tests of Between–Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Situational_recognizability_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	17.523[a]	3	5.841	3.339	.020	.041
Intercept	2746.057	1	2746.057	1569.611	.000	.870
Character	17.523	3	5.841	3.339	.020	.041
Error	411.136	235	1.750			
Total	3214.180	239				
Corrected Total	428.659	238				

a. R Squared = .041 (Adjusted R Squared = .029)

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Situational_recognizability_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	-.4302	.23570	.264	-1.0401	.1797
	Valkyrie	.1506	.23953	.923	-.4692	.7703
	Korg	.2869	.24744	.653	-.3533	.9272
Mighty Thor	Thor	.4302	.23570	.264	-.1797	1.0401
	Valkyrie	.5808	.23769	.072	-.0343	1.1958
	Korg	.7171*	.24565	.020	.0815	1.3528
Valkyrie	Thor	-.1506	.23953	.923	-.7703	.4692
	Mighty Thor	-.5808	.23769	.072	-1.1958	.0343
	Korg	.1364	.24934	.947	-.5088	.7816
Korg	Thor	-.2869	.24744	.653	-.9272	.3533
	Mighty Thor	-.7171*	.24565	.020	-1.3528	-.0815
	Valkyrie	-.1364	.24934	.947	-.7816	.5088

Based on observed means.
 The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.750.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA attitudinal recognizability

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	3.9335	1.07164	62
Mighty Thor	4.3630	1.09866	64
Valkyrie	4.3000	1.20165	60
Korg	3.9788	1.09871	53
Total	4.1506	1.12791	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	8.714^a	3	2.905	2.321	.076	.029
Intercept	4082.989	1	4082.989	3262.891	.000	.933
Character	8.714	3	2.905	2.321	.076	.029
Error	294.065	235	1.251			
Total	4420.054	239				
Corrected Total	302.780	238				

a. R Squared = .029 (Adjusted R Squared = .016)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	-.4295	.19934	.139	-.9453	.0863
	Valkyrie	-.3665	.20258	.272	-.8907	.1576
	Korg	-.0453	.20927	.996	-.5868	.4962
Mighty Thor	Thor	.4295	.19934	.139	-.0863	.9453
	Valkyrie	.0630	.20102	.989	-.4571	.5831
	Korg	.3842	.20776	.253	-.1533	.9218
Valkyrie	Thor	.3665	.20258	.272	-.1576	.8907
	Mighty Thor	-.0630	.20102	.989	-.5831	.4571
	Korg	.3212	.21087	.425	-.2244	.8669
Korg	Thor	.0453	.20927	.996	-.4962	.5868
	Mighty Thor	-.3842	.20776	.253	-.9218	.1533
	Valkyrie	-.3212	.21087	.425	-.8669	.2244

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.251.

ANOVA character enjoyment

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	5.4484	1.19105	62
Mighty Thor	5.0969	1.20738	64
Valkyrie	5.1633	1.35421	60
Korg	4.7057	1.35227	53
Total	5.1180	1.29250	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	15.931^a	3	5.310	3.270	.022	.040
Intercept	6193.348	1	6193.348	3813.419	.000	.942
Character	15.931	3	5.310	3.270	.022	.040
Error	381.662	235	1.624			
Total	6657.920	239				
Corrected Total	397.593	238				

a. R Squared = .040 (Adjusted R Squared = .028)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	.3515	.22709	.411	-.2361	.9391
	Valkyrie	.2851	.23079	.605	-.3121	.8822
	Korg	.7427*	.23841	.011	.1258	1.3596
Mighty Thor	Thor	-.3515	.22709	.411	-.9391	.2361
	Valkyrie	-.0665	.22901	.991	-.6590	.5261
	Korg	.3912	.23668	.351	-.2212	1.0036
Valkyrie	Thor	-.2851	.23079	.605	-.8822	.3121
	Mighty Thor	.0665	.22901	.991	-.5261	.6590
	Korg	.4577	.24023	.229	-.1639	1.0793
Korg	Thor	-.7427*	.23841	.011	-1.3596	-.1258
	Mighty Thor	-.3912	.23668	.351	-1.0036	.2212
	Valkyrie	-.4577	.24023	.229	-1.0793	.1639

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.624.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA character appreciation

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Appreciation_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	4.4323	1.42124	62
Mighty Thor	4.8188	1.26125	64
Valkyrie	4.6300	1.26589	60
Korg	4.0264	1.38622	53
Total	4.4954	1.35595	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Appreciation_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	19.683[a]	3	6.561	3.689	.013	.045
Intercept	4765.676	1	4765.676	2679.896	.000	.919
Character	19.683	3	6.561	3.689	.013	.045
Error	417.902	235	1.778			
Total	5267.440	239				
Corrected Total	437.585	238				

a. R Squared = .045 (Adjusted R Squared = .033)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Appreciation_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	−.3865	.23763	.366	−1.0014	.2284
	Valkyrie	−.1977	.24150	.846	−.8226	.4271
	Korg	.4058	.24947	.366	−.2397	1.0513
Mighty Thor	Thor	.3865	.23763	.366	−.2284	1.0014
	Valkyrie	.1887	.23963	.860	−.4313	.8088
	Korg	.7923*	.24767	.008	.1515	1.4332
Valkyrie	Thor	.1977	.24150	.846	−.4271	.8226
	Mighty Thor	−.1887	.23963	.860	−.8088	.4313
	Korg	.6036	.25138	.080	−.0469	1.2540
Korg	Thor	−.4058	.24947	.366	−1.0513	.2397
	Mighty Thor	−.7923*	.24767	.008	−1.4332	−.1515
	Valkyrie	−.6036	.25138	.080	−1.2540	.0469

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.778.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA character realism

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Realism_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	3.8226	1.22767	62
Mighty Thor	4.2578	1.19962	64
Valkyrie	4.0667	1.33869	60
Korg	3.7201	1.25225	53
Total	3.9777	1.26421	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Realism_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	10.505[a]	3	3.502	2.225	.086	.028
Intercept	3741.607	1	3741.607	2377.220	.000	.910
Character	10.505	3	3.502	2.225	.086	.028
Error	369.876	235	1.574			
Total	4161.833	239				
Corrected Total	380.381	238				

a. R Squared = .028 (Adjusted R Squared = .015)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Realism_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	-.4352	.22356	.211	-1.0137	.1432
	Valkyrie	-.2441	.22720	.706	-.8320	.3438
	Korg	.1025	.23470	.972	-.5048	.7097
Mighty Thor	Thor	.4352	.22356	.211	-.1432	1.0137
	Valkyrie	.1911	.22544	.831	-.3922	.7745
	Korg	.5377	.23300	.099	-.0652	1.1406
Valkyrie	Thor	.2441	.22720	.706	-.3438	.8320
	Mighty Thor	-.1911	.22544	.831	-.7745	.3922
	Korg	.3465	.23649	.460	-.2654	.9585
Korg	Thor	-.1025	.23470	.972	-.7097	.5048
	Mighty Thor	-.5377	.23300	.099	-1.1406	.0652
	Valkyrie	-.3465	.23649	.460	-.9585	.2654

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.574.

