

This Barbie Is Not For Everybody:
A Study on the Impact of Character Engagement Factors, Age and Gender on the
Enjoyment of a Woman-Centric Movie

Student Name: Alessia Basile
Student Number: 647121

Supervisor: Dr. Julia Kneer

Master Media Studies - Media & Business
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master's Thesis
June 2024

Word Count: 15.668 words

ABSTRACT

The underrepresentation of fictional female characters in films continues to be a significant problem. However, in the last few years, the number of movies featuring a female protagonist, as well as the number of female directors gaining recognition in the international movie landscape has increased almost exponentially. Even though recent movies have tried to challenge the idea of women's cinema as primarily associated with chick flicks, the response to films with a woman lead has not always been a positive one, due to factors such as the way female characters are depicted. Therefore, the present study examined to what extent character engagement factors, as well as the gender identification and age of the viewer could have an impact on their enjoyment of a woman-centric movie, whereby the film *Barbie* was used as stimulus. In total, 170 viewers who fit the criteria completed the survey. The respondents, who were asked to answer questions related to recognisability, wishful identification, parasocial relationships, and enjoyment, were divided into four different groups, according to their age group and gender identification. The analyses revealed that females and younger people (aged between 18 and 29) score higher than males and older people (aged 30 and above) on all character engagement factors, as well as on hedonic and eudaimonic entertainment. When analysing specifically character engagement factors and the enjoyment of the film, the hierarchical regression analyses showed that personality recognisability (e.g. the character's approach to life) and attitudinal recognisability (e.g. the character's opinion on social problems) can be considered positive predictors of wishful identification. For parasocial relationship, personality recognisability and attitudinal recognisability, as well as situational recognisability (e.g. the character's reaction to stressful events) and wishful identification were significant positive predictors. Instead, the only positive predictor in common for both eudaimonic entertainment and hedonic entertainment was wishful identification, thus showing how important the extent to which the viewer wishes to be like the fictional character is for the enjoyment of the movie. The outcomes of the study indicate the importance of visibility of women's stories and female protagonists, as the movie *Barbie* was shown to be an enjoyable and relatable experience not only for the young female audience but also for other audiences, albeit to a lesser extent. Therefore, this film could definitely help in paving the way for other films to challenge stereotypes and foster change, while still targeting people of different age groups and gender identifications.

KEYWORDS: *woman-centric movie, gender identification, age groups, character engagement factors, enjoyment*

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Theoretical Framework.....	7
2.1 <i>The evolution in the film industry and the rise of women-centric movies</i>	7
2.2 <i>Enjoyment of a movie</i>	8
2.3 <i>Character engagement factors</i>	10
2.4 <i>The role of gender and age in the enjoyment of a movie</i>	11
2.5 <i>Hypotheses</i>	12
3. Method.....	16
3.1 <i>Justification</i>	16
3.2 <i>Sampling strategy</i>	17
3.3. <i>Sample</i>	18
3.4 <i>Procedure</i>	18
3.5 <i>Measurements</i>	19
3.6 <i>Ethics</i>	24
4. Results.....	25
4.1 <i>Comparisons between age and gender concerning recognisability</i>	25
4.2 <i>Comparisons between age and gender concerning WI</i>	26
4.3 <i>Comparisons between age and gender concerning PSR</i>	26
4.4 <i>Comparisons between age and gender concerning enjoyment</i>	26
4.5 <i>Character engagement variables as predictors for WI</i>	27
4.6 <i>Character engagement variables as predictors for PSR</i>	29
4.7 <i>Character engagement variables as predictors for eudaimonic ent.</i>	32
4.8 <i>Character engagement variables as predictors for hedonic entertainment</i>	36
5. Discussion.....	41
References.....	47
Appendix A.....	52
Appendix B.....	64

1. Introduction

In her monologue at the end of the movie *Barbie*, the character Gloria, while talking about women and how they are perceived by society, states: “We have to always be extraordinary, but somehow we're always doing it wrong” (McArdle, 2023, para. 6). This quote represents a perfect summary of how films that explore women’s stories and complex themes such as that of feminism are perceived by audiences, as there are often conflicting opinions on them.

It is not a secret that the film industry has always given more space to male characters and their stories. In recent years, male characters have continued to outnumber females, who are still underrepresented, leading to the belief that we are (still) in a man’s world (Lauzen, 2022, p. 1). However, something is definitely changing. According to a study by Lauzen (2022, p. 1), the percentage of films with female protagonists has been slightly increasing over the course of the last few years. Moreover, female directors are slowly gaining fame in the landscape of current global cinema (White, 2015, p. 9). Through their work, they are helping transforming film politics, challenging the view that sees women’s cinema as primarily associated with the production of chick flicks, and focusing once again on feminist activism (White, 2015, p. 9).

Nevertheless, even though women-centric movies are becoming more popular, the response to these films has not always been a positive one, due to different individual factors that contribute to the enjoyment of a movie (Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 97). For instance, in media production, one common wisdom is that gender affects media choice, and therefore women and men enjoy different types of films (Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 98). As discussed by Fischhoff (1994, as cited in Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 98), there are still “women’s films” and “men’s films”. Additionally, research shows that members of an audience generally tend to form stronger connections and experience more intense emotional reactions towards characters of their same sex, rather than to opposite-sex characters (Oliver et al., 2000).

Another factor that can impact the enjoyment of a movie is certainly age. According to a study conducted by Mares et al. (2008, p. 494), middle-aged viewers tend to prefer heartwarming and emotional films, whereas younger audiences would rather choose a comedy. However, Lassner (1944, p. 266) found out through interviews that one of younger people’s motivations for movie choice is the opportunity to gather knowledge about world events. Therefore, they would also opt for a film that deals with current social problems (Lassner, 1944, p. 266).

Furthermore, character engagement factors are inevitably going to play a role in the viewers' enjoyment of a film. For instance, movie watchers often recognise themselves in a fictional character (i.e. recognisability), or they want to be like their favourite fictional character (i.e. wishful identification) to the point that they feel affection for that character and create a one-sided relationship with them (i.e. parasocial relationship). Previous research, in fact, shows how these factors, such as perceived similarity with a character, can influence the entertainment experience of the audience (Lim et al., 2020, p. 2; Sanders, 2010, p. 162; Żerebecki et al., 2022, p. 365). Moreover, as Baldwin and Raney (2021, p. 751) discuss, a higher level of parasocial relationship with a character can also lead to a greater enjoyment of a movie.

Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the influence of different factors on people's enjoyment of a movie, specifically a woman-centric movie. Thus, the goal of this research was to understand to what extent these factors can impact the overall enjoyment of a movie centred around a woman. To this end, the following research question was formulated: *To what extent do character engagement factors, gender identification and age group impact people's enjoyment of a woman-centric movie?*

For this research, the film *Barbie* was used as a case example, as it was one of the most popular movies in 2023 featuring a female protagonist and focusing on topics such as feminism. In order to explore the potential relationships between gender identification, age, character engagement factors, and enjoyment, a quantitative approach was used (Babbie, 2015, p. 50). In this case, a survey was conducted among viewers of the *Barbie* movie to collect data about their enjoyment of the film, and the possible factors that may have influenced their experience.

This proposed study showed both societal and scientific relevance. Firstly, when considering scientific relevance, this study appeared extremely relevant as it proposed a contribution to fill the research gap on women and female fictional characters. In fact, although a lot of studies have focused on films, or on fictional characters and how audiences connect and establish a bond with them, few have focused specifically on how viewers connect with female characters, or on how films centred around women's stories are perceived by the general audience. Moreover, with the outcomes of this research, more insight can be provided into how different factors come into play when it comes to the enjoyment of a film. In fact, this study highlighted how the gender identification of the viewer might influence the way they understand and appreciate a woman-centric movie, but it also examined how age could be a factor to take into consideration, especially when a film

involves topics that are often considered “woke”. Lastly, it included the newly created Minority Character Recognisability Scale (MRS), which contributed to making this research particularly interesting, as it allowed to see how this new character engagement factor has an impact on enjoyment.

Instead, when considering societal relevance, this study appeared relevant as it could help in understanding how different demographics respond to woman-centric movies, which could then lead, in the future, to a more inclusive film industry that gives more space to women’s stories. From a marketing perspective, this study brought forward useful insight for movie writers and producers, as it could help them understand how audiences receive or engage with women-centric movies. Therefore, the outcomes of this study could clarify how to create effective marketing campaigns and content that is tailored to the preferences of specific audiences. Lastly, this study appeared interesting to understand if movies focusing on women and their story can have an impact on people’s opinions and their attitudes towards women in real life, thus helping in the redefinition of gender roles.

In the upcoming chapter, an overview of previous relevant research on the rise of women-centric movies and the importance of women as main characters in media is given, as well as on media engagement factors, age, gender, and how they can ultimately impact the entertainment experience of an audience. Subsequently, the third chapter provides a rationale for the implementation of a quantitative approach. Therefore, it includes the sampling strategy, the procedure, the operationalisation of the relevant concepts and their measurements, and the ethics principles used to conduct the research. Then, the fourth chapter introduces the results of the tests conducted on SPSS, including two-way ANOVAs, independent samples T-tests in the case of significant interaction effects, and hierarchical regression analyses. Lastly, in the final chapter, the conclusion and the discussion of the results obtained are presented. Additionally, the implications of the results, as well as limitations of the study and suggestions for future ones are included.

2. Theoretical framework

This second chapter serves as the foundation of this research. Specifically, by exploring and examining previous literature related to this topic, the paper builds the theoretical framework that guides the research question. In this chapter, the theoretical background obtained from existing literature is divided in four different sections, while the fifth one is dedicated to presenting the hypotheses of the study.

2.1 The evolution in the film industry and the emergence of women-centric movies

In entertainment media, female characters continue to be severely underrepresented (Lauzen, 2022, p. 1). Although the number of female protagonists has slightly increased, male characters still continue to outnumber female ones, with men typically representing approximately 60% of main characters (Lauzen, 2022, p. 4; Ward & Grower, 2020, p. 179). Moreover, a predominant concern is related to the way women are portrayed in movies. According to a study from Campbell (2020, p. 212), from the advent of the first movies female characters have rarely been portrayed the same way men are portrayed. Most of the times, their role has been that of support for male characters, portraying them as wives, girlfriends, or staff. Additionally, a study by Ward and Grower (2020, p. 179), states that, regardless of the role they portray, women are mostly shown in stereotypical ways, with limited personality traits, and solely defined by their physical appearance. Therefore, even when the role allows them to take action for themselves or others, they often lack depth, and they are relegated to being presented either as beautiful and objectified, or sometimes even as sexualised or fetishized (Campbell, 2023, p. 212).

The portrayal of women appears extremely important if theories like the Social Cognitive Theory and the Cultivation Theory are taken into account (Manzoor & Rauf, 2016, p. 98). These theories, in fact, provide useful insight to interpret how the audience understands and reacts to gender representation in movies. Firstly, the Social Cognitive Theory examines how individuals tend to find a solution to their real-world problems through the entertainment media they are exposed to daily (Hall et al., 2012, as cited in Manzoor & Rauf, 2016, p. 98). Through a study conducted on people who had watched romantic comedy films, it was proved that people apply what they see in movies to real-life situations. Manzoor and Rauf (2016) state that the reason why individuals decide to use movies to resolve their situations is because they consider them to be a “practical demonstration of real-life issues” (p. 98). The Cultivation Theory, instead, affirms that long exposure to a stereotypical portrayal

of gender may influence people's behaviour and ideas in real life (Ward & Grover, 2020, p. 181).

However, the film industry is rapidly evolving and powerful female characters are increasingly more present in films (e.g. Captain Marvel and Black Widow in the Marvel universe, or the women of Game of Thrones) (Campbell, 2023, p. 213). Moreover, as societal expectations regarding gender and prescribed roles evolve, women enjoy greater freedom to explore non-traditional careers. This change is particularly evident in the film industry, where more women are taking roles behind the camera as directors, producers, cinematographers, and art directors (Campbell, 2023, p. 214). This shift has led women directors to not only alter the landscape of the film industry, but also to shape the twenty-first-century aesthetic, contributing to a slow but steady transformation of films (White, 2015, p. 9). Feminism in films and television has, therefore, become popular, prompting a new wave of media content that focuses on women as both characters and creators (Perkins et al., 2023, p. 1).

One of the most powerful examples of this shift could be Barbie. The movie, directed by Greta Gerwig, has "took the world by storm" since its release in the United States on July 21, 2023 (Mason, 2023, para. 1; Rome, 2024, p. 1). In fact, its focus on the themes of feminism, gender relations, and female empowerment has led the movie to become the highest grossing film of 2023 and has made Greta Gerwig the highest grossing female director of all time (Lin, 2024, p. 2; Perkins et al., 2023, p. 3; Sculos, 2023, p. 9). Nevertheless, the incredible success of a film like this does not necessarily mean that women-centric movies and feminism will be appreciated by movie watchers and, generally, by our society (Perkins et al., 2023, p. 10). For instance, in a study conducted by Rome (2024) about Barbie, an interviewee stated that "As a dad (...) I was struck by the fact that a movie that spends so much time sending positive messages to young girls (...) doesn't seem to care a bit about the anti-male messages to young boys" (p. 3-4), contributing to the belief that this movie is worth of discussion.

2.2 Enjoyment of a movie

It is often assumed that the ultimate goal for the consumption of entertainment is that of enjoyment (Oliver & Raney, 2011, p. 984; Wirth et al., 2012, p. 406). Wirth et al. (2012) note that in many instances, enjoyment and entertainment have been defined as closely related, to the point that enjoyment has been perceived as "the heart of the entertainment experience" (p. 406). However, research has also shown that entertainment could also be consumed for a meaningful purpose, rather than simple enjoyment (Oliver & Raney, 2011, p.

985). In fact, for some people, movies may represent a way of keeping up with current culture, or seeing a film might be important for self-presentational concerns (Tesser et al., 1988, p. 447). Therefore, enjoyment has been reconceptualised in order to capture this diversity of audience responses to the entertainment experience (Oliver & Raney, 2011, p. 985).

Thus, two different motivations why people consume media entertainment have been established: hedonic motivations or eudaimonic motivations. According to Oliver and Raney (2011, p. 985), hedonic motivations refer to the consumption of media entertainment with the aim of pleasure and amusement. Therefore, according to the hedonic view, well-being or enjoyment is connected to the presence of positive and the absence of a negative affect, leading to the short-term satisfaction of the viewer's needs (Wirth et al., 2012, p. 408). On the other hand, eudaimonic motivations refer to the consumption of media entertainment as a way to search for the meaning of life or a purpose (Oliver & Raney, 2011, p. 985). The entertainment experience is to be understood as not just pleasurable, but also as something that offers better insights into human existence (Wirth et al., 2012, p. 409).

To have a better understanding of what constitutes a meaningful entertainment experience for an individual, Klimmt and Rieger (2021, p. 384) introduce the concept of biographic resonance. Biographic resonance, according to Klimmt and Rieger's study (2021, p. 384), refers to the idea that individuals will perceive the entertainment content as meaningful when they feel like there is a connection between the content's message and their personality, their history, a situation in their life, or their current questions about life. Therefore, when this entertainment content resonates with the consumer, that experience is more likely to stand out against the others, leading the consumer to remember it for a longer time (Klimmt & Rieger, 2021, p. 384).

