



# Why Do We Enjoy Reality Shows

## Is It Really All About Humiliation and Gloating?

Michal Hershman Shitrit and Jonathan Cohen

Department of Communication, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel

**Abstract:** The increased popularity of reality shows has been followed by criticism that they rely on viewers' enjoyment of the humiliation and degradation of participants. This study included 163 Israelis who reported on their own willingness to participate in reality shows and how they would react if family members were to participate. Positive correlations between these responses and reported viewing enjoyment dispel the myth that viewers' enjoyment comes primarily from watching others suffer and being humiliated.

**Keywords:** reality shows, motivations

Reality shows are a staple of television schedules around the world. They are characterized by people appearing as themselves (rather than being played by actors); at least part of the action is filmed on location in the characters' living, working, and/or leisure environments; there is officially no predetermined script and the events are presented in narrative form to entertain audiences (Nabi, Bielby, Morgan, & Stitt, 2003). The appeal of such shows lies in witnessing interpersonal relationships and getting to know the participants and their vulnerabilities (Andrejevic, 2004).

Scholars who study reality shows are divided between those who see the shows' appeal as an extension of the appeal of drama and thus driven by empathy and those who see their appeal as driven by voyeuristic desire to intrude on others and see them in their most private (Andrejevic, 2004) and embarrassing moments (Reiss & Wiltz, 2004). In the context of this debate the present study has a rather limited goal. Data originally collected as part of a pilot study on reality show participation in order to assess attitudes toward different shows are used in this study to indirectly provide a critical test of these two explanations by linking enjoyment of reality shows to willingness to participate. Using logical deduction, the basic argument underlying this study is that if viewers are enjoying the humiliation of participants, than the *more* viewers enjoy these shows the *less* they should want to participate in them or see someone they love participate in a reality show. On the other hand, if they are not motivated by humiliation but rather relate positively to participants, then enjoyment should be positively correlated with desire to participate. Thus, a negative correlation between enjoyment and willingness to participate would support the humiliation

hypothesis and a positive correlation would support a positive association hypothesis.

### Reality Shows

Although reality shows come in different forms it is perhaps the promise of seeing real people in supposedly real situations that has made them the focus of so much public scorn and such vehement public debate. Studies of self-reported viewer motives have found that such motives include distraction and boredom (Nabi et al., 2003), and that it serves as a social activity (Lundy, Ruth, & Park, 2008). Others claim that reality shows serve as a guilty pleasure where viewers watch participants who are trapped in a cycle of voyeurism and exhibitionism (Andrejevic, 2004). Supporting this approach, reality shows have been found to include more relational aggression than nonreality programs (Coyne, Robinson, & Nelson, 2010) and watching reality shows was correlated with a motivation to feel socially important (Reiss & Wiltz, 2004).

### Humiliation and Self-Disclosure in Reality Shows

According to Schick (1997), what causes humiliation is that one's failures are seen by others, who gloat or show signs of enjoying the failure. Reality shows often include public exhibitions of various failures whether through humiliating acts (e.g., *Fear Factor*), humiliation by judges or other contestants (e.g., *American Idol*), or humiliation through interpersonal and relational conflict (Dubrofsky, 2011).

Although people tend to enjoy talking about themselves and disclosing their opinions and attitudes (Tamir & Mitchell, 2012), reality shows tend to encourage extreme self-disclosure. These shows often put great pressure on participants to tell the audience more about themselves than they would normally wish to, including negative information (Aslama & Pantti, 2006; Dubrofsky, 2011). Not surprisingly, in an Australian survey (Australian Communication and Media Authority, 2007) 54% of respondents agreed that reality shows exploit the people who participate in them.

The centrality of competition, conflict, and humiliation in reality shows would suggest that producers see displays of humiliation as attractive to viewers and important to the shows' success. Empirical research, however, does not support this contention (Weimann, Cohen, & Bar-Sinai, 2009), and generally provides mixed results. Typically, Hall (2006) found that "both aspirational identification and schadenfreude contributed to some viewers' enthusiasm for the programs..." (p. 210). However, Hall relies on self-report, which is suspect when it comes to reporting motivations (Kahneman, 2011), and so it is perhaps not surprising that results are inconsistent.

To allay some of these concerns, the present study asked respondents to react to a specific hypothetical situation, and deduce what they think and feel about reality shows from these responses. In order to control for other personal factors, such as shyness or low self-esteem, respondents were also asked about their reactions if a close family member were to participate in a reality show. Underlying this method is the assumption that people do not want a loved one to be humiliated and thus if a respondent believed reality shows to be based on humiliation, she/he would be upset if a loved one would participate. Because reality shows vary in many ways (Nabi, 2007), we avoided asking about reality shows in general but rather asked separately about each of a dozen reality shows.