ANOVA parasocial relationship

Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Character	1	Thor	62
	2	Mighty Thor	64
	3	Valkyrie	60
	4	Korg	53

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean

Character	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Thor	5.0472	1.15761	62
Mighty Thor	4.8203	1.27348	64
Valkyrie	4.9236	1.15738	60
Korg	4.3318	1.13328	53
Total	4.7968	1.20587	239

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	16.348[a]	3	5.449	3.884	.010	.047
Intercept	5434.550	1	5434.550	3873.225	.000	.943
Character	16.348	3	5.449	3.884	.010	.047
Error	329.730	235	1.403			
Total	5845.194	239				
Corrected Total	346.079	238				

a. R Squared = .047 (Adjusted R Squared = .035)

Post Hoc Tests

Character

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean
Tukey HSD

(I) Character	(J) Character	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Thor	Mighty Thor	.2269	.21108	.705	-.3193	.7730
	Valkyrie	.1236	.21451	.939	-.4315	.6786
	Korg	.7154*	.22160	.008	.1420	1.2888
Mighty Thor	Thor	-.2269	.21108	.705	-.7730	.3193
	Valkyrie	-.1033	.21286	.962	-.6541	.4475
	Korg	.4886	.21999	.121	-.0807	1.0578
Valkyrie	Thor	-.1236	.21451	.939	-.6786	.4315
	Mighty Thor	.1033	.21286	.962	-.4475	.6541
	Korg	.5919*	.22329	.042	.0141	1.1696
Korg	Thor	-.7154*	.22160	.008	-1.2888	-.1420
	Mighty Thor	-.4886	.21999	.121	-1.0578	.0807
	Valkyrie	-.5919*	.22329	.042	-1.1696	-.0141

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.403.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability

DV: Perceived similarity

Compare group

Model Summary

Character	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Thor	1	.882[a]	.777	.766	.58834
Mighty Thor	1	.912[a]	.833	.824	.54307
Valkyrie	1	.857[b]	.735	.721	.72813
Korg	1	.912[b]	.832	.821	.51920

a. Predictors: (Constant), Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Character	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Thor	1	Regression	70.146	3	23.382	67.550	.000[b]
		Residual	20.076	58	.346		
		Total	90.222	61			
Mighty Thor	1	Regression	87.980	3	29.327	99.439	.000[b]
		Residual	17.695	60	.295		
		Total	105.676	63			
Valkyrie	1	Regression	82.366	3	27.455	51.786	.000[c]
		Residual	29.689	56	.530		
		Total	112.055	59			
Korg	1	Regression	65.196	3	21.732	80.617	.000[c]
		Residual	13.209	49	.270		
		Total	78.405	52			

a. Dependent Variable: Similarity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Character	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
Thor	1	(Constant)	−.336	.287		−1.169	.247
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.192	.076	.220	2.516	.015
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.123	.079	.138	1.556	.125
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.703	.101	.619	6.966	.000
Mighty Thor	1	(Constant)	−.645	.284		−2.267	.027
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.454	.079	.431	5.765	.000
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.004	.082	.004	.053	.958
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.667	.096	.566	6.929	.000
Valkyrie	1	(Constant)	−.661	.371		−1.782	.080
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.368	.111	.315	3.308	.002
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.005	.088	.005	.057	.955
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.720	.101	.628	7.127	.000
Korg	1	(Constant)	−.110	.272		−.406	.686
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.297	.079	.336	3.739	.000
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.033	.079	.033	.414	.681
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.684	.104	.612	6.595	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Similarity_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity

DV: parasocial relationship

All cases

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.580[a]	.336	.325	.99082	.336	29.631	4	234	.000
2	.676[b]	.457	.440	.90199	.121	17.118	3	231	.000
3	.681[c]	.463	.445	.89869	.006	2.700	1	230	.102

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	116.357	4	29.089	29.631	.000[b]
	Residual	229.721	234	.982		
	Total	346.079	238			
2	Regression	158.139	7	22.591	27.767	.000[c]
	Residual	187.940	231	.814		
	Total	346.079	238			
3	Regression	160.320	8	20.040	24.813	.000[d]
	Residual	185.759	230	.808		
	Total	346.079	238			

a. Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.384	.520		2.659	.008
	PMasculinity_Mean	.446	.057	.430	7.784	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.017	.057	.019	.305	.761
	PFemininity_Mean	.364	.073	.330	4.984	.000
	NFemininity_Mean	−.128	.060	−.127	−2.142	.033
2	(Constant)	1.163	.481		2.418	.016
	PMasculinity_Mean	.214	.061	.207	3.484	.001
	NMasculinity_Mean	.032	.053	.036	.608	.544
	PFemininity_Mean	.223	.069	.202	3.212	.002
	NFemininity_Mean	−.160	.056	−.158	−2.851	.005
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.140	.068	.150	2.068	.040
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.031	.062	.035	.501	.617
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.333	.081	.311	4.116	.000
3	(Constant)	1.213	.480		2.526	.012
	PMasculinity_Mean	.215	.061	.207	3.506	.001
	NMasculinity_Mean	.043	.053	.048	.806	.421
	PFemininity_Mean	.211	.070	.191	3.031	.003
	NFemininity_Mean	−.159	.056	−.157	−2.846	.005
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.093	.073	.100	1.272	.205
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.021	.062	.023	.330	.742
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.225	.104	.210	2.158	.032
	Similarity_Mean	.164	.100	.175	1.643	.102

a. Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity
DV: parasocial relationship
Compare group

Model Summary

Character	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
						R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
Thor	1	.611[a]	.373	.329	.94819	.373	8.480	4	57	.000
	2	.685[b]	.469	.401	.89623	.096	3.267	3	54	.028
	3	.711[c]	.505	.431	.87352	.036	3.844	1	53	.055
Mighty Thor	1	.641[d]	.411	.371	1.00995	.411	10.292	4	59	.000
	2	.728[e]	.530	.472	.92570	.119	4.743	3	56	.005
	3	.742[f]	.550	.485	.91393	.020	2.451	1	55	.123
Valkyrie	1	.636[g]	.404	.361	.92504	.404	9.340	4	55	.000
	2	.788[h]	.621	.570	.75913	.216	9.890	3	52	.000
	3	.790[i]	.623	.564	.76389	.003	.354	1	51	.555
Korg	1	.660[d]	.436	.389	.88568	.436	9.284	4	48	.000
	2	.753[j]	.566	.499	.80232	.130	4.498	3	45	.008
	3	.756[k]	.572	.494	.80629	.005	.558	1	44	.459

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

g. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean

h. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

i. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

j. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean

k. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Character	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Thor	1	Regression	30.497	4	7.624	8.480	.000[b]
		Residual	51.247	57	.899		
		Total	81.744	61			
	2	Regression	38.370	7	5.481	6.824	.000[c]
		Residual	43.375	54	.803		
		Total	81.744	61			
	3	Regression	41.303	8	5.163	6.766	.000[d]
		Residual	40.441	53	.763		
		Total	81.744	61			
Mighty Thor	1	Regression	41.990	4	10.498	10.292	.000[e]
		Residual	60.180	59	1.020		
		Total	102.170	63			
	2	Regression	54.183	7	7.740	9.033	.000[f]
		Residual	47.987	56	.857		
		Total	102.170	63			
	3	Regression	56.230	8	7.029	8.415	.000[g]
		Residual	45.940	55	.835		
		Total	102.170	63			
Valkyrie	1	Regression	31.968	4	7.992	9.340	.000[h]
		Residual	47.064	55	.856		
		Total	79.032	59			
	2	Regression	49.066	7	7.009	12.163	.000[i]
		Residual	29.966	52	.576		
		Total	79.032	59			
	3	Regression	49.272	8	6.159	10.555	.000[j]
		Residual	29.760	51	.584		
		Total	79.032	59			