Additionally, Klimmt and Rieger (2021, p. 387) propose the idea that individuals can derive advice or guidance for managing specific aspects of their lives from entertainment content that resonates. Moreover, the authors discuss various forms of biographic resonance, among which the most common appears to be the connection that can be created between the audience and the characters of a specific entertainment piece. This connection is sometimes based on aspects that are fairly easy to detect for the audience, such as shared demographics, career, or dress style, or other times, based on similarities that require more elaboration. For instance, these similarities could entail shared characteristics in personality, self-esteem, or type of humour (Klimmt & Rieger, 2021, p. 387). The notion of resonance appears important, once again, when considering the Cultivation Theory, as it offers an explanation for how

messages in entertainment content strongly affect an individual's perception of reality and their consequent behaviour (Klimmt & Rieger, 2021, p. 385).

2.3 Character engagement factors

There are several factors that may impact the audience's enjoyment of a film. Among these wishful identification, recognisability, and parasocial relationship (PSR) can be found. In fact, according to a study by Raney (2010, p. 309), the enjoyment of media content is strongly dependent on the viewer's emotional connection or attachment to the characters of that media content.

Wishful identification, for instance, is identified by Tolbert and Drogos (2019, p. 3) as a psychological desire to be like a character or another media personality. Therefore, wishful identification goes beyond simply liking or appreciating a character, it entails being so attached to that character that the individual starts to imagine themselves as if they were the character, to the point that their perspective on life changes (Tolbert & Drogos, 2019, p. 3). In other words, wishful identification is seen as a process through which the viewer tends to change their behaviour or appearances in order to emulate those of their favourite media characters (Lim et al., 2020, p. 1; Żerebecki et al., 2022, p. 365). Previous research shows that wishful identification is also a moderator of psychological and social effects of the media, especially on younger people. Thus, identifying with violent characters, for instance, can be related to individuals' own aggressive behaviour in real life (Tolbert & Drogos, 2019, p. 3). This is based on Bandura's (2009, p. 265) Social Cognitive Theory, which explains that humans learn behaviour and actions also by observing certain models.

Recognisability, on the other hand, is defined by Żerebecki et al. (2023, p. 4) as a perceived sense of familiarity by the viewer when seeing a media character in terms of personality, attitude, or situations lived by the fictional character. It is an extremely different concept from that of wishful identification, as it does not concern anymore the individual's willingness to transform themselves to be similar to the character, but rather the connection that is developed between the viewer and the character.

Lastly, another form of attachment that the audience may form with characters is defined as parasocial relationship (PSR). Parasocial relationship is deemed as an important construct to understand why an audience enjoys a film (Baldwin & Raney, 2021, p. 749). Generally, when the viewers have "any combination of cognitive, affective, or behavioural responses toward a fictional character during a single encounter" (Baldwin & Raney, 2021, p. 750), a parasocial interaction occurs, which then transforms into a parasocial relationship

when it becomes a long-term experience, and not necessarily limited to what occurs when watching the fictional character. In a study by Horton and Wohl (1956, p. 215), parasocial relationships are described as a phenomenon in which viewers envision themselves having an interpersonal relationship with the character or the performer. Therefore, when a parasocial relationship occurs, viewers start discussing the character or performer as if they were part of their family or friend circle (Horton & Wohl, 1956, p. 215).

Linked to the concept of parasocial relationships, another important factor to take into consideration is that of perceived similarity. According to Bond (2021, p. 576), the level of perceived similarity between viewers and fictional characters can be crucial for the development of parasocial relationships. Therefore, individuals are more likely to develop and strengthen parasocial relationships with those characters that they feel are similar to them, or that they perceive as authentic (Bond, 2021, p. 575). Additionally, Bond (2021, p. 576) states that gender, as well as race, plays a significant role in the development of parasocial relationships, with women often seen as more invested in relationships and, thus, more prone to developing strong parasocial relationship with characters, compared to men. Therefore, character engagement factors appear crucial to create a deep connection with the characters in the film, thus leading to a more enjoyable and fulfilling experience for the viewers.

2.4 The role of gender and age in the enjoyment of a movie

Research suggests that media preferences strongly depend on demographic factors, such as age, or generational belonging, and the gender you identify with (Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 97). For instance, according to a study by Banerjee et al. (2008, p. 98), men and women enjoy different genres of film, with women being automatically linked to a preference for “chick flicks”, as well as comedies, whereas men are linked to action or horror movies (Wühr et al., 2017, p. 2). Previous studies investigating actual movie preferences have indeed confirmed, to some degree, the prevailing stereotypes about gender differences (Wühr et al., 2017, p. 2).

Additionally, Fischhoff (1994, as cited in Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 98) argues that, in media production, the common wisdom is that two different typologies of movie exist: “women’s films”, which see that story told from the point of view of a woman or that revolve around women’s issues, and “men’s films”, which focus more on action, sex or competition (Fischhoff, 1994, as cited in Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 98). Therefore, individuals, as shown by previous research, will generally tend to form stronger connections and experience more

intense emotional reactions towards characters of their same sex, rather than to opposite-sex characters (Oliver et al., 2000, p. 286).

Another factor that strongly affects movie preference is age. In fact, as mentioned in a study by Tesser et al. (1988, p. 441), in the US moviegoing is believed to be one of the most popular leisure activities among younger people. In particular, the stage of life referred to as emerging adulthood (18-29) (Arnett, 2014, p. 9) is considered a distinct and unique phase of identity development, as in that period media content and movies can play a significant role to provide information and guidance used to make life choices (Behm-Morawitz & Mastro, 2008, p. 132).

Moreover, Mares et al. (2008, p. 491) suggest that, due to emotional developmental changes, individuals tend to value and prefer different types of media content at different ages. According to Lassner (1944, p. 266), younger people or emerging adults feel the urge to learn from the film they are watching; therefore, they are mostly interested in movies that provide them the opportunity to enrich their personalities, or that are also a reflection of their own problems. For young adults it is almost crucial relating the events of the plot to their own life, as they want to see movie portray things as they are in reality, while the same does not happen for older people (Lassner, 1944, p. 256).

However, other studies have shown that emerging adults appear to be more motivated to watch comedies, as well as horror movies (Mares et al., 2008, p. 493), whereas older people appear to have a significant preference for films that are emotional, heartwarming, and with an emphasis only on meaningful positive emotions (Hofer et al., 2014, p. 64; Mares et al., 2008, p. 494). According to the Socioemotional Selectivity Theory, this might be due to the fact that young adults do not feel the need to be frugal with their time, therefore, they are more likely and willing to spend time watching films “just for fun”, or films that are known to be more lightweight, compared to older people. The same happens for horror movies or films that highlight negative emotions, with research suggesting that, particularly within this age demographic, intense emotions, whether positive or negative, are perceived as intrinsically valuable to escape boredom (Mares et al., 2008, p. 493).

2.5 Hypotheses

As discussed, the enjoyment of media content relies heavily on how the viewer bonds with the character at an emotional level and on their attachment to the character (Raney, 2010, p. 576). Therefore, when watching television or movies, viewers “experience feelings and use heuristics developed from their real-life experiences” (Cohen, 1997, p. 516). Previous

research shows, for instance, that the level of wishful identification with a character is related to the perceived similarity with that character (Żerebecki et al., 2022, p. 365). Moreover, another important factor for the development of wishful identification is that of shared gender (as cited in Żerebecki et al., 2022, p. 365). Similar dynamics occur with parasocial relationships. In fact, individuals tend to form and strengthen parasocial relationships with characters they perceive as similar to themselves or as authentic (Bond, 2021, p. 575). Furthermore, gender, along with race, plays a valuable role in shaping parasocial relationships, with women often displaying greater investment in the characters and propensity to develop strong parasocial relationships with them compared to men (Bond, 2021, p. 576). Therefore, the following hypotheses are stated.

H1: *Wishful identification increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.*

H2: *Parasocial relationship increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.*

H3: *Females show higher a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, c) situational recognisability, d) wishful identification, and e) parasocial relationship than men.*

H4: *Wishful identification for females increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.*

H5: *Parasocial relationship for females increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.*

H6: *Wishful identification for males increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.*

H7: *Parasocial relationship for males increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.*

Rain and Mar (2021, p. 2795) state that, when the viewer identifies with a character in the story, this leads to a reduction in self-awareness but, most importantly, in an increased connection to the narrative. Therefore, the audiences “experience the story vicariously through that character” (Rain & Mar, 2021, p. 2795). Those who identify with a character begin to adopt that character's perspective, goals, emotions, and knowledge, experiencing the narrative as if they were the character rather than themselves (Rain & Mar, 2021, p. 2795). Therefore, just like gender, age can be considered another determinant factor for movie preference. Thus, it can be inferred that:

H8: *Younger people (aged 18-29) show a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, c) situational recognisability, d) wishful identification, and e) parasocial relationship than older people (aged 30 and above).*

H9: *Wishful identification for younger people (aged 18-29) increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.*

H10: *Parasocial relationship for younger people (aged 18-29) increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.*

H11: *Wishful identification for older people (aged 30 and above) increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.*

H12: *Parasocial relationship for older people (aged 30 and above) increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.*

Then, Oliver and Raney (2011, p. 985) introduce two different concepts to describe the entertainment experience: hedonic and eudaimonic. According to their study, a hedonic experience involves the consumption of media entertainment for either pleasure or amusement. According to this perspective, the feeling of enjoyment, which is connected to the presence of positive and the absence of a negative affect, is the most important factor, as it satisfies the viewer's needs short-term (Wirth et al., 2012, p. 408). Instead, eudaimonic

motivations refer to the idea that media entertainment can also help in exploring the meaning of life or in seeking a sense of purpose (Oliver & Raney, 2011, p. 985). Thus, the enjoyment of a movie is to be understood as something that not only involves amusement but that also provides deeper insights into human existence (Wirth et al., 2012, p. 409). Therefore, the following hypotheses are stated.

H13: *Eudaimonic entertainment of a woman-centric movie increases with a) parasocial relationship, b) wishful identification, c) personality recognisability, d) attitudinal recognisability, e) situational recognisability, f) people identifying as women, g) people aged 18-29, and decreases with h) people identifying as men, i) people aged 30 and above.*

H14: *Hedonic entertainment of a woman-centric movie increases with a) parasocial relationship, b) wishful identification, c) personality recognisability, d) attitudinal recognisability, e) situational recognisability, f) people identifying as women, g) people aged 18-29, and decreases with h) people identifying as men, i) people aged 30 and above.*

3. Method

3.1 Justification

The aim of this research was to determine the extent to which elements such as age group, gender identification, and character engagement factors impact the enjoyment of a woman-centric movie. Therefore, since the focus of this study was on testing hypotheses and verifying the existence of a relationship between various factors and the enjoyment of a woman-centric movie, the best option possible was a quantitative approach (Sukamolson, 2007, p. 9). With quantitative research, in fact, there is the possibility of studying a phenomenon through the use of a sample (i.e. viewers of Barbie), in order to make inferences about a population (Sukamolson, 2007, p. 8). Moreover, these inferences are done by making use of statistical data (Babbie, 2015, p. 26). For this quasi-experimental study, a survey was utilised, as most of the variables under study (i.e., recognisability, wishful identification, parasocial relationship, and enjoyment) were not numerical in nature. Furthermore, a study by Marshall (2005, p. 132) states that the use of surveys in quantitative research is extremely useful as it allows for the production of high-quality usable data, as well as more honest answers by the participants.

To create and publish the questionnaire, as well as to process the data gathered, the software Qualtrics was chosen. Moreover, it was important to conduct significant preparation in order to ensure the reliability and validity of the survey (Marshall, 2005, p. 135). Therefore, the questionnaire was tested among some students prior to being made available to everyone to assess its clarity and the structure of the questions. As a result, some adjustments were made to the wording of the concepts related to character engagement factors to make it more understandable for the participants, while maintaining fidelity to the original content. Finally, as the questionnaire was developed by incorporating several established scales from the literature which measured the key concepts of this research, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the data to further prepare it and to examine its internal consistency reliability.

This study, as previously stated, aimed to test whether factors such as recognisability, wishful identification, and parasocial relationship, combined with different gender identifications and age groups could impact the enjoyment of a movie primarily focused on women and feminism, and with a female protagonist. Therefore, the first test that was conducted was a two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). This statistical test, in fact, allows the researcher to detect differences between more than two group means (Sawyer, 2009, p. E27). In this case, as the two independent variables (gender and age group) that consisted of

two groups each were tested against one dependent variable in order to check whether an interaction effect occurred, a 2x2 ANOVA was used (Sawyer, 2009, p. E32). Subsequently, since the only interaction effect that occurred between age group and gender identification was with the variable hedonic entertainment, an independent-samples t-test was conducted. An independent-samples t-test, as stated by Sawyer (2009, p. E29) is a statistical method used to compare the means of two independent groups to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between them. Lastly, a hierarchical regression analysis was used to explore potential correlations between the variables. Therefore, as theory expects variables such as recognisability, wishful identification, parasocial relationships, and enjoyment to be correlated, hierarchical regression can be useful for the researcher to test the significance of variables in a particular order on a dependent variable after considering the influence of other variables (Lewis, 2007, p. 9). The same analysis was then conducted by using the option of split files for gender identification and age group.

3.2 Sampling strategy

For this study, the movie Barbie was used as stimulus as it was one of the most well-known woman-centric movies of 2023. Therefore, the research only focused on people who watched the film. As two of the main factors to analyse were age and gender identification, the audience of interest was divided into 4 groups: younger females (18 to 29 years old), older females (30 and above), younger males (18 to 29 years old), and older males (30 and above). As younger and older non-binary people or people who identify with another gender identity would have been hard to reach, the target population of this study only included responses of people who identified as female or male. Moreover, since the popularity of the movie was international, the sample aimed to reach and possibly include international viewers. In order to make inferences about this population, the researcher made use of non-probability sampling, namely purposive sampling, to find participants who fit the criteria (i.e. younger females, older females, younger males or older males who had seen the movie Barbie) and obtain a representative sample.

To reach viewers of the movie, the researcher decided to use firstly social media platforms. Consequently, the survey was shared on platforms such as X (formerly Twitter), Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and TikTok. Moreover, film pages and fan pages on Facebook were contacted in order to ask them to share it as well. Eventually, because of an initial low response rate, the researcher also made use of platforms built specifically to share surveys, such as SurveySwap or SurveyCircle, and Facebook pages devoted to the same cause to

improve the response rate. However, this method was not effective, and was therefore cancelled. Lastly, the researcher repeated the first method which involved social media platforms such as Reddit several times. Snowball sampling was also used, by inserting a message at the end of the survey kindly requesting the people who filled out the questionnaire to share it with other people who had seen the film Barbie. Eventually, these methods proved to be extremely effective.

3.3 Sample

Initially, the study recorded a total of 320 participants. However, following a process of data cleaning, 170 respondents were determined valid for the purpose of the analysis. The final sample ($N = 170$) consisted of $n = 65$ respondents who identified as females and belonged to the age group 18 to 29, $n = 35$ participants who identified as females and were aged 30 and above, $n = 39$ who identified as males and were in the age group 18 to 29, and, lastly, $n = 31$ participants who identified as males and were aged 30 and above. The average age of the respondents was 32.07 ($SD = 13.76$; range = 18-70). Moreover, most of the respondents identified as White (85.3%), followed by Asian (7.6%) and people of Latino or Spanish origin (2.4%), or some other ethnicity (2.4%%). When it comes to the country of origin, the most common was Italy (39.4%), followed by the United States of America (19.4%) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (10.0%). Lastly, in terms of education level, most of the respondents obtained a highschool diploma (40.0%), followed by a bachelor's degree (35.3%), and a graduate or professional degree (22.4%).

3.4 Procedure

The participants were invited to fill in an online survey, which required approximately 8 minutes to complete. They were initially presented with a brief description of the topic of the study, followed by the informed consent, which was used to clarify how the research data would be collected and analysed and to confirm whether the respondents were at least 18 years old and understood the terms of the study. Consequently, those who consented were presented with a filter question which asked them whether they had watched the Barbie movie (2023). Those who had not watched it were directed to the end of the questionnaire, whereas the others could proceed with the following section.

Then, the participants were presented with Likert-scale based questions regarding character engagement factors. Firstly, they were asked to provide an answer to 20 questions regarding recognisability and the extent to which they recognised themselves in the character

of Barbie. Then, they were presented with 3 questions related to wishful identification and 6 concerning parasocial relationships. Finally, they were asked their level of agreement with 12 statements regarding their enjoyment of the movie Barbie, which included question on both hedonic and eudaimonic entertainment.

Once the participants had completed the Likert-scale based questions, they were presented with questions regarding demographics, such as their gender identity and an open-question about their age, which were crucial for the analysis of the data. Moreover, to know more about their cultural background, the respondents were asked to pick their ethnicity from a list of categories and their country of origin from a list that included 195 countries. Lastly, they were presented with a question concerning their level of education. After completing the questionnaire, participants received a message from the researcher, thanking them for their time and effort.

3.5 Measurements

As a step in the questionnaire preparation process, the main concepts of this study were operationalised by using previously established scales. However, the Minority Character Recognisability Scale (Żerebecki et al., 2023) was considered a novel scale, as it was recently developed.

Recognisability. Recognisability was measured using the Minority Character Recognisability Scale (MRS), which was recently developed by Żerebecki et al. (2023). The scale comprised of 20 items, including statements such as ‘*I recognise the problems that [character] has as problems that I could have*’ or ‘*I recognise the topics that [character] discusses with others as topics I could discuss with other people in my life*’. The participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each of these statements through a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Wishful identification. The concept of wishful identification was measured using the Wishful Identification Scale, which was ideated by Hoffner (1996, p. 400). The scale included 3 items, with statements such as ‘*[Character] is the sort of person I want to be like myself*’, ‘*I wish I could be more like [character]*’, and ‘*I’d like to do the kinds of things [character] does in the movie*’. Participants were then asked to express their level of agreement through a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Parasocial relationships. In this research, parasocial relationships were measured by referring to the Multiple-PRS scale created by Tukachinsky (2011, p. 80), which included the 6 items from the friendship communication sub-scale. The scale comprised of statements such

as ‘*If [character] was a real person, I could have disclosed positive things about myself honestly and fully (deeply) to him/her*’ or ‘*I think [character] could be a friend of mine*’. Here the participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement through a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Enjoyment. For this study, the viewer’s enjoyment of the movie was divided into hedonic and eudaimonic entertainment experience. The scale used was Oliver and Bartsch’s (2010, p. 63) which included 12 items, such as ‘*I had a good time watching this movie*’ or ‘*I know I will never forget this movie*’. In this case, the participants were asked to state their level of agreement through a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Moreover, *Age group* was measured by asking the participants to state whether their age is comprised between 18 and 30 years old, or if they are older than 30. *Gender identification* was also one of the measures of this study.

Before including recognisability, wishful identification, parasocial relationships, and entertainment experience in further analyses, the scales that contained a wide range of single items were evaluated in terms of validity and reliability through a factor analysis.

Firstly, for recognisability, the 20 items which were Likert-scale based were entered into a confirmatory factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation and fixed number of factors set on 3, $KMO = .94$, $X^2 (N = 170, 190) = 2377.35$, $p = .000$. The resultant model explained 66.5% of the variance in ‘Recognisability’. Factor loadings of individual items onto the three factors are presented in Table 1. The following factors were found.

Personality recognisability. The first factor ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 1.40$) included 6 items about personality recognisability such as recognising oneself in the character’s approach to life, strengths and thought processes.

Attitudinal recognisability. The second factor ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 1.17$) included 3 items such as recognising oneself in the character’s opinions about moral or social issues, or what is good or bad.

Situational recognisability. The third factor ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.41$) included 11 items about situational recognisability such as recognising oneself in the character’s life and recognising similar past experiences or situations.

Table 1. Factor loadings, explained variance and reliability of the three factors found for the scale 'Recognisability'. ($N = 170$)

I recognise...	Personality recognisability	Attitudinal recognisability	Situational recognisability
... Barbie's approach to life as an approach to life that I have.	.74		
... Barbie's opinions about other people as opinions I have.	.72		
... the solutions to problems of Barbie as solutions I could follow.	.71		
... the decisions of Barbie as decisions that I could make.	.66		
... the strengths of Barbie as strengths that I have.	.63		
... the thought processes of Barbie as thought processes I have.	.53		
... the topics that Barbie discusses with others as topics I could discuss with other people in my life.		.77	
... Barbie's opinions about social problems as opinions I have.		.64	
... Barbie's opinions about what is good and bad as opinions I have.		.60	
... my life in the life of Barbie.			.78
... the situations that Barbie encounters as situations that could also happen to me.			.78
... the past experiences of Barbie as similar to my past experiences.			.76
... the problems that Barbie has as problems that I could have.			.73
... the life changes Barbie experiences as life changes that could happen to me.			.72
... myself in Barbie.			.71
... the places in which I see Barbie as places I could be in.			.70
... the personality traits of Barbie as traits that I have.			.63
... the weaknesses of Barbie as weaknesses I have.			.61
... the behaviours of Barbie as behaviours that I could show.			.52
... the reactions to stressful situations of Barbie as reactions that I could have.			.50
R^2	.08	.05	.54
Cronbach's α	.89	.80	.94

Then, the 3 Likert-scale based items describing wishful identification were entered into a confirmatory factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation and fixed number of factors set on 1, $KMO = .71$ $X^2(N = 170, 3) = 329.83, p < .001$. The resultant model explained 82.8% of the variance in ‘Wishful identification’. Factor loadings of individual items onto the one factor are presented in Table 2. The following factor was identified.

Wishful identification. This factor ($M = 3.10, SD = 1.12$) included 3 items regarding wanting to be like the main character and wishing to do the same things that the main character does in the movie.

Table 2. Factor loadings, explained variance and reliability of the one factor found for the scale ‘Wishful identification’. ($N = 170$)

	Wishful identification
I wish I could be more like Barbie.	.94
Barbie is the sort of person I want to be like myself.	.93
I’d like to do the things Barbie does in the movie.	.86
R^2	.83
Cronbach’s α	.90

Next, the 6 Likert-scale based items belonging to the scale regarding parasocial relationships were entered into a confirmatory factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation and fixed number of factors set on 1, $KMO = .83$ $X^2(N = 170, 15) = 781.08, p < .001$. The resultant model explained 69.3% of the variance in ‘Parasocial relationship’. Factor loadings of individual items onto the one factor are presented in Table 3. The following factor was identified.

Parasocial relationship. This factor ($M = 4.28, SD = 1.48$) included 6 items about wanting to know what the character would do in their position and being able to disclose positive and negative things about oneself to the character.

Table 3. Factor loadings, explained variance and reliability of the one factor found for the scale ‘Parasocial relationship’. ($N = 170$)

	Parasocial relationship
If Barbie was a real person, I could have disclosed a great deal of things about myself to her.	.90
If Barbie was a real person, I could have disclosed negative things about myself honestly and fully (deeply) to her.	.86
Sometimes, I wish I could ask Barbie for advice.	.83
If Barbie was a real person, I could have disclosed positive things about myself honestly and fully (deeply) to her.	.82
I think Barbie could be a friend of mine.	.79
Sometimes, I wish I knew what Barbie would do in my situation.	.79
R^2	.69
Cronbach’s α	.91

Lastly, the 12 items regarding the enjoyment or entertainment experience which were Likert-scale based were entered into a confirmatory factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation and fixed number of factors set on 2, $KMO = .89$ $X^2 (N = 170, 66) = 1683.41, p < .001$. The resultant model explained 71.1% of the variance in ‘Enjoyment’. Factor loadings of individual items onto the two factors are presented in Table 4. The following factors were found.

Eudaimonic entertainment. The first factor ($M = 3.24, SD = .94$) included 9 items in regard to having a meaningful experience while watching the movie, such as being moved by the film or it leaving a lasting impression on the viewer.

Hedonic entertainment. The second factor ($M = 4.43, SD = .79$) included 3 items about experiencing fun while watching the movie, such as finding the movie entertaining or having a good time while watching it.

Table 4. Factor loadings, explained variance and reliability of the two factors found for the scale 'Enjoyment'. ($N = 170$)

	Eudaimonic entertainment	Hedonic entertainment
I was on the edge of my seat while watching this movie.	.82	
The movie was suspenseful.	.76	
I know I will never forget this movie.	.75	
This movie left me with a lasting impression.	.75	
This was a heart-pounding kind of movie.	.75	
This movie will stick with me for a long time.	.72	
I was moved by this movie.	.67	
This movie was thought provoking.	.59	
I found this movie to be very meaningful.	.53	
It was fun for me to watch this movie.		.92
I had a good time watching this movie.		.92
The movie was entertaining.		.87
R^2	.55	.15
Cronbach's α	.92	.93

3.6 Ethics

When conducting survey research, it is also important to consider ethical aspects. According to a study by Kelley et al. (2003, p. 266) some of the most important issues regarding ethics which need to be taken into account when conducting a survey are confidentiality and informed consent. Therefore, the right to confidentiality of the participants should always be respected (Kelley et al., 2003, p. 266). Moreover, the respondents should be informed about the content of the study and the aims of the survey, and should, therefore, give their consent to take part in it (Kelley et al., 2003, p. 266). For this research, the participants were thoroughly informed of the aims of the study and, before starting the questionnaire, they were asked for their informed consent, in order not to do harm. Moreover, in order to prevent other ethical issues, this study included only participants who were over 18 years old, and the outcomes of the research were expected to be positive.

4. Results

This study's aim was to examine to what extent media engagement factors, gender identification, and age group affect the viewers' enjoyment of a woman-centric movie. Therefore, multiple hypotheses were formulated to test differences between age groups and gender identities in terms of recognisability, wishful identification, parasocial relationships, and enjoyment. Then, other hypotheses tested whether there were correlations between the concepts that were previously discussed.

4.1 Comparisons between age and gender concerning recognisability

A two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identities as independent variables and personality recognisability as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for age groups on personality recognisability, $F(1, 166) = 12.00, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$. People aged between 18 and 29 ($M = 4.51, SD = 1.23$) scored higher on personality recognisability than people aged 30 and older ($M = 3.74, SD = 1.53$). Also, gender identity revealed a significant main effect on personality recognisability, $F(1, 166) = 65.75, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .28$. Females ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.00$) scored higher on personality recognisability than males ($M = 3.31, SD = 1.40$). No significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 166) = 0.88, p = .350$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ (= H3a, H8a).

Then, a two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identity as independent variables and attitudinal recognisability as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for age groups on attitudinal recognisability, $F(1, 166) = 7.88, p = .006$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. People aged between 18 and 29 ($M = 4.68, SD = 1.00$) scored higher on attitudinal recognisability than people aged 30 and older ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.39$). Also, gender identity revealed a significant main effect on attitudinal recognisability, $F(1, 166) = 20.26, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .11$. Females ($M = 4.80, SD = .88$) scored higher on attitudinal recognisability than males ($M = 4.01, SD = 1.37$). No significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 166) = 1.36, p = .245$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ (= H3b, H8b).

Lastly, a two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identity as independent variables and situational recognisability as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for age groups on situational recognisability, $F(1, 165) = 10.46, p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. People aged between 18 and 29 ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.23$) scored higher on situational recognisability than people aged 30 and older ($M = 3.72, SD = 1.57$). Also, gender

identity revealed a significant main effect on situational recognisability, $F(1, 165) = 78.66, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .32$. Females ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.11$) scored higher on situational recognisability than males ($M = 3.19, SD = 1.22$). No significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 165) = 0.04, p = .841$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$ (= H3c, H8c).

4.2 Comparisons between age and gender concerning wishful identification

A two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identities as independent variables and wishful identification as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed there was not a significant main effect for age groups on wishful identification, $F(1, 165) = 2.46, p = .119$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Also, gender identity revealed a significant main effect on wishful identification, $F(1, 165) = 36.64, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$. Females ($M = 3.50, SD = .95$) scored higher on wishful identification than males ($M = 2.53, SD = 1.12$). No significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 165) = 1.42, p = .235$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ (= H3d, \neq H8d).

4.3 Comparisons between age and gender concerning parasocial relationship

Then, a two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identities as independent variables and parasocial relationship as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for age groups on parasocial relationship, $F(1, 166) = 8.42, p = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. People aged between 18 and 29 ($M = 4.57, SD = 1.35$) scored higher on parasocial relationship than people aged 30 and older ($M = 3.83, SD = 1.39$). Also, gender identity revealed a significant main effect on parasocial relationship, $F(1, 166) = 24.98, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$. Females ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.32$) scored higher on parasocial relationship than males ($M = 3.61, SD = 1.45$). No significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 166) = 0.09, p = .765$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$ (= H3e, H8e).

4.4 Comparisons between age and gender concerning enjoyment

A two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identities as independent variables and eudaimonic entertainment as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for age groups on eudaimonic entertainment, $F(1, 166) = 10.10, p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. People aged between 18 and 29 ($M = 3.43, SD = .78$) scored higher on eudaimonic entertainment than people aged 30 and older ($M = 2.95, SD = 1.09$). Also, gender identity revealed a significant main effect on eudaimonic entertainment, $F(1, 166) = 23.99, p$

< .001, partial $\eta^2 = .13$. Females ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .80$) scored higher on eudaimonic entertainment than males ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .99$). No significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 166) = 0.05$, $p = .827$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$ (= H13f, H13g, H13h, H13i).

Then, a two-way ANOVA was conducted with age groups, and gender identity as independent variables and hedonic entertainment as dependent variable. ANOVA revealed there was not a significant main effect for age groups on hedonic entertainment, $F(1, 166) = 3.54$, $p = .062$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. However, gender identity revealed a significant main effect on hedonic entertainment, $F(1, 166) = 23.89$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$. Females ($M = 4.65$, $SD = .57$) scored higher on hedonic entertainment than males ($M = 4.11$, $SD = .94$). A significant interaction effect between age groups and gender identity was shown, $F(1, 166) = 4.77$, $p = .030$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$ (= H14f, H14h, \neq H14g, H14i).