Korg	1	Regression	29.132	4	7.283	9.284	.000^e
		Residual	37.653	48	.784		
		Total	66.785	52			
	2	Regression	37.817	7	5.402	8.393	.000^k
		Residual	28.967	45	.644		
		Total	66.785	52			
	3	Regression	38.180	8	4.772	7.341	.000^l
		Residual	28.605	44	.650		
		Total	66.785	52			

a. Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

g. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

h. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean

i. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

j. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

k. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean

l. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Character	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
Thor	1	(Constant)	3.321	1.074		3.093	.003
		PMasculinity_Mean	.341	.142	.258	2.407	.019
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.282	.129	−.252	−2.180	.033
		PFemininity_Mean	.458	.146	.384	3.143	.003
		NFemininity_Mean	−.232	.113	−.231	−2.056	.044
	2	(Constant)	3.524	1.041		3.386	.001
		PMasculinity_Mean	.131	.155	.100	.850	.399
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.263	.124	−.235	−2.114	.039
		PFemininity_Mean	.213	.161	.179	1.320	.192
		NFemininity_Mean	−.169	.111	−.169	−1.527	.133
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.121	.123	.145	.981	.331
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.209	.127	−.246	−1.649	.105
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.480	.176	.444	2.728	.009
	3	(Constant)	3.500	1.014		3.450	.001
		PMasculinity_Mean	.091	.152	.069	.599	.551
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.210	.124	−.188	−1.691	.097
		PFemininity_Mean	.171	.159	.143	1.078	.286
		NFemininity_Mean	−.128	.110	−.128	−1.159	.252
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.052	.125	.063	.417	.679
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.274	.128	−.323	−2.142	.037
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.240	.211	.222	1.139	.260
		Similarity_Mean	.408	.208	.429	1.961	.055
Mighty Thor	1	(Constant)	−.099	1.043		−.095	.925
		PMasculinity_Mean	.545	.121	.483	4.510	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	.018	.119	.019	.154	.878
		PFemininity_Mean	.409	.160	.318	2.559	.013
		NFemininity_Mean	.020	.125	.018	.156	.876
	2	(Constant)	.350	.984		.356	.723
		PMasculinity_Mean	.314	.132	.278	2.377	.021
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.050	.114	−.051	−.434	.666
		PFemininity_Mean	.224	.156	.174	1.433	.157
		NFemininity_Mean	−.030	.117	−.028	−.255	.800
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.053	.143	.051	.371	.712
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.282	.147	.284	1.925	.059
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.167	.178	.144	.940	.351
	3	(Constant)	.692	.995		.695	.490
		PMasculinity_Mean	.318	.131	.281	2.434	.018
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.089	.116	−.092	−.770	.445
		PFemininity_Mean	.206	.155	.160	1.331	.189
		NFemininity_Mean	.010	.118	.009	.082	.935
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.115	.177	−.111	−.649	.519
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.294	.145	.296	2.028	.047
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.083	.237	−.072	−.351	.727
		Similarity_Mean	.352	.225	.358	1.565	.123

			B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Valkyrie	1	(Constant)	3.234	1.029		3.142	.003
		PMasculinity_Mean	.535	.108	.567	4.970	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.101	.143	−.102	−.707	.482
		PFemininity_Mean	−.027	.153	−.022	−.174	.862
		NFemininity_Mean	−.158	.126	−.156	−1.258	.214
	2	(Constant)	2.140	.870		2.459	.017
		PMasculinity_Mean	.305	.099	.323	3.073	.003
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.005	.119	−.005	−.044	.965
		PFemininity_Mean	−.109	.129	−.090	−.841	.404
		NFemininity_Mean	−.236	.112	−.233	−2.101	.040
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.329	.123	.336	2.688	.010
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.049	.100	.059	.486	.629
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.245	.121	.254	2.020	.049
	3	(Constant)	2.113	.877		2.410	.020
		PMasculinity_Mean	.305	.100	.324	3.058	.004
		NMasculinity_Mean	.020	.127	.020	.157	.876
		PFemininity_Mean	−.111	.130	−.092	−.853	.398
		NFemininity_Mean	−.249	.115	−.246	−2.163	.035
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.303	.131	.309	2.312	.025
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.046	.101	.055	.454	.652
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.185	.158	.192	1.168	.248
		Similarity_Mean	.090	.152	.108	.595	.555
Korg	1	(Constant)	.570	1.083		.526	.601
		PMasculinity_Mean	.540	.115	.515	4.709	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	.039	.104	.057	.373	.711
		PFemininity_Mean	.366	.134	.428	2.730	.009
		NFemininity_Mean	−.082	.127	−.077	−.647	.521
	2	(Constant)	.706	.996		.708	.482
		PMasculinity_Mean	.308	.128	.294	2.409	.020
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.006	.106	−.009	−.059	.954
		PFemininity_Mean	.226	.129	.264	1.756	.086
		NFemininity_Mean	−.151	.119	−.141	−1.276	.208
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.024	.141	.029	.169	.867
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.059	.135	.065	.441	.661
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.404	.173	.392	2.337	.024
	3	(Constant)	.885	1.030		.860	.395
		PMasculinity_Mean	.318	.129	.303	2.463	.018
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.013	.107	−.019	−.120	.905
		PFemininity_Mean	.196	.136	.228	1.440	.157
		NFemininity_Mean	−.171	.122	−.159	−1.400	.169
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.028	.158	−.034	−.176	.861
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.057	.135	.062	.420	.677
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.280	.240	.271	1.163	.251
		Similarity_Mean	.188	.251	.203	.747	.459

a. Dependent Variable: Parasocial_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship
DV: character realism
All cases

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.504ᵃ	.254	.241	1.10152	.254	19.874	4	234	.000
2	.689ᵇ	.475	.459	.92988	.221	32.453	3	231	.000
3	.697ᶜ	.486	.468	.92199	.011	4.974	1	230	.027
4	.715ᵈ	.512	.493	.90042	.026	12.148	1	229	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	96.457	4	24.114	19.874	.000[b]
	Residual	283.924	234	1.213		
	Total	380.381	238			
2	Regression	180.640	7	25.806	29.844	.000[c]
	Residual	199.741	231	.865		
	Total	380.381	238			
3	Regression	184.868	8	23.108	27.185	.000[d]
	Residual	195.513	230	.850		
	Total	380.381	238			
4	Regression	194.717	9	21.635	26.685	.000[e]
	Residual	185.664	229	.811		
	Total	380.381	238			

a. Dependent Variable: Realism_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.326	.579		.563	.574
	PMasculinity_Mean	.514	.064	.473	8.076	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.068	.064	.073	1.074	.284
	PFemininity_Mean	.080	.081	.069	.987	.325
	NFemininity_Mean	.206	.067	.194	3.090	.002
2	(Constant)	.317	.496		.640	.523
	PMasculinity_Mean	.259	.063	.238	4.086	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.041	.054	.044	.750	.454
	PFemininity_Mean	−.067	.072	−.058	−.942	.347
	NFemininity_Mean	.125	.058	.118	2.173	.031
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.006	.070	−.006	−.085	.932
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.379	.064	.402	5.897	.000
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.233	.083	.208	2.799	.006
3	(Constant)	.387	.493		.785	.433
	PMasculinity_Mean	.260	.063	.239	4.133	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.056	.054	.059	1.022	.308
	PFemininity_Mean	−.084	.071	−.073	−1.181	.239
	NFemininity_Mean	.127	.057	.119	2.212	.028
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.071	.075	−.073	−.947	.344
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.364	.064	.387	5.684	.000
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.083	.107	.074	.775	.439
	Similarity_Mean	.228	.102	.233	2.230	.027
4	(Constant)	.108	.488		.221	.826
	PMasculinity_Mean	.210	.063	.194	3.338	.001
	NMasculinity_Mean	.046	.053	.049	.860	.390
	PFemininity_Mean	−.133	.071	−.115	−1.869	.063
	NFemininity_Mean	.163	.057	.154	2.869	.004
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.092	.074	−.095	−1.258	.210
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.360	.063	.382	5.743	.000
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.031	.105	.028	.294	.769
	Similarity_Mean	.191	.101	.194	1.895	.059
	Parasocial_Mean	.230	.066	.220	3.485	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Realism_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship, character realism