Lastly, since a significant interaction effect was found, an independent samples t-test was conducted to investigate the differences between specific subgroups. Looking first at the comparisons within males, post hoc t-test revealed that participants aged between 18 and 29 ($M = 4.32$, $SD = .82$) experienced more hedonic entertainment than participants aged 30 and above ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.02$), $t(68) = 2.16$, $p = .017$. No significant difference in hedonic entertainment was found between younger females ($M = 4.64$, $SD = .62$) and older females ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .46$), $t(88,5) = -0.32$, $p = .750$. Further comparing hedonic entertainment specifically for participants aged between 18 and 29, a post-hoc t-test revealed that young females ($M = 4.64$, $SD = .62$) experienced more hedonic entertainment than young males ($M = 4.32$, $SD = .82$), $t(102) = 2.21$, $p = .014$. Moreover, when making a comparison between participants aged 30 and older, the t-test revealed that older females ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .46$) scored higher on hedonic entertainment than older males ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.02$), $t(64) = 4.32$, $p < .001$.

4.5 Character engagement variables as predictors for wishful identification

A multiple regression analysis was conducted with wishful identification as dependent variable and personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability as predictors. The model was found to be significant, $F(3, 164) = 65.15$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .54$. Personality recognisability was found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful identification ($\beta = .26$, $p = .007$), thereby offering support for H1a. Attitudinal recognisability was also found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful identification

($\beta = .38, p < .001$), offering support for H1b. However, the effect of situational recognisability ($\beta = .16, p = .067$) was not significant. H1c was therefore rejected.

Another multiple regression analysis was then conducted by splitting files into two separate gender identities. Firstly, when considering only female participants, the multiple regression analysis was conducted with wishful identification as dependent variable and personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability as predictors. The model was found to be significant, $F(3, 95) = 11.52, p < .001, R^2 = .27$. Attitudinal recognisability was found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful identification ($\beta = .41, p = .001$), thereby offering support for H4b. However, the effect of personality recognisability ($\beta = .04, p = .736$) and situational recognisability ($\beta = .12, p = .374$) was not significant. H4a and H4c were therefore rejected.

Then, a multiple regression analysis was conducted by taking into consideration only male participants. Wishful identification was used as dependent variable and personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability as predictors. The model was found to be significant, $F(3, 65) = 45.19, p < .001, R^2 = .68$. Personality recognisability was found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful identification ($\beta = .43, p = .002$), thereby offering support for H6a. Moreover, attitudinal recognisability was found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful identification ($\beta = .36, p = .006$), thereby offering support for H6b. However, the effect of situational recognisability ($\beta = .08, p = .469$) was not significant. H6c was therefore rejected.

Another multiple regression analysis was then conducted by splitting files into two separate age groups. Firstly, when considering only participants aged between 18 and 29, the multiple regression analysis was conducted with wishful identification as dependent variable and personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability as predictors. The model was found to be significant, $F(3, 98) = 30.36, p < .001, R^2 = .48$. Attitudinal recognisability was found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful identification ($\beta = .48, p < .001$), thereby offering support for H9b. However, the effect of personality recognisability ($\beta = .15, p = .137$) and situational recognisability ($\beta = .15, p = .137$) was not significant. H9a and H9c were therefore rejected.

Lastly, a multiple regression analysis was conducted by taking into consideration only participants aged 30 and above. Wishful identification was used as dependent variable and personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability as predictors. The model was found to be significant, $F(3, 62) = 24.18, p < .001, R^2 = .62$. Personality recognisability was found to be a significant positive predictor of wishful

identification ($\beta = .64, p = .003$), thereby offering support for H11a. However, the effect of attitudinal recognisability ($\beta = .10, p = .522$) and situational recognisability ($\beta = .07, p = .698$) was not significant. H11b and H11c were therefore rejected.

4.6 Character engagement variables as predictors for parasocial relationship

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with parasocial relationship as dependent variable. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .61, F(3, 164) = 85.08, p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model improved, $\Delta R^2 = .67, \Delta F(1, 163) = 28.34, p < .001$, with wishful identification being a significant predictor and with personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability being significant as well (see Table 5). Thus, H2a, H2b, H2c, and H2d were accepted.

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis for parasocial relationship

	Model 1	Model 2
Personality recognisability	.27**	.18*
Attitudinal recognisability	.34***	.21**
Situational recognisability	.24**	.19*
Wishful identification		.36***
	$R^2 = .61$	$\Delta R^2 = .67$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

Then, another hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with parasocial relationship as dependent variable by taking into consideration only female participants. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .47, F(3, 95) = 27.65, p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .53, \Delta F(1, 94) = 22.70, p < .001$, with wishful identification being a significant predictor and with situational recognisability being

significant as well, while attitudinal recognisability was no longer significant (see Table 6). Thus, H5a and H5d were accepted, while H5b and H5c were rejected.

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analysis for parasocial relationship with female participants

	Model 1	Model 2
Personality recognisability	.17	.16
Attitudinal recognisability	.29**	.17
Situational recognisability	.33**	.29**
Wishful identification		.28***
	$R^2 = .47$	$\Delta R^2 = .53$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

Moreover, another hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with parasocial relationship as dependent variable by taking into consideration only male participants. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .66$, $F(3, 65) = 41.33$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .75$, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 25.64$, $p < .001$, with wishful identification being a significant predictor, while personality recognisability and attitudinal recognisability were no longer significant (see Table 7). Thus, H7a was accepted, while H7b, H7c, and H7d were rejected.

Table 7. Hierarchical regression analysis for parasocial relationship with male participants

	Model 1	Model 2
Personality recognisability	.44**	.20
Attitudinal recognisability	.38**	.18
Situational recognisability	.04	-.00
Wishful identification		.55***
	$R^2 = .66$	$\Delta R^2 = .75$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

Another hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with parasocial relationship as dependent variable by taking into consideration only participants aged between 18 and 29. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .51$, $F(3, 98) = 33.81$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .61$, $\Delta F(4, 97) = 38.21$, $p < .001$, with wishful identification being a significant predictor and with situational recognisability being significant as well, while personality and attitudinal recognisability were no longer significant (see Table 8). Thus, H10a and H10d were accepted, while H10b and H10c were rejected.

Table 8. Hierarchical regression analysis for parasocial relationship with participants 18-29

	Model 1	Model 2
Personality recognisability	.22*	.15
Attitudinal recognisability	.30**	.08
Situational recognisability	.31**	.24**
Wishful identification		.45***
	$R^2 = .51$	$\Delta R^2 = .61$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

Lastly, another hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with parasocial relationship as dependent variable by taking into consideration only participants aged 30 and above. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .69$, $F(3, 62) = 45.53$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .72$, $\Delta F(4, 61) = 39.07$, $p < .001$, with wishful identification being a significant predictor and with attitudinal recognisability being significant as well, while personality recognisability was no longer significant (see Table 9). Thus, H12a and H12c were accepted, while H12b and H12d were rejected.

Table 9. Hierarchical regression analysis for parasocial relationship with participants 30+

	Model 1	Model 2
Personality recognisability	.43*	.24
Attitudinal recognisability	.38*	.35*
Situational recognisability	.06	.04
Wishful identification		.29*
	$R^2 = .69$	$\Delta R^2 = .72$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

4.7 Character engagement variables as predictors for eudaimonic entertainment

Firstly, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with eudaimonic entertainment as dependent variable. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .50$, $F(3, 164) = 55.01$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .56$, $\Delta F(1, 163) = 23.29$, $p < .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .58$, $\Delta F(1, 162) = 4.64$, $p = .033$, with wishful identification and parasocial relationship being significant predictors, and with personality recognisability no longer being significant (see Table 10). Thus, H13a and H13b were accepted. H13c, H13d, and H13e were rejected.

Table 10. Hierarchical regression analysis for eudaimonic entertainment

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.25*	.16	.12
Attitudinal recognisability	.36***	.22*	.18
Situational recognisability	.16	.10	.07
Wishful identification		.37***	.30***
Parasocial relationship			.19*
	$R^2 = .50$	$\Delta R^2 = .56$	$\Delta R^2 = .58$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .033$

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

Then, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with eudaimonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only female participants. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .26$, $F(3, 95) = 10.91$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(1, 94) = 18.91$, $p < .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the model was no longer significant, $\Delta R^2 = .40$, $\Delta F(1, 93) = 3.35$, $p = .070$, with only wishful identification being a significant predictor (see Table 11).

Table 11. Hierarchical regression analysis for eudaimonic entertainment with females

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.23	.21	.18
Attitudinal recognisability	.28*	.12	.08
Situational recognisability	.07	.02	-.04
Wishful identification		.41***	.35***
Parasocial relationship			.21
	$R^2 = .26$	$\Delta R^2 = .38$	$\Delta R^2 = .40$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p = .070$

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

Lastly, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with eudaimonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only male participants. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .61$, $F(3, 65) = 33.93$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .64$, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 4.60$, $p = .036$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the model was no longer significant, $\Delta R^2 = .66$, $\Delta F(1, 63) = 3.34$, $p = .072$, with only situational recognisability being a significant predictor (see Table 12).

Table 12. Hierarchical regression analysis for eudaimonic entertainment with males

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.14	.02	-.04
Attitudinal recognisability	.43**	.33*	.28
Situational recognisability	.27*	.25*	.25*
Wishful identification		.28*	.13
Parasocial relationship			.27
	$R^2 = .61$	$\Delta R^2 = .64$	$\Delta R^2 = .66$
	$p < .001$	$p = .036$	$p = .072$

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

Then, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with eudaimonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only participants aged between 18 and 29. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .33$, $F(3, 98) = 16.18$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model improved, $\Delta R^2 = .36$, $\Delta F(4, 97) = 13.32$, $p < .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the predictive value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .37$, $\Delta F(5, 96) = 11.39$, $p < .001$, with no value being a significant predictor (see Table 13).

Table 13. Hierarchical regression analysis for eudaimonic entertainment with 18-29

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.16	.13	.10
Attitudinal recognisability	.33**	.23	.21
Situational recognisability	.17	.13	.08
Wishful identification		.21	.12
Parasocial relationship			.21
	$R^2 = .33$	$\Delta R^2 = .36$	$\Delta R^2 = .37$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

Lastly, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with eudaimonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only participants aged 30 and above. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .61$, $F(3, 62) = 32.18$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .74$, $\Delta F(4, 61) = 42.66$, $p < .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the predictive value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .75$, $\Delta F(5, 60) = 36.12$, $p < .001$, with only wishful identification being a strong predictor (see Table 14).

Table 14. Hierarchical regression analysis for eudaimonic entertainment with participants 30+

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.47*	.10	.05
Attitudinal recognisability	.29	.23	.15
Situational recognisability	.05	.01	.00
Wishful identification		.58***	.52***
Parasocial relationship			.22
	$R^2 = .61$	$\Delta R^2 = .74$	$\Delta R^2 = .75$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

4.8 Character engagement variables as predictors for hedonic entertainment

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with hedonic entertainment as dependent variable. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .31$, $F(3, 164) = 24.23$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .35$, $\Delta F(1, 163) = 11.16$, $p = .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the value of the model did not improve significantly, $\Delta R^2 = .35$, $\Delta F(1, 162) = .01$, $p = .908$, with wishful identification and personality recognisability being significant predictors (see Table 15). Thus, H14b and H14c were accepted. H14a, H14d, and H14e were rejected.

Table 15. Hierarchical regression analysis for hedonic entertainment

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.45***	.37**	.36**
Attitudinal recognisability	.24*	.12	.12
Situational recognisability	-.12	-.17	-.18
Wishful identification		.31**	.31**
Parasocial relationship			.01
	$R^2 = .31$	$\Delta R^2 = .35$	$\Delta R^2 = .35$
	$p < .001$	$p = .001$	$p = .908$

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

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with hedonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only female participants. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 95) = 2.8$, $p = .044$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .17$, $\Delta F(1, 94) = 10.27$, $p = .002$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the model was no longer significant, $\Delta R^2 = .18$, $\Delta F(1, 93) = .93$, $p = .338$, with personality

recognisability, situational recognisability, and wishful identification being significant predictors (see Table 16).

Table 16. Hierarchical regression analysis for hedonic entertainment with female participants

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.33*	.32*	.30*
Attitudinal recognisability	.06	-.09	-.11
Situational recognisability	-.21	-.25	-.29*
Wishful identification		.35**	.31**
Parasocial relationship			.13
	$R^2 = .08$	$\Delta R^2 = .17$	$\Delta R^2 = .18$
	$p = .044$	$p = .002$	$p = .338$

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

Furthermore, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with hedonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only male participants. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .38$, $F(3, 65) = 13.40$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the model was no longer significant, $\Delta R^2 = .40$, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 1.56$, $p = .217$. the same happened when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, $\Delta R^2 = .40$, $\Delta F(1, 63) = .01$, $p = .917$, with no value being a significant predictor (see Table 17).

Table 17. Hierarchical regression analysis for hedonic entertainment with male participants

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.26	.17	.17
Attitudinal recognisability	.41*	.34	.34
Situational recognisability	-.03	-.05	-.05
Wishful identification		.21	.22
Parasocial relationship			-.02
	$R^2 = .38$	$\Delta R^2 = .40$	$\Delta R^2 = .40$
	$p < .001$	$p = .217$	$p = .917$

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

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with hedonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only participants aged between 18 and 29. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .18$, $F(3, 98) = 6.9$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model improved, $\Delta R^2 = .20$, $\Delta F(4, 97) = 6.03$, $p < .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the predictive value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .20$, $\Delta F(5, 96) = 4.86$, $p < .001$, with personality recognisability being the only significant predictor (see Table 18).

Table 18. Hierarchical regression analysis for hedonic entertainment with participants 18-29

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.34*	.31*	.29*
Attitudinal recognisability	.20	.10	.09
Situational recognisability	-.11	-.14	-.16
Wishful identification		.22	.18
Parasocial relationship			.09
	$R^2 = .18$	$\Delta R^2 = .20$	$\Delta R^2 = .20$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

Lastly, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with hedonic entertainment as dependent variable by taking into consideration only participants aged 30 and above. Personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, situational recognisability, were included in the first block as control variables, whereas wishful identification was added in the second block, and parasocial relationship in the third one. When personality recognisability, attitudinal recognisability, and situational recognisability were used as predictors, the model reached significance, $R^2 = .44$, $F(3, 62) = 16.33$, $p < .001$. When wishful identification was added into the second block, the predictive value of the model significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .51$, $\Delta F(4, 61) = 15.65$, $p < .001$. Lastly, when parasocial relationship was added into the third block, the predictive value of the model slightly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .51$, $\Delta F(5, 60) = 12.38$, $p < .001$, with wishful identification being the only significant predictor (see Table 19).

Table 19. Hierarchical regression analysis for hedonic entertainment with participants 30+

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Personality recognisability	.72**	.45	.47
Attitudinal recognisability	.16	.12	.15
Situational recognisability	-.23	-.26	-.26
Wishful identification		.42**	.44**
Parasocial relationship			-.07
	$R^2 = .44$	$\Delta R^2 = .51$	$\Delta R^2 = .51$
	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

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

This study tested a considerable number of hypotheses. Therefore, the results of all the analyses are presented in Table 20.

Table 20. Hypotheses and results

Hypothesis	Difference/Relationship	Result
H1	Wishful identification increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) v, c) x
H2	Parasocial relationship increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) v, c) v, d) v
H3	Females show higher a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, c) situational recognisability, d) wishful identification, and e) parasocial relationship than men	a) v, b) v, c) v, d) v, e) v
H4	Wishful identification for females increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.	a) x, b) v, c) x
H5	Parasocial relationship for females increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) x, c) x, d) v
H6	Wishful identification for males increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) v, c) x
H7	Parasocial relationship for males increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) x, c) x, d) x

Table 20. Continued

Hypothesis	Difference/Relationship	Result
H8	Younger people (aged 18-29) show a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, c) situational recognisability, d) wishful identification, and e) parasocial relationship than older people (aged 30 and above).	a) v, b) v, c) v, d) x, e) v
H9	Wishful identification for younger people (aged 18-29) increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.	a) x, b) v, c) x
H10	Parasocial relationship for younger people (aged 18-29) increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) x, c) x, d) v
H11	Wishful identification for older people (aged 30 and above) increases with a) personality recognisability, b) attitudinal recognisability, and c) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) x, c) x
H12	Parasocial relationship for older people (aged 30 and above) increases with a) wishful identification, b) personality recognisability, c) attitudinal recognisability, and d) situational recognisability.	a) v, b) x, c) v, d) x
H13	Eudaimonic entertainment of a woman-centric movie increases with a) parasocial relationship, b) wishful identification, c) personality recognisability, d) attitudinal recognisability, e) situational recognisability, f) people identifying as women, g) people aged 18-29, and decreases with h) people identifying as men, i) people aged 30 and above.	a) v, b) v, c) x, d) x, e) x, f) v, g) v, h) v, i) v
H14	Hedonic entertainment of a woman-centric movie increases with a) parasocial relationship, b) wishful identification, c) personality recognisability, d) attitudinal recognisability, e) situational recognisability, f) people identifying as women, g) people aged 18-29, and decreases with h) people identifying as men, i) people aged 30 and above.	a) x, b) v, c) v, d) x, e) x, f) v, g) x, h) v, i) x

Note. Rejected = x, accepted = v

5. Discussion

Previous studies have shown how, despite the rising popularity of women-centric movies and the growing fame of female directors, individuals might still have hesitations or difficulties in connecting with those stories and characters. In fact, several factors might play a role in the enjoyment of a woman-centric movie. For this reason, this study proposed to investigate to what extent factors such as age and gender identification, as well as the viewers' engagement with the fictional characters, could impact the audience's enjoyment of a movie centred around a female character and women's stories. The movie *Barbie*, directed by Greta Gerwig, was used as a case example as it represented one of the most popular women-centric movies released in 2023. The analyses conducted in this study shown that, in most cases, females and people aged between 18 and 29 score higher than males and people aged 30 and above when it comes to character engagement factors (H3, H8, H13, H14). This is in line with previous studies; in fact, according to Bond (2021, p. 576), women are much more likely than men to build stronger relationships with fictional characters and develop, for instance, parasocial relationships. In relation to age, Klimmt and Rieger (2021, p. 387) mention that the connection with a fictional character is often based on similarities that are easily detectable by the audience, such as shared demographics. Therefore, as the character that was analysed in this study is Stereotypical Barbie, a young woman, it appears normal that other young women would find her more relatable. Moreover, the experiences that Stereotypical Barbie faces in the movie are definitely familiar to the majority of women, making it easier for them to connect on a deeper level with the character. Interestingly, no interaction effect between age and gender was identified, except when hedonic entertainment was taken into consideration. This could mean that, when it comes to the enjoyment of a woman-centric movie from a hedonic perspective, the impact of age on it strongly depends on the gender of the participant and vice versa (Bond, 2021, p. 576; Klimmt & Rieger, 2021, p. 387). In the context of the movie *Barbie*, as it is categorised as a comedy movie, it appears reasonable that gender and age present an interaction effect in relation to hedonic entertainment, because hedonic motivations are described by Oliver and Raney (2011, p. 985) as the consumption of a media piece with the simple aim of being amused.

Then, as part of examining how character engagement factors could affect the enjoyment of a film, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. The analyses showed that both personality recognisability and attitudinal recognisability can be considered positive predictors of wishful identification (H1a, H1b). According to Żerebecki et al. (2022, p. 365), wishful identification is strongly dependent on how similar to oneself the viewer perceives the

fictional character to be. Therefore, being able to see oneself in the personality or the attitude of a character increases the chance of wanting to emulate that character. The first regression analysis also showed that situational recognisability is not a predictor for wishful identification (H1c). This is also in line with previous findings by Żerebecki et al. (2022, p. 365). In fact, it is pointed out that attitudinal similarity, as well as similarities in terms of personality, can be considered the most important predictors of wishful identification. When testing the predictors for parasocial relationship, personality similarity, attitudinal similarity, situational similarity, and wishful identification showed significant positive influence on the development of parasocial relationships (H2a, H2b, H2c, H2d). Recent studies (Lim et al., 2020, p. 4; Żerebecki et al., 2022, p. 366) already theorised that wishful identification can have a positive effect on PSR, as viewers who engage in imitative behaviour with a fictional character will tend to develop a stronger PSR with them. Similarly, parasocial relationships will be stronger with characters who the viewers perceive as similar to themselves. However, when it comes to enjoyment, both regression analysis showed different results. The first analysis, which explored eudaimonic entertainment, showed that only PSR and wishful identification are positive predictors for it (H13a, H13b). In the case of hedonic entertainment, only wishful identification was identified as a positive predictor (H14b). With the only element in common between the two being wishful identification, this could entail that, when it comes to the enjoyment of a movie, whether the reason the audience enjoys it is because it is amusing or because it is meaningful, the extent to which the viewers recognise themselves in the fictional character is not important. On the other hand, liking the characters to the point of wanting to emulate them plays a crucial role in the enjoyment of a movie by the general audience.

Additional analyses were then carried out for both gender identification and age groups, in order to have a thorough examination of how character engagement factors impact enjoyment when taking specifically into consideration women, men, younger people, or older people. Therefore, when looking at the predictors for wishful identification with split files for gender, personality recognisability and attitudinal recognisability were both significant predictors when it comes to male participants (H6a, H6b), supporting what Żerebecki et al. (2022, p. 365) state in their study. However, when analysing female participants, only attitudinal recognisability was found to be a significant predictor for wishful identification (H4b). These findings suggest that, for females especially, the need to imitate a character is strongly correlated to how similar this character is perceived to be to the viewer in terms of attitude and way of behaving. A similar situation was found with split files for age group. In

fact, in every single case, situational recognisability was not found to be a significant predictor for wishful identification (H9c, H11c). Therefore, this suggests that no matter how similar the situations lived by Barbie appear to those lived by the viewers of the movie, this factor will not be crucial in the development of wishful identification. Thus, viewers' tendency to wanting to be like Barbie is not influenced by how easily they recognise the situations in which she finds herself as situations that they have gone through as well. Instead, when analysing parasocial relationship, the only predictor that was found to be significant for both gender identities and age groups was wishful identification, backing Lim et al.'s idea (2020) that "wishful identification is a precursor to fostering PSR" (p. 4), in this case with fictional characters (H5a, H7a, H10a, H12a). Although in some analyses either attitudinal recognisability or situational recognisability were identified as positive predictors for the development of PSR, the impact of recognisability was not consistent. This shows that wishful identification seems to mediate the relationship between recognisability and parasocial relationship. Therefore, considering that wishful identification is affecting PSR and recognisability is influencing WI, recognisability needs to be implemented in order to have higher levels of parasocial relationship with the fictional character. Lastly, when considering eudaimonic and hedonic entertainment, there were no clear predictors. In fact, for some groups (i.e. females and participants aged 30 and above), the only significant predictor of both eudaimonic and hedonic entertainment appeared to be wishful identification, proving that the enjoyment of a film is mostly based on how much the viewer likes the individual character, and how willing they are to imitate said character. However, for the other groups, the predictors varied, or there were no significant predictors. These findings suggest that, although the impact of age and gender identification on the audience's engagement with the character Stereotypical Barbie and on the enjoyment of the film is clear, making comparisons between groups easily understandable, the same does not happen when analysing specifically each group with regression analyses.

When it comes to the limitations, this study encountered four crucial ones. Firstly, this study relied on a relatively small sample ($N = 170$). This might be due to the length and duration of the survey. Moreover, a lot of incomplete responses were registered, which led to the reduction of the sample size from $N = 320$ to $N = 170$. The low response rate could also be attributed to the specific sample criteria that were used to recruit participants. In fact, the audience of the movie Barbie mainly consisted of younger females, with 74.6% of the viewers being females under the age of 29 (Van Der Meer, 2023, para. 3). However, this study wanted to look at the opinion of both females and males who had seen the movie, as well as older

people, which made the data collection process significantly more difficult. A second limitation, related to the first one, was a difficulty associated to the comparability of the different groups of interest. The sample included $n = 65$ younger females (between 18 and 29), $n = 35$ older females (30 and older), $n = 39$ younger males (between 18 and 29), and $n = 31$ older males (30 and older), which unquestionably made it harder to generalise the test outcomes. The third limitation pertained to the representativeness of the sample. This could be explained by the fact that the movie Barbie was banned in several countries prior to the release because of its themes of gender and sexuality (Faguy, 2023, para. 1), which made it difficult to obtain a diverse sample and one representative of the population, as people from different countries could not participate in the study. Lastly, this study focused specifically on one character, stereotypical Barbie, a woman, making it easier for certain participants to relate to her. Therefore, this could have played a part in the determination of what factors can impact the enjoyment of a woman-centric film. Moreover, the movie Barbie is a western product, which could mean that it essentially reflects western notions of femininity and feminism, once again making it more difficult for people belonging to different cultural backgrounds to relate to the character and, thus, the film. In fact, previous research has shown that cultural background significantly influences how people consume media or how they interpret it (Croteau & Hoynes, 2018, p. 391).

In sum, the results answer the RQ, which was *To what extent do character engagement factors, gender identification and age group impact people's enjoyment of a woman-centric movie?*. The most important takeaways can be summarised in the following three points:

- 1) Females, compared to males, score higher when it comes to character engagement factors. Therefore, this confirms that females tend to develop stronger relationships with fictional characters, especially when the fictional character in examination is another woman, as they often see themselves as similar, or because they aspire to be like them.
- 2) Similarly, younger people (aged 18 to 29) score higher on character engagement factors than older people (aged 30 and above). This could, once again, be connected to the fact that they see Stereotypical Barbie as more relatable, due to the shared demographics.
- 3) When it comes to character engagement factors, the main takeaway is that wishful identification, or the desire to emulate a character, is a crucial factor for both hedonic and eudaimonic entertainment. This suggests that the extent to which viewers see

themselves in a fictional character is less important than how much they want to emulate the character.

Therefore, this study showed both societal and scientific relevance. Firstly, when considering scientific relevance, it proposed a contribution to fill the research gap on women and female fictional characters, as it analysed specifically how female characters in a film focused on women's stories are perceived by the audience. Moreover, it provided more insight into how different factors can influence the enjoyment of a film, specifically a woman-centric movie, by examining if and how both gender identification and age have an impact on it. From a societal point of view, the exploration of different demographic groups and their perception of women-centric movies could potentially help writers and producers in understanding how to create a more inclusive film industry by assessing what has worked with Barbie. Furthermore, the response to this movie could be interesting to see if, in the future, it helps in the redefinition of gender roles, and how women are perceived in society.

Future research on the topic could include the examination of more characters from the film in order to have a deeper understanding of the extent to what character engagement factors can impact the enjoyment of a woman-centric movie. Moreover, it would also be interesting to focus on other movies, maybe pertaining to a different genre, as Barbie is a comedy, because the genre could have affected the way participants feel about the film. Therefore, future research could definitely investigate different genres and how the audience feels about the stories revolving around women and themes such as feminism. Furthermore, even though the study included data regarding the ethnicity and nationality of the respondents, it was not used for any analysis. Thus, in the future, it could be interesting to implement another perspective, which would include ethnicity or sexual orientation, and how these factors intersect with gender when it comes to the enjoyment of a film starring a woman protagonist and focusing on the stories of women.

In conclusion, the rise of films that features female protagonists and that address important topics such as feminism, as seen in Greta Gerwig's trilogy (i.e. *Lady Bird*, *Little Women*, and *Barbie*), marks a significant shift in the film industry. In fact, as suggested by the Cultivation Theory, these portrayals are crucial for women, as they provide relatable characters and situations, allowing them to see themselves represented on screen, but also positively influence people's ideas regarding women in real life. However, it is important that these themes become more prevalent in the film industry, as the findings of this study suggest that men and older audiences are less familiar with these topics and, therefore, tend to enjoy a film like Barbie less. In the future, marketers could try to appeal to different audiences by

playing with the hedonic entertainment factor, as the findings also revealed that there was no significant main effect for age groups on hedonic entertainment. By producing more movies that tackle these issues, there is a potential for a substantial impact on women's roles in society, which would help creating a greater understanding and acceptance across all demographics.

References

- Arnett, J. J. (2023). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. Oxford University Press.
- Babbie, E. (2015). *The basics of social science research* (7th edition). Cengage Learning.
- Baldwin, J. A., & Raney, A. A. (2021). Enjoyment of unoriginal characters: Individual differences in nostalgia-proneness and parasocial relationships. *Mass Communication and Society*, 24(5), 748-768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2021.1916035>
- Bandura, A. (2009). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. *Media Psychology*, 3, 265-299. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0303_03
- Banerjee, S. C., Greene, K., Krcmar, M., Bagdasarov, Z., & Ruginyte, D. (2008). The role of gender and sensation seeking in film choice: Exploring mood and arousal. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20(3), 97-105. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105.20.3.97>
- Behm-Morawitz, E., & Mastro, D. E. (2008). Mean girls? The influence of gender portrayals in teen movies on emerging adults' gender-based attitudes and beliefs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 131-146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900808500109>
- 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>
- Brown, T. A., & Moore, M. T. (2012). Confirmatory factor analysis. *Handbook of Structural Equation Modeling*, 361, 379.
- Campbell, J. R. (2023). Where women rule: Female fantasy television and movies. *The Politics and International Relations of Fantasy Films and Television: To Win or Die* 211-265. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Croteau, D., & Hoynes, W. (2018). *Media/Society: Technology, industries, content, and users*. Sage Publications.
- Faguy, A. (2023, October 29). 'Barbie' banned in Algeria—Here's where else you can't see the box office hit. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/anafaguy/2023/08/15/barbie-banned-in-algeria-heres-where-else-you-cant-see-the-box-office-hit/>
- Fischhoff, S. (1994). Race and sex differences in patterns of film attendance and avoidance. In *Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA*.