DV: character enjoyment

All cases

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
					Change Statistics				
1	.539[a]	.291	.279	1.09770	.291	23.992	4	234	.000
2	.613[b]	.376	.357	1.03649	.085	10.485	3	231	.000
3	.613[c]	.376	.354	1.03873	.000	.002	1	230	.961
4	.887[d]	.787	.779	.60767	.411	443.056	1	229	.000
5	.888[e]	.788	.779	.60826	.001	.556	1	228	.457

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	115.637	4	28.909	23.992	.000[b]
	Residual	281.956	234	1.205		
	Total	397.593	238			
2	Regression	149.429	7	21.347	19.871	.000[c]
	Residual	248.164	231	1.074		
	Total	397.593	238			
3	Regression	149.431	8	18.679	17.312	.000[d]
	Residual	248.161	230	1.079		
	Total	397.593	238			
4	Regression	313.033	9	34.781	94.193	.000[e]
	Residual	84.560	229	.369		
	Total	397.593	238			
5	Regression	313.238	10	31.324	84.665	.000[f]
	Residual	84.354	228	.370		
	Total	397.593	238			

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.021	.577		3.505	.001
	PMasculinity_Mean	.375	.063	.338	5.912	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	−.018	.063	−.019	−.292	.771
	PFemininity_Mean	.415	.081	.351	5.126	.000
	NFemininity_Mean	−.161	.066	−.148	−2.420	.016
2	(Constant)	1.733	.553		3.134	.002
	PMasculinity_Mean	.169	.071	.152	2.392	.018
	NMasculinity_Mean	.001	.061	.001	.021	.983
	PFemininity_Mean	.288	.080	.244	3.612	.000
	NFemininity_Mean	−.174	.064	−.160	−2.701	.007
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.103	.078	.103	1.327	.186
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.032	.072	−.033	−.444	.657
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.370	.093	.323	3.981	.000
3	(Constant)	1.734	.555		3.124	.002
	PMasculinity_Mean	.169	.071	.152	2.387	.018
	NMasculinity_Mean	.002	.061	.002	.027	.978
	PFemininity_Mean	.288	.080	.244	3.579	.000
	NFemininity_Mean	−.174	.064	−.160	−2.694	.008
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.102	.085	.102	1.201	.231
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.032	.072	−.033	−.446	.656
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.366	.120	.319	3.045	.003
	Similarity_Mean	.006	.115	.006	.049	.961

4	(Constant)	.596	.329		1.810	.072
	PMasculinity_Mean	−.033	.043	−.029	−.766	.445
	NMasculinity_Mean	−.038	.036	−.040	−1.071	.285
	PFemininity_Mean	.090	.048	.076	1.874	.062
	NFemininity_Mean	−.025	.038	−.023	−.644	.520
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.014	.050	.014	.286	.775
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.052	.042	−.053	−1.219	.224
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.155	.071	.136	2.187	.030
	Similarity_Mean	−.148	.068	−.148	−2.184	.030
	Parasocial_Mean	.938	.045	.876	21.049	.000
5	(Constant)	.599	.330		1.819	.070
	PMasculinity_Mean	−.026	.044	−.023	−.586	.558
	NMasculinity_Mean	−.037	.036	−.039	−1.026	.306
	PFemininity_Mean	.085	.048	.072	1.766	.079
	NFemininity_Mean	−.019	.039	−.018	−.493	.622
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.011	.050	.011	.223	.823
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.040	.045	−.041	−.874	.383
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.156	.071	.136	2.199	.029
	Similarity_Mean	−.142	.068	−.141	−2.073	.039
	Parasocial_Mean	.946	.046	.883	20.659	.000
	Realism_Mean	−.033	.045	−.033	−.745	.457

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship, character realism
DV: character enjoyment
Compare groups

Model Summary

Character	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
						Change Statistics				
Thor	1	.588[a]	.346	.300	.99670	.346	7.527	4	57	.000
	2	.645[b]	.417	.341	.96691	.071	2.189	3	54	.100
	3	.684[c]	.467	.387	.93268	.051	5.037	1	53	.029
	4	.880[d]	.774	.735	.61284	.307	70.757	1	52	.000
	5	.885[e]	.783	.741	.60621	.009	2.144	1	51	.149
Mighty Thor	1	.701[f]	.491	.457	.89009	.491	14.230	4	59	.000
	2	.777[g]	.604	.555	.80571	.113	5.335	3	56	.003
	3	.777[h]	.604	.547	.81282	.000	.025	1	55	.876
	4	.923[i]	.852	.827	.50189	.248	90.255	1	54	.000
	5	.924[j]	.853	.825	.50464	.001	.413	1	53	.523
Valkyrie	1	.595[k]	.355	.308	1.12688	.355	7.551	4	55	.000
	2	.694[l]	.482	.412	1.03847	.127	4.254	3	52	.009
	3	.694[m]	.482	.401	1.04824	.000	.036	1	51	.850
	4	.935[n]	.874	.852	.52165	.392	155.938	1	50	.000
	5	.935[o]	.874	.849	.52691	.000	.006	1	49	.937
Korg	1	.548[f]	.300	.242	1.17748	.300	5.146	4	48	.002
	2	.657[p]	.431	.343	1.09619	.131	3.461	3	45	.024
	3	.657[q]	.432	.329	1.10804	.001	.043	1	44	.838
	4	.868[r]	.753	.702	.73842	.322	56.074	1	43	.000
	5	.870[s]	.757	.699	.74181	.004	.608	1	42	.440

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Character	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Thor	1	Regression	29.910	4	7.478	7.527	.000[b]
		Residual	56.625	57	.993		
		Total	86.535	61			
	2	Regression	36.050	7	5.150	5.508	.000[c]
		Residual	50.485	54	.935		
		Total	86.535	61			
	3	Regression	40.431	8	5.054	5.810	.000[d]
		Residual	46.104	53	.870		
		Total	86.535	61			
	4	Regression	67.005	9	7.445	19.823	.000[e]
		Residual	19.530	52	.376		
		Total	86.535	61			
	5	Regression	67.793	10	6.779	18.448	.000[f]
		Residual	18.742	51	.367		
		Total	86.535	61			
Mighty Thor	1	Regression	45.096	4	11.274	14.230	.000[g]
		Residual	46.743	59	.792		
		Total	91.839	63			
	2	Regression	55.486	7	7.927	12.210	.000[h]
		Residual	36.354	56	.649		
		Total	91.839	63			
	3	Regression	55.502	8	6.938	10.501	.000[i]
		Residual	36.337	55	.661		
		Total	91.839	63			
	4	Regression	78.237	9	8.693	34.510	.000[j]
		Residual	13.602	54	.252		
		Total	91.839	63			
	5	Regression	78.342	10	7.834	30.763	.000[k]
		Residual	13.497	53	.255		
		Total	91.839	63			