- Hofer, M., Allemand, M., & Martin, M. (2014). Age differences in nonhedonic entertainment experiences. *Journal of Communication, 64*(1), 61-81.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12074>
- Hoffner, C. (1996). Children's wishful identification and parasocial interaction with favorite television characters. *J. Broad & Elec. Media, 40*, 389.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08838159609364360>
- Horton, D., & Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry, 19*(3), 215-229.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1956.11023049>
- Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., & Sitzia, J. (2003). Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. *International Journal for Quality in health care, 15*(3), 261-266. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzg031>
- Klimmt, C., & Rieger, D. (2021). Biographic resonance theory of eudaimonic media entertainment. *The Oxford Handbook of Entertainment Theory*, 383-402.
- Lassner, R. (1944). Sex and age determinants of theatre and movie interests. *Journal of General Psychology, 31*, 241.
<https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/00221309.1944.10543192>
- Lauzen, M. M. (2022). It's a man's (celluloid) world, even in a pandemic year: Portrayals of female characters in the top US films of 2021. *The Center for the Study of Women in Television and Film*. <https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2022/03/2021-Its-a-Mans-Celluloid-World-Report.pdf>.
- Lewis, M. (2007). Stepwise versus hierarchical regression: Pros and cons. Online Submission.
- Lim, J. S., Choe, M. J., Zhang, J., & Noh, G. Y. (2020). The role of wishful identification, emotional engagement, and parasocial relationships in repeated viewing of live-streaming games: A social cognitive theory perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior, 108*, 106327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106327>
- Lin, Y. (2023). Feminist Voices under the Lens of 'Barbie': An Analysis of Discourse Transmission and Mass Resonance in XiaoHongShu. *Arts, Culture and Language, 1*(4). <https://doi.org/10.61173/s4en2442>
- Manzoor, S., & Rauf, S. (2016). Analysis of gender stereotypes in movies. *Pakistan Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 4*(1), 95-109. <https://doi.org/10.46568/pjass.v4i1.298>
- Mason, S. (n.d.-b). *The Barbie movie's revolutionary effect on society*. The Blue Banner. <https://thebluebanner.net/15479/arts-features-2/the-barbie-movies-revolutionary-effect-on-society/>

- Mares, M. L., Oliver, M. B., & Cantor, J. (2008). Age differences in adults' emotional motivations for exposure to films. *Media Psychology, 11*(4), 488-511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213260802492026>
- Marshall, G. (2005). The purpose, design and administration of a questionnaire for data collection. *Radiography, 11*(2), 131-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2004.09.002>
- McArdle, T. (2023, July 28). Read the powerful 'Barbie' monologue about being a woman that America Ferrera performed '30 to 50' times. *People*. <https://people.com/read-the-powerful-barbie-monologue-about-being-a-woman-that-america-ferrera-performed-30-to-50-times-7565806>
- 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>
- 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., Weaver III, J. B., & Sargent, S. L. (2000). An examination of factors related to sex differences in enjoyment of sad films. *J. Broad. & Elec. Media, 44*, 282.
- Perkins, C., Brooks, J., Loreck, J., Tan, P., Ford, J., & Sheehan, R. J. (2023). Doing film feminisms in the age of popular feminism: A roundtable convened by Claire Perkins and Jodi Brooks. *Australian Feminist Studies, 1-17*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.2023.2287205>
- Rain, M., & Mar, R. A. (2021). Adult attachment and engagement with fictional characters. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 38*(9), 2792-2813.
- Raney, A. A. (2010). Media enjoyment as a function of affective dispositions toward and moral judgment of characters. *Handbook of Emotions and the Mass Media, 166-178*.
- Rome, E. S. (2024). Perspective: Barbie: Food for the soul or fanciful nostalgia?. *Advances in Nutrition, 100182*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advnut.2024.100182>
- Sanders, M. S. (2010). Making a good (bad) impression: Examining the cognitive processes of disposition theory to form a synthesized model of media character impression formation. *Communication Theory, 20*(2), 147-168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01358.x>
- Sawyer, S. F. (2009). Analysis of variance: The fundamental concepts. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy, 17*(2), 27E-38E. <https://doi.org/10.1179/jmt.2009.17.2.27E>

- Sculos, B. W. (2023). The profits of (the critique of) patriarchy: On toxic masculinity, feminism, & corporate capitalism in the Barbie movie. *Class, Race and Corporate Power*.
- Sukamolson, S. (2007). Fundamentals of quantitative research. *Language Institute Chulalongkorn University, 1(3)*, 1-20.
- Tukachinsky, R. (2010). Para-romantic love and para-friendships: Development and assessment of a multiple-parasocial relationships scale.
- Tesser, A., Millar, K., & Wu, C. H. (1988). On the perceived functions of movies. *The Journal of psychology, 122(5)*, 441-449.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1988.10542949>
- Tolbert, A. N., & Drogos, K. L. (2019). Tweens' wishful identification and parasocial relationships with YouTubers. *Frontiers in psychology, 10*, 2781.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02781>
- Van Der Meer, A. (2023, November 14). What the 'Barbie' movie taught influencer marketing about Man-Hating. *PRNEWS*. <https://www.prnewsonline.com/what-the-barbie-movie-taught-influencer-marketing-about-man-hating/#:~:text=In%20fact%2C%20the%20audience%20was,percent%20over%2030%20years%20old.>
- Ward, L. M., & Grower, P. (2020). Media and the development of gender role stereotypes. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 2*, 177-199.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-051120-010630>
- White, P. (2015). *Women's cinema, world cinema: Projecting contemporary feminisms*. Duke University Press.
- Wirth, W., Hofer, M., & Schramm, H. (2012). Beyond pleasure: Exploring the eudaimonic entertainment experience. *Human Communication Research, 38(4)*, 406-428.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2012.01434.x>
- Wühr, P., Lange, B. P., & Schwarz, S. (2017). Tears or fears? Comparing gender stereotypes about movie preferences to actual preferences. *Frontiers in psychology, 8*, 428.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00428>
- 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)*.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia3020026>

Žerebecki, B. G., Oprea, S. J., Hofhuis, J., & Janssen, S. (in press). Beyond perceived similarity. Development and validation of the Character Recognizability Scale (CRS). *Mass Communication and Society*.

Appendix A – Questionnaire

Dear respondent, Thank you for your interest in this research. I am inviting you to fill in a questionnaire for my master's thesis study at Erasmus University Rotterdam. The purpose of this study is to gather insights into what factors might impact the enjoyment of a woman-centric film, by using the **Barbie Movie** as a case example.

This questionnaire will take approximately **8 minutes** to fill in. Please answer each question carefully and honestly, I am 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 any questions or concerns regarding the research, please feel free to send an email to barbieaudienceresearch@gmail.com.

By clicking on 'I consent' below, you understand these terms, you freely consent to participate, and you state that you are at least 18 years old.

I consent

I do not consent

**Respondents will be sent to the end of the survey if 'I do not consent' is selected.*

Did you watch the movie ‘Barbie’ (2023)?

Yes

No

**Respondents will be sent to the end of the survey if ‘No’ is selected.*

The following questions ask their respondents about media engagement factors.

To what extent do you recognise similarities between you and the character of Barbie?

Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I recognise the personality traits of Barbie as traits that I have.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I recognise the weaknesses of Barbie as weaknesses that I have.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I recognise myself in Barbie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I recognise the strengths of Barbie as	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

strengths that I have.

I recognise the behaviours of Barbie as behaviours that I could show.

I recognise the situations that Barbie encounters as situations that could also happen to me.

I recognise the past experiences of Barbie as similar to my past experiences.

I recognise the problems that Barbie has as the problems that I could have.

I recognise the places, in which I see Barbie as the places I could be in.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

I recognise my life in the life of Barbie.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

I recognise the topics that Barbie discusses with others as the topics I could discuss with other people in my life.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

I recognise the life changes Barbie experiences as life changes that could happen to me.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

I recognise Barbie's approach to life

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

as an approach to
life that I have.

I recognise
Barbie's
opinions about
what is good and
bad as opinions I
have.

I recognise the
solutions to
problems of
Barbie as
solutions I could
follow.

I recognise
Barbie's
opinions about
other people as
opinions I have.

I recognise the
thought
processes before
decisions of
Barbie as thought
processes I have.

I recognise Barbie's opinions about social problems as opinions I have.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I recognise the decisions of Barbie as decisions that I could make.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I recognise the reactions to stressful situations of Barbie as reactions that I could have.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To what extent do you wish you could be like the character Barbie? Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Barbie is the sort of person I want to be like myself.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I wish I could be more like Barbie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I'd like to do the kinds of things Barbie does in the movie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

How would you describe your relationship with the character Barbie? Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
If Barbie was a real person, I could have disclosed negative things about myself honestly and fully (deeply) to her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If Barbie was a real person, I could have disclosed a great deal of things	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

about myself to her.

Sometimes, I wish I knew what Barbie would do in my situation.

If Barbie was a real person, I could have disclosed positive things about myself honestly and fully (deeply) to her.

Sometimes, I wish I could ask Barbie for advice.

I think Barbie could be a friend of mine.

To what extent did you enjoy the movie ‘Barbie’? Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
It was fun for me to watch this movie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had a good time watching this movie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The movie was entertaining.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I found this movie to be very meaningful.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I was moved by this movie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
This movie was thought provoking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
This movie will stick with me for a long time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I know I will never forget this movie.

This movie left me with a lasting impression.

I was at the edge of my seat while watching this movie.

This was a heart-pounding kind of movie.

The movie was suspenseful.

Demographics

You are almost done! Before completing this questionnaire, we would like to ask you some questions about your personal background.

To which gender identity do you most identify?

- Female
- Male
- Non-binary
- Other

What is your age? (in number)

What is your ethnicity?

- White (e.g. German, Irish, English, Italian, Polish, French, etc)
- Latino or Spanish origin (e.g. Mexican or Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran, Dominican, Colombian, etc)
- African American or Black (American)
- African (e.g. South-African, Nigerian, etc.)
- Asian (e.g. Chinese, Filipino, Asian Indian, Vietnamese, Korean, Japanese, etc)
- American Indian or Alaska Native (e.g. Navajo nation, Blackfeet tribe, Mayan, Aztec, Native Village or Barrow Inupiat Traditional Government, Nome Eskimo Community, etc)
- Middle Eastern
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (e.g. Native Hawaiian, Samoan, Chamorro, Tongan, Fijian, etc)

Caribbean

Some other race, ethnicity or origin

What is your country of origin?

Respondents are presented with a list consisting of 195 countries to select from.

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than highschool

Highschool diploma

Bachelor's degree

Graduate or professional degree (MA, MS, MBA, PhD, JD, MD, DDS, etc.)

End of survey

Thank you very much for your participation! Your answers have been saved.

If you know other people who have seen the film Barbie, please share this survey with them!

Here's the link: https://erasmusuniversity.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_b0WOPF0BojPhsh0

Appendix B – SPSS output

Two-Way ANOVA

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	104
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	100
	2 Male	70

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: personalityrecognisability

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	5,0554	,83629	65
	Male	3,6103	1,25568	39
	Total	4,5135	1,22902	104
2,00	Female	4,4610	1,16140	35
	Male	2,9355	1,50766	31
	Total	3,7444	1,53075	66
Total	Female	4,8473	,99828	100
	Male	3,3114	1,40378	70
	Total	4,2149	1,40111	170

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: personalityrecognisability

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	113,038 ^a	3	37,679	28,596	<,001	,341
Intercept	2532,914	1	2532,914	1922,309	<,001	,921
Agegroup	15,815	1	15,815	12,003	<,001	,067
Gender	86,637	1	86,637	65,752	<,001	,284
Agegroup * Gender	,063	1	,063	,048	,827	,000
Error	218,729	166	1,318			
Total	3351,884	170				
Corrected Total	331,767	169				

a. R Squared = ,341 (Adjusted R Squared = ,329)

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	104
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	100
	2 Male	70

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: attitudinalrecognisability

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	4,8962	,77421	65
	Male	4,3159	1,14257	39
	Total	4,6786	,96630	104
2,00	Female	4,6107	1,04616	35
	Male	3,6250	1,55020	31
	Total	4,1477	1,38829	66
Total	Female	4,7963	,88436	100
	Male	4,0099	1,37233	70
	Total	4,4725	1,17376	170

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: attitudinalrecognisability

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	35,557 ^a	3	11,852	9,973	<,001	,153
Intercept	2988,812	1	2988,812	2514,983	<,001	,938
Agegroup	9,359	1	9,359	7,876	,006	,045
Gender	24,075	1	24,075	20,258	<,001	,109
Agegroup * Gender	1,614	1	1,614	1,358	,245	,008
Error	197,275	166	1,188			
Total	3633,353	170				
Corrected Total	232,832	169				

a. R Squared = ,153 (Adjusted R Squared = ,137)

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	103
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	99
	2 Male	70

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: situationalrecognisability

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	5,0335	,94306	64
	Male	3,4683	1,01898	39
	Total	4,4408	1,23215	103
2,00	Female	4,4857	1,30756	35
	Male	2,8479	1,38059	31
	Total	3,7165	1,56602	66
Total	Female	4,8398	1,11094	99
	Male	3,1935	1,22346	70
	Total	4,1579	1,41289	169

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: situationalrecognisability

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	124,572 ^a	3	41,524	32,503	<,001	,371
Intercept	2456,123	1	2456,123	1922,504	<,001	,921
Agegroup	13,364	1	13,364	10,461	,001	,060
Gender	100,487	1	100,487	78,655	<,001	,323
Agegroup * Gender	,052	1	,052	,040	,841	,000
Error	210,798	165	1,278			
Total	3257,109	169				
Corrected Total	335,370	168				

a. R Squared = ,371 (Adjusted R Squared = ,360)

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	103
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	100
	2 Male	69

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	3,5179	,86207	65
	Male	2,7281	,94553	38
	Total	3,2265	,96813	103
2,00	Female	3,4571	1,09689	35
	Male	2,2796	1,27104	31
	Total	2,9040	1,31366	66
Total	Female	3,4967	,94577	100
	Male	2,5266	1,11790	69
	Total	3,1006	1,12323	169

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	41,941 ^a	3	13,980	13,568	<,001	,198
Intercept	1400,429	1	1400,429	1359,118	<,001	,892
Agegroup	2,530	1	2,530	2,455	,119	,015
Gender	37,754	1	37,754	36,640	<,001	,182
Agegroup * Gender	1,466	1	1,466	1,423	,235	,009
Error	170,015	165	1,030			
Total	1836,667	169				
Corrected Total	211,957	168				

a. R Squared = ,198 (Adjusted R Squared = ,183)

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	104
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	100
	2 Male	70

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: psr

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	4,9923	1,22383	65
	Male	3,8547	1,26131	39
	Total	4,5657	1,35050	104
2,00	Female	4,3048	1,38944	35
	Male	3,2957	1,61973	31
	Total	3,8308	1,57423	66
Total	Female	4,7517	1,31905	100
	Male	3,6071	1,44742	70
	Total	4,2804	1,48114	170

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: psr

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	70,090 ^a	3	23,363	12,899	<,001	,189
Intercept	2655,922	1	2655,922	1466,404	<,001	,898
Agegroup	15,256	1	15,256	8,423	,004	,048
Gender	45,243	1	45,243	24,980	<,001	,131
Agegroup * Gender	,162	1	,162	,090	,765	,001
Error	300,656	166	1,811			
Total	3485,444	170				
Corrected Total	370,746	169				

a. R Squared = ,189 (Adjusted R Squared = ,174)

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	104
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	100
	2 Male	70