Valkyrie	1	Regression	38.357	4	9.589	7.551	.000^l
		Residual	69.842	55	1.270		
		Total	108.199	59			
	2	Regression	52.121	7	7.446	6.904	.000^m
		Residual	56.078	52	1.078		
		Total	108.199	59			
	3	Regression	52.161	8	6.520	5.934	.000^n
		Residual	56.039	51	1.099		
		Total	108.199	59			
	4	Regression	94.594	9	10.510	38.625	.000°
		Residual	13.606	50	.272		
		Total	108.199	59			
	5	Regression	94.595	10	9.460	34.072	.000^p
		Residual	13.604	49	.278		
		Total	108.199	59			

Korg	1	Regression	28.539	4	7.135	5.146	.002[g]
		Residual	66.550	48	1.386		
		Total	95.088	52			
	2	Regression	41.015	7	5.859	4.876	.000[q]
		Residual	54.074	45	1.202		
		Total	95.088	52			
	3	Regression	41.067	8	5.133	4.181	.001[r]
		Residual	54.022	44	1.228		
		Total	95.088	52			
	4	Regression	71.642	9	7.960	14.599	.000[s]
		Residual	23.446	43	.545		
		Total	95.088	52			
	5	Regression	71.976	10	7.198	13.080	.000[t]
		Residual	23.112	42	.550		
		Total	95.088	52			

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

g. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

h. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

i. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Character	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
Thor	1	(Constant)	3.302	1.129		2.925	.005
		PMasculinity_Mean	.169	.149	.125	1.139	.260
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.136	.136	−.118	−.997	.323
		PFemininity_Mean	.621	.153	.506	4.049	.000
		NFemininity_Mean	−.310	.118	−.300	−2.614	.011
	2	(Constant)	3.355	1.123		2.989	.004
		PMasculinity_Mean	.026	.167	.019	.159	.874
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.123	.134	−.106	−.913	.365
		PFemininity_Mean	.442	.174	.360	2.538	.014
		NFemininity_Mean	−.241	.120	−.234	−2.012	.049
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.039	.133	.045	.291	.772
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.235	.137	−.269	−1.717	.092
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.459	.190	.413	2.420	.019
	3	(Constant)	3.326	1.083		3.071	.003
		PMasculinity_Mean	−.023	.162	−.017	−.140	.889
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.058	.133	−.050	−.436	.664
		PFemininity_Mean	.391	.169	.318	2.305	.025
		NFemininity_Mean	−.190	.118	−.184	−1.613	.113
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.045	.134	−.053	−.339	.736
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.314	.136	−.359	−2.300	.025
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.166	.225	.149	.737	.464
		Similarity_Mean	.499	.222	.509	2.244	.029

			B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
	4	(Constant)	.489	.788		.621	.537
		PMasculinity_Mean	−.097	.107	−.071	−.902	.371
		NMasculinity_Mean	.112	.089	.098	1.257	.215
		PFemininity_Mean	.252	.113	.205	2.238	.030
		NFemininity_Mean	−.086	.078	−.084	−1.102	.276
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.088	.088	−.102	−.995	.324
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.092	.093	−.105	−.984	.330
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.029	.150	−.026	−.191	.849
		Similarity_Mean	.168	.151	.171	1.110	.272
		Parasocial_Mean	.811	.096	.788	8.412	.000
	5	(Constant)	.555	.780		.711	.480
		PMasculinity_Mean	−.058	.109	−.043	−.535	.595
		NMasculinity_Mean	.104	.089	.090	1.175	.246
		PFemininity_Mean	.229	.112	.186	2.033	.047
		NFemininity_Mean	−.051	.081	−.050	−.630	.531
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.101	.088	−.118	−1.151	.255
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.034	.101	−.039	−.337	.738
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.047	.148	−.042	−.317	.753
		Similarity_Mean	.195	.151	.199	1.291	.202
		Parasocial_Mean	.835	.097	.812	8.629	.000
		Realism_Mean	−.131	.089	−.135	−1.464	.149
Mighty Thor	1	(Constant)	.943	.919		1.026	.309
		PMasculinity_Mean	.456	.107	.426	4.279	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.128	.105	−.139	−1.222	.227
		PFemininity_Mean	.442	.141	.363	3.138	.003
		NFemininity_Mean	.014	.110	.014	.130	.897
	2	(Constant)	1.068	.856		1.247	.217
		PMasculinity_Mean	.265	.115	.248	2.305	.025
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.170	.100	−.184	−1.704	.094
		PFemininity_Mean	.310	.136	.254	2.278	.027
		NFemininity_Mean	−.028	.102	−.027	−.275	.785
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.119	.124	−.121	−.955	.344
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.201	.128	.213	1.574	.121
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.334	.155	.304	2.161	.035
	3	(Constant)	1.098	.885		1.241	.220
		PMasculinity_Mean	.266	.116	.248	2.288	.026
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.173	.103	−.188	−1.683	.098
		PFemininity_Mean	.308	.138	.253	2.240	.029
		NFemininity_Mean	−.024	.105	−.024	−.232	.817
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.134	.158	−.136	−.848	.400
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.202	.129	.214	1.567	.123
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.312	.211	.284	1.478	.145
		Similarity_Mean	.031	.200	.034	.157	.876

	4	(Constant)	.612	.549		1.115	.270
		PMasculinity_Mean	.042	.075	.039	.558	.579
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.110	.064	−.120	−1.730	.089
		PFemininity_Mean	.163	.086	.134	1.892	.064
		NFemininity_Mean	−.031	.065	−.031	−.481	.632
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.053	.098	−.054	−.541	.591
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.005	.082	−.005	−.059	.953
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.370	.130	.337	2.840	.006
		Similarity_Mean	−.216	.126	−.232	−1.713	.092
		Parasocial_Mean	.703	.074	.742	9.500	.000
	5	(Constant)	.660	.557		1.184	.242
		PMasculinity_Mean	.036	.077	.033	.465	.644
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.122	.067	−.132	−1.829	.073
		PFemininity_Mean	.162	.087	.133	1.867	.067
		NFemininity_Mean	−.037	.066	−.036	−.565	.575
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.062	.099	−.063	−.622	.537
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.014	.084	−.014	−.162	.872
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.367	.131	.334	2.792	.007
		Similarity_Mean	−.216	.127	−.232	−1.702	.095
		Parasocial_Mean	.682	.082	.719	8.323	.000
		Realism_Mean	.055	.086	.055	.643	.523
Valkyrie	1	(Constant)	3.857	1.254		3.076	.003
		PMasculinity_Mean	.563	.131	.510	4.290	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.131	.174	−.113	−.755	.453
		PFemininity_Mean	−.075	.187	−.053	−.400	.691
		NFemininity_Mean	−.233	.153	−.196	−1.521	.134
	2	(Constant)	2.908	1.191		2.442	.018
		PMasculinity_Mean	.357	.136	.323	2.627	.011
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.041	.162	−.035	−.251	.802
		PFemininity_Mean	−.150	.177	−.106	−.846	.401
		NFemininity_Mean	−.301	.154	−.254	−1.959	.055
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.381	.168	.332	2.270	.027
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.010	.137	−.010	−.072	.943
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.176	.166	.156	1.058	.295
	3	(Constant)	2.919	1.203		2.426	.019
		PMasculinity_Mean	.357	.137	.323	2.602	.012
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.052	.174	−.045	−.298	.767
		PFemininity_Mean	−.149	.179	−.106	−.833	.409
		NFemininity_Mean	−.295	.158	−.249	−1.870	.067
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.392	.180	.342	2.180	.034
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.009	.139	−.009	−.062	.951
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.202	.217	.179	.929	.357
		Similarity_Mean	−.040	.209	−.040	−.190	.850

	4	(Constant)	.396	.632		.626	.534
		PMasculinity_Mean	−.008	.074	−.007	−.109	.913
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.075	.087	−.065	−.872	.387
		PFemininity_Mean	−.016	.090	−.011	−.180	.858
		NFemininity_Mean	.002	.082	.002	.024	.981
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.030	.094	.026	.321	.749
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.063	.069	−.065	−.916	.364
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.019	.110	−.017	−.173	.863
		Similarity_Mean	−.148	.104	−.150	−1.416	.163
		Parasocial_Mean	1.194	.096	1.021	12.488	.000
	5	(Constant)	.403	.645		.625	.535
		PMasculinity_Mean	−.007	.075	−.007	−.098	.922
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.076	.087	−.065	−.866	.391
		PFemininity_Mean	−.018	.094	−.013	−.192	.848
		NFemininity_Mean	.003	.083	.002	.032	.975
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.030	.095	.026	.315	.754
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.061	.074	−.063	−.827	.412
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.018	.112	−.016	−.159	.874
		Similarity_Mean	−.147	.106	−.149	−1.388	.172
		Parasocial_Mean	1.195	.098	1.022	12.176	.000
		Realism_Mean	−.006	.075	−.006	−.079	.937
Korg	1	(Constant)	1.622	1.439		1.127	.265
		PMasculinity_Mean	.481	.152	.385	3.159	.003
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.048	.139	−.059	−.345	.732
		PFemininity_Mean	.331	.178	.324	1.856	.070
		NFemininity_Mean	−.077	.169	−.060	−.455	.651
	2	(Constant)	1.732	1.361		1.272	.210
		PMasculinity_Mean	.199	.174	.159	1.138	.261
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.096	.144	−.117	−.662	.511
		PFemininity_Mean	.165	.176	.162	.939	.353
		NFemininity_Mean	−.152	.162	−.119	−.939	.353
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.017	.193	.017	.088	.931
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.027	.184	.025	.148	.883
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.532	.236	.432	2.254	.029
	3	(Constant)	1.664	1.415		1.176	.246
		PMasculinity_Mean	.195	.177	.156	1.098	.278
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.093	.146	−.114	−.636	.528
		PFemininity_Mean	.177	.187	.173	.948	.348
		NFemininity_Mean	−.145	.168	−.113	−.864	.392
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.036	.217	.037	.168	.867
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.028	.186	.026	.152	.880
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.579	.330	.471	1.753	.087
		Similarity_Mean	−.071	.345	−.065	−.206	.838

4	(Constant)	.748	.951		.787	.436
	PMasculinity_Mean	−.134	.126	−.107	−1.063	.294
	NMasculinity_Mean	−.080	.098	−.097	−.818	.418
	PFemininity_Mean	−.025	.127	−.025	−.199	.844
	NFemininity_Mean	.032	.114	.025	.277	.783
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.065	.144	.067	.451	.654
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.031	.124	−.028	−.246	.807
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.290	.224	.236	1.298	.201
	Similarity_Mean	−.265	.231	−.241	−1.145	.258
	Parasocial_Mean	1.034	.138	.866	7.488	.000
5	(Constant)	.919	.980		.938	.354
	PMasculinity_Mean	−.166	.133	−.133	−1.246	.220
	NMasculinity_Mean	−.100	.101	−.123	−.989	.329
	PFemininity_Mean	−.038	.129	−.037	−.291	.772
	NFemininity_Mean	.012	.117	.010	.106	.916
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.085	.147	.088	.580	.565
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.065	.133	−.060	−.492	.625
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.284	.225	.231	1.263	.213
	Similarity_Mean	−.281	.233	−.255	−1.205	.235
	Parasocial_Mean	1.018	.140	.853	7.257	.000
	Realism_Mean	.094	.120	.087	.780	.440

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship, character realism
DV: character appreciation
All cases

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
					Change Statistics				
1	.586[a]	.343	.332	1.10826	.343	30.567	4	234	.000
2	.715[b]	.511	.496	.96235	.168	26.445	3	231	.000
3	.716[c]	.513	.496	.96294	.002	.717	1	230	.398
4	.829[d]	.688	.675	.77274	.175	128.160	1	229	.000
5	.852[e]	.726	.714	.72570	.038	31.647	1	228	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	150.176	4	37.544	30.567	.000[b]
	Residual	287.409	234	1.228		
	Total	437.585	238			
2	Regression	223.651	7	31.950	34.499	.000[c]
	Residual	213.934	231	.926		
	Total	437.585	238			
3	Regression	224.316	8	28.039	30.239	.000[d]
	Residual	213.269	230	.927		
	Total	437.585	238			
4	Regression	300.843	9	33.427	55.980	.000[e]
	Residual	136.742	229	.597		
	Total	437.585	238			
5	Regression	317.510	10	31.751	60.289	.000[f]
	Residual	120.075	228	.527		
	Total	437.585	238			

a. Dependent Variable: Appreciation_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	−.039	.582		−.067	.947
	PMasculinity_Mean	.630	.064	.541	9.836	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.145	.064	.145	2.271	.024
	PFemininity_Mean	.287	.082	.231	3.511	.001
	NFemininity_Mean	−.070	.067	−.062	−1.047	.296
2	(Constant)	−.229	.513		−.446	.656
	PMasculinity_Mean	.337	.066	.289	5.140	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.148	.056	.148	2.633	.009
	PFemininity_Mean	.111	.074	.090	1.502	.134
	NFemininity_Mean	−.127	.060	−.112	−2.125	.035
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.123	.072	.118	1.711	.088
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.164	.067	.162	2.463	.015
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.368	.086	.306	4.270	.000
3	(Constant)	−.201	.515		−.392	.696
	PMasculinity_Mean	.337	.066	.290	5.141	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.154	.057	.153	2.715	.007
	PFemininity_Mean	.105	.075	.084	1.403	.162
	NFemininity_Mean	−.126	.060	−.111	−2.115	.035
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.098	.078	.093	1.245	.214
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.158	.067	.156	2.360	.019
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.309	.111	.257	2.769	.006
	Similarity_Mean	.091	.107	.086	.847	.398

4	(Constant)	−.980	.419		−2.341	.020
	PMasculinity_Mean	.200	.054	.171	3.692	.000
	NMasculinity_Mean	.127	.046	.126	2.778	.006
	PFemininity_Mean	−.031	.061	−.025	−.505	.614
	NFemininity_Mean	−.025	.049	−.022	−.503	.616
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.038	.063	.036	.600	.549
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.145	.054	.143	2.695	.008
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.164	.090	.137	1.821	.070
	Similarity_Mean	−.015	.086	−.014	−.171	.865
	Parasocial_Mean	.642	.057	.571	11.321	.000
5	(Constant)	−1.012	.393		−2.575	.011
	PMasculinity_Mean	.137	.052	.117	2.627	.009
	NMasculinity_Mean	.113	.043	.112	2.634	.009
	PFemininity_Mean	.009	.058	.007	.156	.876
	NFemininity_Mean	−.073	.047	−.065	−1.574	.117
	Personality_recognizability_Mean	.066	.059	.063	1.103	.271
	Situational_recognizability_Mean	.037	.054	.037	.686	.493
	Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.155	.085	.129	1.829	.069
	Similarity_Mean	−.072	.082	−.068	−.879	.380
	Parasocial_Mean	.573	.055	.509	10.484	.000
	Realism_Mean	.300	.053	.279	5.626	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Appreciation_Mean

Predictor: Perceived gendered personality traits, personality recognizability, situational recognizability, attitudinal recognizability, perceived similarity, parasocial relationship, character realism
DV: character appreciation
Compare group