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	3,6342	,71974	65
	Male	3,0912	,77312	39
	Total	3,4306	,78242	104
2,00	Female	3,3270	,90144	35
	Male	2,5269	1,14071	31
	Total	2,9512	1,08973	66
Total	Female	3,5267	,79727	100
	Male	2,8413	,98723	70
	Total	3,2444	,94061	170

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	26,990 ^a	3	8,997	12,188	<,001	,181
Intercept	1553,548	1	1553,548	2104,683	<,001	,927
Agegroup	7,457	1	7,457	10,102	,002	,057
Gender	17,711	1	17,711	23,994	<,001	,126
Agegroup * Gender	,649	1	,649	,879	,350	,005
Error	122,531	166	,738			
Total	1939,012	170				
Corrected Total	149,521	169				

a. R Squared = ,181 (Adjusted R Squared = ,166)

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
Agegroup	1,00	104
	2,00	66
To which gender identity do you most identify?	1 Female	100
	2 Male	70

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Agegroup	To which gender identity do you most identify?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1,00	Female	4,6410	,62447	65
	Male	4,3248	,82181	39
	Total	4,5224	,71773	104
2,00	Female	4,6762	,46079	35
	Male	3,8495	1,02140	31
	Total	4,2879	,87488	66
Total	Female	4,6533	,57035	100
	Male	4,1143	,93919	70
	Total	4,4314	,78835	170

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	15,895 ^a	3	5,298	9,867	<,001	,151
Intercept	3003,789	1	3003,789	5593,923	<,001	,971
Agegroup	1,902	1	1,902	3,542	,062	,021
Gender	12,826	1	12,826	23,885	<,001	,126
Agegroup * Gender	2,559	1	2,559	4,765	,030	,028
Error	89,138	166	,537			
Total	3443,333	170				
Corrected Total	105,033	169				

a. R Squared = ,151 (Adjusted R Squared = ,136)

Independent Samples T-test

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Group Statistics^a

	Agegroup	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
hedonicentertainment	1,00	65	4,6410	,62447	,07746
	2,00	35	4,6762	,46079	,07789

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Independent Samples Test^a

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance One-Sided p	Significance Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Equal variances assumed	1,080	,301	-,293	98	,385	,770	-,03516	,12013	-,27357	,20324
	Equal variances not assumed			-,320	88,512	,375	,750	-,03516	,10984	-,25344	,18311

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Independent Samples Effect Sizes^a

		Standardizer ^b	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Cohen's d	,57300	-,061	-,472	,350
	Hedges' correction	,57743	-,061	-,469	,347
	Glass's delta	,46079	-,076	-,487	,336

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes. Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation. Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor. Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Group Statistics^a

	Agegroup	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
hedonicentertainment	1,00	39	4,3248	,82181	,13159
	2,00	31	3,8495	1,02140	,18345

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Independent Samples Test^a

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						One-Sided p	Two-Sided p			Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Equal variances assumed	2,715	,104	2,158	68	,017	,034	,47532	,22023	,03587	,91478
	Equal variances not assumed			2,105	56,919	,020	,040	,47532	,22577	,02322	,92743

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Independent Samples Effect Sizes^a

		Standardizer ^b	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Cohen's d	,91524	,519	,038	,997
	Hedges' correction	,92549	,514	,037	,986
	Glass's delta	1,02140	,465	-,024	,948

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Agegroup = 1,00

Group Statistics^a

	To which gender identity do you most identify?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
hedonicentertainment	Female	65	4,6410	,62447	,07746
	Male	39	4,3248	,82181	,13159

a. Agegroup = 1,00

Independent Samples Test^a

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						One-Sided p	Two-Sided p			Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Equal variances assumed	2,256	,136	2,216	102	,014	,029	,31624	,14269	,03321	,59926
	Equal variances not assumed			2,071	64,308	,021	,042	,31624	,15270	,01122	,62126

a. Agegroup = 1,00

Independent Samples Effect Sizes^a

		Standardizer ^b	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Cohen's d	,70448	,449	,046	,850
	Hedges' correction	,70971	,446	,046	,843
	Glass's delta	,82181	,385	-,024	,789

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Agegroup = 2,00

Group Statistics^a

		To which gender identity do you most identify?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
hedonicentertainment	Female		35	4,6762	,46079	,07789
	Male		31	3,8495	1,02140	,18345

a. Agegroup = 2,00

Independent Samples Test^a

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance One-Sided p	Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Equal variances assumed	17,216	<,001	4,321	64	<,001	<,001	,82673	,19133	,44450	1,20896
	Equal variances not assumed			4,148	40,626	<,001	<,001	,82673	,19930	,42413	1,22933

a. Agegroup = 2,00

Independent Samples Effect Sizes^a

		Standardizer ^b	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
hedonicentertainment	Cohen's d	,77577	1,066	,545	1,579
	Hedges' correction	,78501	1,053	,538	1,561
	Glass's delta	1,02140	,809	,279	1,328

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes. Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation. Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor. Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Hierarchical regression analysis

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,737 ^a	,544	,535	,76732

a. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	115,075	3	38,358	65,150	<,001 ^b
	Residual	96,559	164	,589		
	Total	211,634	167			

a. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,059	,233		,251	,802
	personalityrecognisability	,205	,076	,257	2,708	,007
	attitudinalrecognisability	,364	,081	,382	4,474	<,001
	situationalrecognisability	,131	,071	,164	1,842	,067

a. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^b	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^b	.	Enter

- a. Dependent Variable: psr
 b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,780 ^a	,609	,602	,94030	,609	85,081	3	164	<,001
2	,817 ^b	,667	,659	,87053	,058	28,343	1	163	<,001

- a. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
 b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	225,680	3	75,227	85,081	<,001 ^b
	Residual	145,004	164	,884		
	Total	370,685	167			
2	Regression	247,159	4	61,790	81,536	<,001 ^c
	Residual	123,525	163	,758		
	Total	370,685	167			

- a. Dependent Variable: psr
 b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
 c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,086	,286		,300	,764
	personalityrecognisability	,283	,093	,268	3,049	,003
	attitudinalrecognisability	,432	,100	,342	4,331	<,001
	situationalrecognisability	,256	,087	,243	2,947	,004
2	(Constant)	,058	,265		,220	,826
	personalityrecognisability	,186	,088	,176	2,121	,035
	attitudinalrecognisability	,260	,098	,206	2,660	,009
	situationalrecognisability	,195	,081	,185	2,393	,018
	wishfulidentification	,472	,089	,356	5,324	<,001

- a. Dependent Variable: psr

Excluded Variables^a

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,356 ^b	5,324	<,001	,385	,456

- a. Dependent Variable: psr
 b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^b	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^b	.	Enter
3	psr ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,708 ^a	,502	,492	,67290	,502	55,006	3	164	<,001
2	,751 ^b	,564	,553	,63136	,062	23,290	1	163	<,001
3	,759 ^c	,576	,563	,62443	,012	4,641	1	162	,033

a. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	74,720	3	24,907	55,006	<,001 ^b
	Residual	74,259	164	,453		
	Total	148,979	167			
2	Regression	84,004	4	21,001	52,684	<,001 ^c
	Residual	64,975	163	,399		
	Total	148,979	167			
3	Regression	85,813	5	17,163	44,017	<,001 ^d
	Residual	63,165	162	,390		
	Total	148,979	167			

a. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,800	,205		3,909	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,169	,066	,252	2,547	,012
	attitudinalrecognisability	,286	,071	,358	4,010	<,001
	situationalrecognisability	,108	,062	,161	1,731	,085
2	(Constant)	,782	,192		4,071	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,106	,064	,157	1,658	,099
	attitudinalrecognisability	,173	,071	,217	2,443	,016
	situationalrecognisability	,067	,059	,101	1,139	,256
	wishfulidentification	,310	,064	,370	4,826	<,001
3	(Constant)	,775	,190		4,078	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,083	,064	,124	1,300	,195
	attitudinalrecognisability	,142	,072	,177	1,979	,050
	situationalrecognisability	,044	,059	,065	,735	,463
	wishfulidentification	,253	,069	,302	3,675	<,001
	psr	,121	,056	,191	2,154	,033

a. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^a

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
					Correlation	Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,370 ^b	4,826	<,001	,354	,456
	psr	,316 ^b	3,726	<,001	,280	,391
2	psr	,191 ^c	2,154	,033	,167	,333

a. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^b	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^b	.	Enter
3	psr ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,554 ^a	,307	,294	,66454	,307	24,228	3	164	<,001
2	,593 ^b	,351	,336	,64487	,044	11,158	1	163	,001
3	,593 ^c	,352	,332	,64683	,000	,013	1	162	,908

a. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32,098	3	10,699	24,228	<,001 ^b
	Residual	72,425	164	,442		
	Total	104,523	167			
2	Regression	36,738	4	9,184	22,085	<,001 ^c
	Residual	67,785	163	,416		
	Total	104,523	167			
3	Regression	36,743	5	7,349	17,564	<,001 ^d
	Residual	67,780	162	,418		
	Total	104,523	167			

a. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,937	,202		14,532	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,250	,066	,445	3,813	<,001
	attitudinalrecognisability	,162	,071	,241	2,291	,023
	situationalrecognisability	-,068	,061	-,122	-1,107	,270
2	(Constant)	2,924	,196		14,907	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,205	,065	,365	3,153	,002
	attitudinalrecognisability	,082	,072	,122	1,127	,261
	situationalrecognisability	-,097	,060	-,173	-1,605	,110
	wishfulidentification	,219	,066	,312	3,340	,001
3	(Constant)	2,924	,197		14,857	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,204	,066	,363	3,082	,002
	attitudinalrecognisability	,080	,074	,119	1,077	,283
	situationalrecognisability	-,098	,062	-,175	-1,594	,113
	wishfulidentification	,216	,071	,307	3,029	,003
	psr	,007	,058	,013	,115	,908

a. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^a

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,312 ^b	3,340	,001	,253	,456
	psr	,140 ^b	1,355	,177	,106	,391
2	psr	,013 ^c	,115	,908	,009	,333

a. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Hierarchical regression analysis (split files for gender)

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability ^c		Enter

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification
 c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,517 ^b	,267	,244	,82658	,267	11,523	3	95	<.,001

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23,618	3	7,873	11,523	<.,001 ^c
	Residual	64,907	95	,683		
	Total	88,525	98			

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification
 c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,753	,488		1,544	,126
	personalityrecognisability	,037	,111	,040	,338	,736
	attitudinalrecognisability	,438	,133	,409	3,280	,001
	situationalrecognisability	,096	,107	,112	,894	,374

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c		Enter

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification
 c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,822 ^b	,676	,661	,65091	,676	45,191	3	65	<.,001

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57,440	3	19,147	45,191	<.,001 ^c
	Residual	27,539	65	,424		
	Total	84,979	68			

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification
 c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-,011	,250		-,042	,966
	personalityrecognisability	,342	,108	,433	3,176	,002
	attitudinalrecognisability	,290	,103	,358	2,820	,006
	situationalrecognisability	,076	,104	,084	,730	,468

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Dependent Variable: psr
 c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

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	,683 ^b	,466	,449	,98368	,466	27,649	3	95	<,001
2	,725 ^c	,525	,505	,93258	,059	11,697	1	94	<,001

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability
 c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	80,261	3	26,754	27,649	<,001 ^c
	Residual	91,925	95	,968		
	Total	172,186	98			
2	Regression	90,434	4	22,609	25,996	<,001 ^d
	Residual	81,752	94	,870		
	Total	172,186	98			

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Dependent Variable: psr
 c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability
 d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-,262	,581		-,452	,652
	personalityrecognisability	,220	,132	,167	1,668	,099
	attitudinalrecognisability	,431	,159	,289	2,718	,008
	situationalrecognisability	,388	,127	,326	3,056	,003
2	(Constant)	-,561	,557		-1,006	,317
	personalityrecognisability	,205	,125	,156	1,640	,104
	attitudinalrecognisability	,258	,159	,173	1,626	,107
	situationalrecognisability	,351	,121	,294	2,897	,005
	wishfulidentification	,396	,116	,284	3,420	<,001

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
 b. Dependent Variable: psr

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,284 ^c	3,420	<,001	,333	,733

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,810 ^b	,656	,640	,87360	,656	41,333	3	65	<,001
2	,869 ^c	,754	,739	,74392	,098	25,637	1	64	<,001

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	94,633	3	31,544	41,333	<,001 ^c
	Residual	49,607	65	,763		
	Total	144,240	68			
2	Regression	108,821	4	27,205	49,159	<,001 ^d
	Residual	35,419	64	,553		
	Total	144,240	68			

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,357	,336		1,062	,292
	personalityrecognisability	,450	,145	,437	3,110	,003
	attitudinalrecognisability	,398	,138	,377	2,882	,005
	situationalrecognisability	,050	,140	,043	,361	,720
2	(Constant)	,364	,286		1,273	,207
	personalityrecognisability	,204	,132	,198	1,542	,128
	attitudinalrecognisability	,190	,124	,180	1,523	,133
	situationalrecognisability	-,004	,120	-,004	-,035	,972
	wishfulidentification	,718	,142	,551	5,063	<,001

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Dependent Variable: psr

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,551 ^c	5,063	<,001	,535	,324

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^a	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

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	,506 ^b	,256	,233	,70120	,256	10,905	3	95	<,001
2	,617 ^c	,381	,354	,64321	,125	18,905	1	94	<,001
3	,634 ^d	,402	,370	,63530	,022	3,354	1	93	,070

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16,086	3	5,362	10,905	<,001 ^c
	Residual	46,710	95	,492		
	Total	62,796	98			
2	Regression	23,907	4	5,977	14,447	<,001 ^d
	Residual	38,889	94	,414		
	Total	62,796	98			
3	Regression	25,261	5	5,052	12,517	<,001 ^e
	Residual	37,536	93	,404		
	Total	62,796	98			

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,193	,414		2,883	,005
	personalityrecognisability	,180	,094	,225	1,908	,059
	attitudinalrecognisability	,256	,113	,284	2,258	,026
	situationalrecognisability	,048	,091	,067	,533	,595
2	(Constant)	,932	,384		2,424	,017
	personalityrecognisability	,167	,086	,209	1,928	,057
	attitudinalrecognisability	,104	,110	,115	,946	,346
	situationalrecognisability	,015	,083	,021	,181	,856
	wishfulidentification	,347	,080	,412	4,348	<,001
3	(Constant)	1,004	,382		2,630	,010
	personalityrecognisability	,140	,087	,176	1,619	,109
	attitudinalrecognisability	,070	,110	,078	,642	,522
	situationalrecognisability	-,030	,086	-,042	-,348	,728
	wishfulidentification	,296	,084	,352	3,542	<,001
	psr	,129	,070	,213	1,831	,070

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,412 ^c	4,348	<,001	,409	,733
	psr	,350 ^c	3,012	,003	,297	,534
2	psr	,213 ^d	1,831	,070	,187	,475

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalreco gnisability, attitudinalreco gnisability, personalityrec ognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentifi cation ^d	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,781 ^b	,610	,592	,63498	,610	33,928	3	65	<,001
2	,798 ^c	,636	,614	,61807	,026	4,604	1	64	,036
3	,809 ^d	,655	,627	,60706	,018	3,343	1	63	,072

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	41,039	3	13,680	33,928	<,001 ^c
	Residual	26,208	65	,403		
	Total	67,246	68			
2	Regression	42,798	4	10,699	28,008	<,001 ^d
	Residual	24,449	64	,382		
	Total	67,246	68			
3	Regression	44,029	5	8,806	23,895	<,001 ^e
	Residual	23,217	63	,369		
	Total	67,246	68			

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
- b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment
- c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
- d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification
- e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,564	,244		2,310	,024
	personalityrecognisability	,099	,105	,141	,941	,350
	attitudinalrecognisability	,312	,100	,433	3,110	,003
	situationalrecognisability	,219	,102	,271	2,153	,035
	psr	,186	,102	,273	1,828	,072
2	(Constant)	,567	,238		2,384	,020
	personalityrecognisability	,012	,110	,018	,113	,910
	attitudinalrecognisability	,239	,103	,332	2,308	,024
	situationalrecognisability	,199	,099	,247	2,009	,049
	wishfulidentification	,253	,118	,284	2,146	,036
	psr	,186	,102	,273	1,828	,072
3	(Constant)	,499	,236		2,110	,039
	personalityrecognisability	-,026	,110	-,036	-,233	,817
	attitudinalrecognisability	,203	,103	,283	1,966	,054
	situationalrecognisability	,200	,098	,248	2,053	,044
	wishfulidentification	,119	,137	,134	,868	,389
	psr	,186	,102	,273	1,828	,072

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
- b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,284 ^c	2,146	,036	,259	,324
	psr	,342 ^c	2,718	,008	,322	,344
2	psr	,273 ^d	1,828	,072	,224	,246

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
- b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment
- c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
- d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,285 ^b	,081	,052	,5701	,081	2,803	3	95	,044
2	,414 ^c	,172	,137	,53167	,090	10,268	1	94	,002
3	,424 ^d	,180	,136	,53188	,008	,927	1	93	,338

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2,609	3	,870	2,803	,044 ^c
	Residual	29,474	95	,310		
	Total	32,083	98			
2	Regression	5,511	4	1,378	4,874	,001 ^d
	Residual	26,572	94	,283		
	Total	32,083	98			
3	Regression	5,774	5	1,155	4,082	,002 ^e
	Residual	26,309	93	,283		
	Total	32,083	98			

a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4,070	,329		12,376	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,191	,075	,334	2,547	,012
	attitudinalrecognisability	,036	,090	,056	,404	,687
	situationalrecognisability	-,107	,072	-,208	-1,485	,141
2	(Constant)	3,910	,318		12,304	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,183	,071	,320	2,556	,012
	attitudinalrecognisability	-,056	,091	-,087	-,621	,536
	situationalrecognisability	-,127	,069	-,247	-1,842	,069
	wishfulidentification	,211	,066	,351	3,204	,002
3	(Constant)	3,942	,320		12,333	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,171	,072	,300	2,359	,020
	attitudinalrecognisability	-,071	,092	-,110	-,771	,443
	situationalrecognisability	-,147	,072	-,285	-2,040	,044
	wishfulidentification	,189	,070	,314	2,700	,008
	psr	,057	,059	,131	,963	,338

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,351 ^c	3,204	,002	,314	,733
	psr	,254 ^c	1,911	,059	,193	,534
2	psr	,131 ^d	,963	,338	,099	,475

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Female
b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment
c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability
d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, wishfulidentification

To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment
c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,618 ^b	,382	,354	,76056	,382	13,398	3	65	<,001
2	,630 ^c	,397	,359	,75732	,015	1,557	1	64	,217
3	,630 ^d	,397	,349	,76324	,000	,011	1	63	,917

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification
d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23,251	3	7,750	13,398	<,001 ^c
	Residual	37,599	65	,578		
	Total	60,850	68			
2	Regression	24,144	4	6,036	10,524	<,001 ^d
	Residual	36,706	64	,574		
	Total	60,850	68			
3	Regression	24,150	5	4,830	8,291	<,001 ^e
	Residual	36,700	63	,583		
	Total	60,850	68			

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment
 c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
 d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification
 e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,487	,292		8,504	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,174	,126	,260	1,383	,172
	attitudinalrecognisability	,281	,120	,411	2,341	,022
	situationalrecognisability	-,023	,122	-,030	-,189	,850
2	(Constant)	2,489	,291		8,546	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,112	,135	,168	,835	,407
	attitudinalrecognisability	,229	,127	,335	1,807	,075
	situationalrecognisability	-,037	,122	-,048	-,302	,764
	wishfulidentification	,180	,144	,213	1,248	,217
3	(Constant)	2,494	,297		8,391	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,115	,138	,172	,833	,408
	attitudinalrecognisability	,232	,130	,338	1,781	,080
	situationalrecognisability	-,037	,123	-,048	-,300	,765
	wishfulidentification	,190	,172	,224	1,102	,275
	psr	-,013	,128	-,021	-,105	,917

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,213 ^c	1,248	,217	,154	,324
	psr	,096 ^c	,573	,569	,071	,344
2	psr	-,021 ^d	-,105	,917	-,013	,246

- a. To which gender identity do you most identify? = Male
 b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment
 c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
 d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Hierarchical regression analysis (split files for age)

Agegroup = 1,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,694 ^b	,482	,466	,71036

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	45,955	3	15,318	30,357	<,001 ^c
	Residual	49,452	98	,505		
	Total	95,407	101			

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-,083	,355		-,234	,815
	personalityrecognisability	,120	,080	,153	1,499	,137
	attitudinalrecognisability	,475	,098	,477	4,842	<,001
	situationalrecognisability	,121	,081	,153	1,498	,137

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

Agegroup = 2,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,789 ^b	,623	,605	,82570

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability,
attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	69,900	3	23,300	34,175	<,001 ^c
	Residual	42,270	62	,682		
	Total	112,170	65			

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability,
personalityrecognisability

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,242	,325		,744	,460
	personalityrecognisability	,551	,178	,642	3,094	,003
	attitudinalrecognisability	,095	,148	,101	,643	,522
	situationalrecognisability	,055	,141	,066	,390	,698

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: wishfulidentification

Agegroup = 1,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter

- a. Agegroup = 1,00
- b. Dependent Variable: psr
- c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,713 ^b	,509	,494	,97016
2	,782 ^c	,612	,596	,86672

- a. Agegroup = 1,00
- b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
- c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	95,453	3	31,818	33,805	<,001 ^c
	Residual	92,238	98	,941		
	Total	187,691	101			
2	Regression	114,824	4	28,706	38,213	<,001 ^d
	Residual	72,867	97	,751		
	Total	187,691	101			

- a. Agegroup = 1,00
- b. Dependent Variable: psr
- c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
- d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,014	,484		,029	,977
	personalityrecognisability	,243	,109	,220	2,220	,029
	attitudinalrecognisability	,415	,134	,297	3,098	,003
	situationalrecognisability	,340	,110	,306	3,084	,003
2	(Constant)	,066	,433		,153	,879
	personalityrecognisability	,168	,099	,152	1,697	,093
	attitudinalrecognisability	,118	,133	,084	,884	,379
	situationalrecognisability	,264	,100	,238	2,654	,009
	wishfulidentification	,626	,123	,446	5,078	<,001

- a. Agegroup = 1,00
- b. Dependent Variable: psr

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	
1	wishfulidentification ^c	,446 ^c	5,078	<,001	,458	,518

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

Agegroup = 2,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,829 ^b	,688	,673	,90061
2	,848 ^c	,719	,701	,86100

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	110,795	3	36,932	45,533	<,001 ^c
	Residual	50,288	62	,811		
	Total	161,083	65			
2	Regression	115,862	4	28,965	39,073	<,001 ^d
	Residual	45,221	61	,741		
	Total	161,083	65			

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,189	,355		,532	,597
	personalityrecognisability	,441	,194	,429	2,273	,026
	attitudinalrecognisability	,430	,162	,379	2,658	,010
	situationalrecognisability	,055	,154	,055	,361	,720
2	(Constant)	,105	,341		,308	,759
	personalityrecognisability	,251	,199	,244	1,257	,214
	attitudinalrecognisability	,397	,155	,350	2,558	,013
	situationalrecognisability	,036	,147	,036	,247	,805
	wishfulidentification	,346	,132	,289	2,614	,011

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: psr

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,289 ^c	2,614	,011	,317	,377

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: psr

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

Agegroup = 1,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,576 ^b	,331	,311	,65333
2	,595 ^c	,355	,328	,64514
3	,610 ^d	,372	,340	,63954

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	20,720	3	6,907	16,181	<,001 ^c
	Residual	41,830	98	,427		
	Total	62,550	101			
2	Regression	22,179	4	5,545	13,322	<,001 ^d
	Residual	40,372	97	,416		
	Total	62,550	101			
3	Regression	23,285	5	4,657	11,386	<,001 ^e
	Residual	39,266	96	,409		
	Total	62,550	101			

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,238	,326		3,796	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,102	,074	,161	1,392	,167
	attitudinalrecognisability	,269	,090	,333	2,975	,004
	situationalrecognisability	,106	,074	,166	1,431	,156
2	(Constant)	1,252	,322		3,887	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,082	,074	,129	1,114	,268
	attitudinalrecognisability	,187	,099	,231	1,884	,063
	situationalrecognisability	,085	,074	,133	1,153	,252
	wishfulidentification	,172	,092	,212	1,872	,064
3	(Constant)	1,244	,319		3,895	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,061	,074	,096	,828	,410
	attitudinalrecognisability	,172	,099	,213	1,746	,084
	situationalrecognisability	,053	,076	,083	,695	,489
	wishfulidentification	,095	,102	,117	,925	,357
	psr	,123	,075	,213	1,645	,103

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,212 ^c	1,872	,064	,187	,518
	psr	,268 ^c	2,329	,022	,230	,491
2	psr	,213 ^d	1,645	,103	,166	,388

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Agegroup = 2,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,780 ^b	,609	,590	,69778
2	,858 ^c	,737	,719	,57727
3	,866 ^d	,751	,730	,56640

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47,001	3	15,667	32,177	<,001 ^c
	Residual	30,188	62	,487		
	Total	77,188	65			
2	Regression	56,860	4	14,215	42,657	<,001 ^d
	Residual	20,328	61	,333		
	Total	77,188	65			
3	Regression	57,940	5	11,588	36,121	<,001 ^e
	Residual	19,249	60	,321		
	Total	77,188	65			

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,d}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,626	,275		2,278	,026
	personalityrecognisability	,338	,150	,474	2,244	,028
	attitudinalrecognisability	,225	,125	,286	1,794	,078
	situationalrecognisability	,035	,119	,050	,290	,773
2	(Constant)	,509	,228		2,230	,029
	personalityrecognisability	,072	,134	,101	,536	,594
	attitudinalrecognisability	,179	,104	,228	1,718	,091
	situationalrecognisability	,008	,099	,011	,081	,936
	wishfulidentification	,483	,089	,582	5,439	<,001
3	(Constant)	,493	,224		2,198	,032
	personalityrecognisability	,033	,133	,046	,248	,805
	attitudinalrecognisability	,117	,107	,150	1,093	,279
	situationalrecognisability	,002	,097	,003	,024	,981
	wishfulidentification	,429	,092	,518	4,675	<,001
	psr	,154	,084	,223	1,834	,072

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,582 ^c	5,439	<,001	,572	,377
	psr	,404 ^c	3,021	,004	,361	,312
2	psr	,223 ^d	1,834	,072	,230	,281

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: eudaimonicentertainment

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Agegroup = 1,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,418 ^b	,175	,150	,66523
2	,446 ^c	,199	,166	,65871
3	,449 ^d	,202	,160	,66096

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9,190	3	3,063	6,922	<,001 ^c
	Residual	43,368	98	,443		
	Total	52,558	101			
2	Regression	10,469	4	2,617	6,032	<,001 ^d
	Residual	42,088	97	,434		
	Total	52,558	101			
3	Regression	10,619	5	2,124	4,861	<,001 ^e
	Residual	41,939	96	,437		
	Total	52,558	101			

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,223	,332		9,705	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,197	,075	,338	2,630	,010
	attitudinalrecognisability	,149	,092	,202	1,624	,108
	situationalrecognisability	-,065	,076	-,110	-,858	,393
2	(Constant)	3,236	,329		9,839	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,178	,075	,305	2,369	,020
	attitudinalrecognisability	,073	,101	,098	,719	,474
	situationalrecognisability	-,084	,076	-,144	-,113	,268
	wishfulidentification	,161	,094	,217	1,717	,089
3	(Constant)	3,233	,330		9,795	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,170	,076	,292	2,227	,028
	attitudinalrecognisability	,067	,102	,091	,661	,510
	situationalrecognisability	-,096	,079	-,164	-,124	,224
	wishfulidentification	,132	,106	,178	1,253	,213
	psr	,045	,077	,086	,585	,560

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,217 ^c	1,717	,089	,172	,518
	psr	,170 ^c	1,301	,196	,131	,491
2	psr	,086 ^d	,585	,560	,060	,388

a. Agegroup = 1,00

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

Agegroup = 2,00

Variables Entered/Removed^{a,b}

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability ^c	.	Enter
2	wishfulidentification ^c	.	Enter
3	psr ^c	.	Enter

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

c. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^a

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,664 ^b	,441	,414	,66953
2	,712 ^c	,506	,474	,63448
3	,713 ^d	,508	,467	,63886

a. Agegroup = 2,00

b. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability

c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification

d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	21,960	3	7,320	16,329	<,001 ^c
	Residual	27,793	62	,448		
	Total	49,753	65			
2	Regression	25,196	4	6,299	15,647	<,001 ^d
	Residual	24,557	61	,403		
	Total	49,753	65			
3	Regression	25,264	5	5,053	12,380	<,001 ^e
	Residual	24,489	60	,408		
	Total	49,753	65			

- a. Agegroup = 2,00
- b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment
- c. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
- d. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification
- e. Predictors: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification, psr

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,812	,264		10,666	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,409	,144	,716	2,835	,006
	attitudinalrecognisability	,103	,120	,163	,854	,396
	situationalrecognisability	-,130	,114	-,232	-1,137	,260
2	(Constant)	2,745	,251		10,938	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,257	,147	,449	1,748	,086
	attitudinalrecognisability	,076	,114	,121	,668	,507
	situationalrecognisability	-,145	,108	-,260	-1,338	,186
	wishfulidentification	,277	,098	,415	2,835	,006
3	(Constant)	2,749	,253		10,871	<,001
	personalityrecognisability	,267	,150	,466	1,779	,080
	attitudinalrecognisability	,092	,121	,146	,757	,452
	situationalrecognisability	-,144	,109	-,257	-1,316	,193
	wishfulidentification	,290	,104	,436	2,800	,007
	psr	-,039	,095	-,070	-,408	,685

- a. Agegroup = 2,00
- b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment

Excluded Variables^{a,b}

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	wishfulidentification	,415 ^c	2,835	,006	,341	,377
	psr	,082 ^c	,481	,633	,061	,312
2	psr	-,070 ^d	-,408	,685	-,053	,281

- a. Agegroup = 2,00
- b. Dependent Variable: hedonicentertainment
- c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability
- d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), situationalrecognisability, attitudinalrecognisability, personalityrecognisability, wishfulidentification