Model Summary

Character	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
						Change Statistics				
Thor	1	.569[a]	.323	.276	1.20941	.323	6.810	4	57	.000
	2	.663[b]	.440	.367	1.13088	.116	3.731	3	54	.016
	3	.710[c]	.504	.429	1.07381	.064	6.892	1	53	.011
	4	.858[d]	.736	.690	.79154	.232	45.540	1	52	.000
	5	.886[e]	.785	.743	.72081	.049	11.706	1	51	.001
Mighty Thor	1	.631[f]	.398	.357	1.01126	.398	9.750	4	59	.000
	2	.711[g]	.506	.444	.94062	.108	4.065	3	56	.011
	3	.716[h]	.513	.442	.94234	.007	.796	1	55	.376
	4	.855[i]	.731	.686	.70715	.218	43.669	1	54	.000
	5	.870[j]	.756	.710	.67888	.026	5.590	1	53	.022
Valkyrie	1	.566[k]	.320	.271	1.08104	.320	6.475	4	55	.000
	2	.759[l]	.576	.519	.87840	.255	10.434	3	52	.000
	3	.764[m]	.584	.518	.87861	.008	.975	1	51	.328
	4	.870[n]	.757	.714	.67747	.174	35.780	1	50	.000
	5	.901[o]	.813	.774	.60118	.055	14.495	1	49	.000
Korg	1	.637[f]	.405	.356	1.11252	.405	8.183	4	48	.000
	2	.782[p]	.612	.552	.92815	.207	7.988	3	45	.000
	3	.782[q]	.612	.542	.93843	.000	.020	1	44	.889
	4	.854[r]	.729	.672	.79377	.117	18.499	1	43	.000
	5	.862[s]	.744	.683	.78084	.015	2.436	1	42	.126

a. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean

c. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean

d. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean

e. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean, Situational_recognizability_Mean, Personality_recognizability_Mean, Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean, Similarity_Mean, Parasocial_Mean, Realism_Mean

f. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

ANOVA[a]

Character	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Thor	1	Regression	39.843	4	9.961	6.810	.000[b]
		Residual	83.373	57	1.463		
		Total	123.215	61			
	2	Regression	54.156	7	7.737	6.049	.000[c]
		Residual	69.060	54	1.279		
		Total	123.215	61			
	3	Regression	62.102	8	7.763	6.732	.000[d]
		Residual	61.113	53	1.153		
		Total	123.215	61			
	4	Regression	90.635	9	10.071	16.073	.000[e]
		Residual	32.580	52	.627		
		Total	123.215	61			
	5	Regression	96.717	10	9.672	18.615	.000[f]
		Residual	26.498	51	.520		
		Total	123.215	61			
Mighty Thor	1	Regression	39.881	4	9.970	9.750	.000[g]
		Residual	60.336	59	1.023		
		Total	100.218	63			
	2	Regression	50.671	7	7.239	8.182	.000[h]
		Residual	49.547	56	.885		
		Total	100.218	63			
	3	Regression	51.377	8	6.422	7.232	.000[i]
		Residual	48.840	55	.888		
		Total	100.218	63			
	4	Regression	73.215	9	8.135	16.268	.000[j]
		Residual	27.003	54	.500		
		Total	100.218	63			
	5	Regression	75.791	10	7.579	16.445	.000[k]
		Residual	24.427	53	.461		
		Total	100.218	63			

					Mean Square	F	Sig.
Valkyrie	1	Regression	30.270	4	7.568	6.475	.000^l
		Residual	64.276	55	1.169		
		Total	94.546	59			
	2	Regression	54.423	7	7.775	10.076	.000^m
		Residual	40.123	52	.772		
		Total	94.546	59			
	3	Regression	55.176	8	6.897	8.934	.000^n
		Residual	39.370	51	.772		
		Total	94.546	59			
	4	Regression	71.598	9	7.955	17.333	.000°
		Residual	22.948	50	.459		
		Total	94.546	59			
	5	Regression	76.837	10	7.684	21.260	.000^p
		Residual	17.709	49	.361		
		Total	94.546	59			
Korg	1	Regression	40.513	4	10.128	8.183	.000^g
		Residual	59.410	48	1.238		
		Total	99.923	52			
	2	Regression	61.157	7	8.737	10.142	.000^q
		Residual	38.766	45	.861		
		Total	99.923	52			
	3	Regression	61.174	8	7.647	8.683	.000^r
		Residual	38.749	44	.881		
		Total	99.923	52			
	4	Regression	72.830	9	8.092	12.843	.000^s
		Residual	27.093	43	.630		
		Total	99.923	52			
	5	Regression	74.315	10	7.432	12.189	.000^t
		Residual	25.608	42	.610		
		Total	99.923	52			

a. Dependent Variable: Appreciation_Mean

b. Predictors: (Constant), NFemininity_Mean, NMasculinity_Mean, PMasculinity_Mean, PFemininity_Mean

Coefficients^a

Character	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
Thor	1	(Constant)	−.747	1.370		−.546	.587
		PMasculinity_Mean	.734	.181	.453	4.063	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	.026	.165	.019	.158	.875
		PFemininity_Mean	.427	.186	.291	2.294	.025
		NFemininity_Mean	−.049	.144	−.040	−.341	.734
	2	(Constant)	−.478	1.313		−.364	.717
		PMasculinity_Mean	.409	.195	.253	2.098	.041
		NMasculinity_Mean	.081	.157	.059	.516	.608
		PFemininity_Mean	.117	.204	.080	.573	.569
		NFemininity_Mean	−.043	.140	−.035	−.308	.759
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.160	.156	.156	1.026	.309
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.032	.160	.031	.203	.840
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.440	.222	.331	1.981	.053
	3	(Constant)	−.518	1.247		−.416	.679
		PMasculinity_Mean	.343	.187	.212	1.835	.072
		NMasculinity_Mean	.168	.153	.122	1.101	.276
		PFemininity_Mean	.048	.195	.033	.245	.807
		NFemininity_Mean	.025	.135	.021	.188	.852
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.047	.154	.046	.302	.764
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.074	.157	−.071	−.473	.638
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.045	.259	.034	.172	.864
		Similarity_Mean	.672	.256	.575	2.625	.011
	4	(Constant)	−3.458	1.017		−3.399	.001
		PMasculinity_Mean	.267	.138	.164	1.928	.059
		NMasculinity_Mean	.344	.115	.251	2.982	.004
		PFemininity_Mean	−.096	.145	−.066	−.660	.512
		NFemininity_Mean	.133	.101	.108	1.313	.195
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.003	.114	.003	.024	.981
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.156	.121	.149	1.289	.203
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.157	.193	−.118	−.812	.421
		Similarity_Mean	.329	.195	.281	1.684	.098
		Parasocial_Mean	.840	.124	.684	6.748	.000
	5	(Constant)	−3.641	.928		−3.925	.000
		PMasculinity_Mean	.160	.130	.099	1.235	.222
		NMasculinity_Mean	.367	.105	.268	3.486	.001
		PFemininity_Mean	−.032	.134	−.022	−.236	.815
		NFemininity_Mean	.035	.096	.029	.364	.717
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.039	.104	.038	.377	.708
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.006	.120	−.006	−.049	.962
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	−.106	.177	−.080	−.598	.552
		Similarity_Mean	.255	.179	.218	1.422	.161
		Parasocial_Mean	.772	.115	.629	6.713	.000
		Realism_Mean	.363	.106	.314	3.421	.001

	Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Mighty Thor	1	(Constant)	−.178	1.044		−.170	.865
		PMasculinity_Mean	.521	.121	.466	4.299	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	.083	.119	.086	.696	.489
		PFemininity_Mean	.458	.160	.360	2.861	.006
		NFemininity_Mean	−.055	.125	−.052	−.442	.660
	2	(Constant)	.154	1.000		.154	.878
		PMasculinity_Mean	.308	.134	.276	2.294	.026
		NMasculinity_Mean	.024	.116	.025	.211	.834
		PFemininity_Mean	.295	.159	.231	1.856	.069
		NFemininity_Mean	−.101	.119	−.094	−.850	.399
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.013	.145	−.013	−.089	.929
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.255	.149	.259	1.711	.093
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.220	.181	.192	1.221	.227
	3	(Constant)	.354	1.026		.345	.731
		PMasculinity_Mean	.310	.135	.277	2.305	.025
		NMasculinity_Mean	.001	.119	.001	.011	.991
		PFemininity_Mean	.284	.160	.223	1.781	.081
		NFemininity_Mean	−.078	.122	−.073	−.638	.526
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.112	.183	−.109	−.611	.544
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.262	.149	.266	1.752	.085
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.074	.245	.064	.301	.765
		Similarity_Mean	.207	.232	.213	.892	.376
	4	(Constant)	−.123	.774		−.159	.874
		PMasculinity_Mean	.091	.106	.082	.858	.395
		NMasculinity_Mean	.063	.090	.065	.697	.489
		PFemininity_Mean	.142	.122	.112	1.168	.248
		NFemininity_Mean	−.084	.091	−.079	−.924	.360
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.032	.138	−.032	−.235	.815
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.059	.116	.060	.509	.613
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.131	.184	.114	.712	.480
		Similarity_Mean	−.036	.178	−.037	−.202	.841
		Parasocial_Mean	.689	.104	.696	6.608	.000
	5	(Constant)	.113	.749		.151	.880
		PMasculinity_Mean	.059	.103	.053	.573	.569
		NMasculinity_Mean	.007	.090	.007	.078	.938
		PFemininity_Mean	.136	.117	.107	1.162	.250
		NFemininity_Mean	−.114	.089	−.107	−1.288	.203
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	−.076	.133	−.074	−.572	.570
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.016	.113	.016	.141	.889
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.112	.177	.097	.632	.530
		Similarity_Mean	−.035	.171	−.035	−.202	.841
		Parasocial_Mean	.581	.110	.587	5.274	.000
		Realism_Mean	.274	.116	.260	2.364	.022

	Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Valkyrie	1	(Constant)	2.711	1.203		2.254	.028
		PMasculinity_Mean	.513	.126	.498	4.080	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.171	.167	−.158	−1.023	.311
		PFemininity_Mean	−.006	.179	−.005	−.034	.973
		NFemininity_Mean	.025	.147	.023	.171	.865
	2	(Constant)	1.416	1.007		1.406	.166
		PMasculinity_Mean	.247	.115	.239	2.147	.036
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.062	.137	−.057	−.452	.653
		PFemininity_Mean	−.096	.150	−.073	−.641	.524
		NFemininity_Mean	−.076	.130	−.068	−.584	.562
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.320	.142	.298	2.256	.028
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.115	.116	.127	.993	.325
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.302	.140	.287	2.154	.036
	3	(Constant)	1.466	1.009		1.454	.152
		PMasculinity_Mean	.246	.115	.238	2.140	.037
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.110	.146	−.101	−.754	.454
		PFemininity_Mean	−.092	.150	−.070	−.612	.543
		NFemininity_Mean	−.051	.132	−.046	−.385	.702
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.370	.151	.345	2.456	.017
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.121	.116	.133	1.039	.304
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.417	.182	.396	2.289	.026
		Similarity_Mean	−.173	.175	−.188	−.988	.328
	4	(Constant)	−.103	.821		−.126	.900
		PMasculinity_Mean	.019	.096	.018	.197	.844
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.125	.112	−.115	−1.109	.273
		PFemininity_Mean	−.009	.116	−.007	−.078	.938
		NFemininity_Mean	.134	.107	.121	1.256	.215
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.145	.122	.135	1.188	.240
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.087	.090	.096	.965	.339
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.280	.142	.265	1.964	.055
		Similarity_Mean	−.240	.135	−.261	−1.773	.082
		Parasocial_Mean	.743	.124	.679	5.982	.000
	5	(Constant)	−.490	.735		−.667	.508
		PMasculinity_Mean	−.019	.086	−.019	−.223	.824
		NMasculinity_Mean	−.112	.100	−.104	−1.123	.267
		PFemininity_Mean	.094	.107	.071	.882	.382
		NFemininity_Mean	.098	.095	.088	1.029	.308
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.159	.108	.148	1.462	.150
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	−.022	.085	−.024	−.261	.795
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.214	.128	.203	1.675	.100
		Similarity_Mean	−.285	.121	−.310	−2.364	.022
		Parasocial_Mean	.666	.112	.609	5.947	.000
		Realism_Mean	.325	.085	.344	3.807	.000

			B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Korg	1	(Constant)	−1.894	1.360		−1.393	.170
		PMasculinity_Mean	.733	.144	.572	5.091	.000
		NMasculinity_Mean	.395	.131	.470	3.009	.004
		PFemininity_Mean	.330	.169	.315	1.956	.056
		NFemininity_Mean	.014	.160	.011	.090	.928
	2	(Constant)	−1.560	1.153		−1.353	.183
		PMasculinity_Mean	.399	.148	.311	2.701	.010
		NMasculinity_Mean	.303	.122	.361	2.479	.017
		PFemininity_Mean	.108	.149	.103	.726	.471
		NFemininity_Mean	−.101	.137	−.077	−.737	.465
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.019	.163	.019	.116	.908
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.191	.156	.170	1.226	.226
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.539	.200	.428	2.699	.010
	3	(Constant)	−1.599	1.199		−1.334	.189
		PMasculinity_Mean	.397	.150	.310	2.641	.011
		NMasculinity_Mean	.304	.124	.363	2.455	.018
		PFemininity_Mean	.115	.158	.110	.727	.471
		NFemininity_Mean	−.097	.142	−.074	−.682	.499
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.030	.183	.030	.164	.870
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.192	.158	.171	1.216	.230
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.567	.280	.449	2.024	.049
		Similarity_Mean	−.041	.292	−.036	−.140	.889
	4	(Constant)	−2.164	1.022		−2.117	.040
		PMasculinity_Mean	.194	.135	.151	1.430	.160
		NMasculinity_Mean	.313	.105	.372	2.980	.005
		PFemininity_Mean	−.010	.137	−.009	−.072	.943
		NFemininity_Mean	.012	.123	.009	.099	.922
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.048	.155	.048	.309	.759
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.155	.134	.138	1.163	.251
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.388	.240	.308	1.615	.114
		Similarity_Mean	−.161	.249	−.142	−.646	.522
		Parasocial_Mean	.638	.148	.522	4.301	.000
	5	(Constant)	−1.805	1.032		−1.750	.087
		PMasculinity_Mean	.127	.140	.099	.908	.369
		NMasculinity_Mean	.269	.107	.321	2.522	.016
		PFemininity_Mean	−.036	.136	−.034	−.264	.793
		NFemininity_Mean	−.028	.124	−.022	−.229	.820
		Personality_recognizability_Mean	.091	.155	.091	.584	.562
		Situational_recognizability_Mean	.082	.140	.073	.590	.558
		Attitudinal_recognizability_Mean	.375	.237	.297	1.585	.120
		Similarity_Mean	−.195	.246	−.173	−.793	.432
		Parasocial_Mean	.604	.148	.494	4.094	.000
		Realism_Mean	.197	.126	.178	1.561	.126