## Self-Disclosure

Attitudes toward reality shows are not the only predictor of willingness to participate in reality shows. Another factor that is likely to account for such willingness is how one feels about disclosing one's thoughts, feelings, and experiences (Waring, 1990). Participants in reality shows are expected to self-disclose, and allowing viewers to know participants' inner feelings and thoughts is central to success. In addition, the high degree of self-disclosure that is expected in some reality shows can be seen as part of the humiliation that participants endure. Therefore, a measure of self-disclosure is included in order to control for its role in willingness to participate.

## Hypotheses

Based on the assumption that people do not wish to be humiliated or see loved ones publicly humiliated, if people enjoy reality shows for their humiliation we would expect a negative correlation between enjoyment and willingness to participate. If, on the other hand, empathy is why people enjoy these shows, we would expect a positive correlation between enjoyment and the willingness to participate.

*Research Question 1 (RQ):* What is the nature of the correlation between enjoying reality shows and the willingness to participate in them?

In addition, as we expect that self-disclosure plays a major role in willingness to participate in reality shows we expect a positive correlation between self-disclosure and willingness to participate in reality shows. That said, it is expected that the role of self-disclosure will vary somewhat across reality shows because of variations in format, and because it is a personal trait, it should be associated with one's own willingness but not with participation by a loved one.

*Hypothesis 1 (H1):* Self-disclosure will be positively correlated with one's own willingness to participate in reality shows.

## Method

### The Programs

In this study, 12 programs were used to represent reality shows. These shows were all locally produced shows with Israeli participants that were aired at the time of the study or in the few years preceding the study (2011). In choosing the shows we included the most popular shows aired in recent years on broadcast channels so that many of our respondents would be familiar with the shows and so as to capture the diversity of shows. Most of these shows were based on foreign formats that were purchased by local producers. In all, the sample of programs included the most popular Israeli reality shows and, as described here, is similar to the types of reality shows broadcast elsewhere.

Three shows were aired on Israel's most widely watched commercial channel and were the local versions of *Big Brother*, *American Idol*, and *So You Think You Can Dance*. Next, broadcast on the other commercial channel were the local version of the *Biggest Loser* the Israeli version of the BBC's *Master Chef*, and *Super Nanny*. Local versions

of the US formats *The Bachelor*, *Survivor*, *The Amazing Race*, and *The Beauty and the Geek* were also included.

Original formats included *Mishpachah Choreget* (loosely translated as *a family over-budget*) that follows a family in financial distress as it tries, assisted by a personal finance coach, to get its finances and its life back in order. The final show was called *The Ambassador*, in which 14 contestants competed for a position as a spokesperson for an international PR firm in New York. Shows were presented to respondents without specifying a specific season or episode and the order of the shows was fixed.

## Sample

A convenience sample of 163 university students from the Faculty of Humanities in a special academic program for nontraditional students during May 2011 completed the survey. Thus, although the sample was not representative of the population as a whole, it was demographically varied. Of the respondents, 60 were male, 92 female, and 11 did not report their gender. Their ages ranged from 18 to 72 years, with a mean age of 34.03 ( $SD = 9.68$ ). The questionnaires were administered by the instructor to participants who agreed to complete the study voluntarily, in the classrooms, at the end of the lessons.

## Measurement

This study utilized data from a pilot study for research on reality show participation. As such, it was intended to provide a sense of people's thoughts about viewing of reality shows and participating in them. The questionnaires included items regarding demographics, TV viewing habits, familiarity with the reality television shows mentioned here, and self-disclosure. For each of the 12 shows listed in the previous section, participants were asked: How often they watched, how much they enjoyed, the extent to which they would want to participate if offered a chance, and how happy they would be if a family member was interested in participating. Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale, with 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *very much*. Because single-item measures were used and variance was expected across shows, no reliability measures were computed.<sup>1</sup>

The self-disclosure measure was based on the Self-Disclosure Index developed by Miller, Berg, and Archer (1983) but the items were translated into Hebrew and adapted. Items asked to what extent one would reveal to a stranger various types of information, such as "Your

personal habits" or "Things you have done and feel guilty about." The answers, recorded on a scale of 1 (= *not at all*) to 7 (= *very much*) formed a reliable score ( $\alpha = .92$ ).

In the current sample, overall TV viewing was reported as just below average (3.76 on a 7-point scale). Across all 12 reality shows the mean frequency viewing was 1.96 (on a 7-point scale), suggesting overall infrequent viewing. Mean enjoyment across the 12 reality shows was 2.92 (on a 7-point scale), suggesting a low level of enjoyment. Although the average viewing and enjoyment across the shows were low, there were a range of responses suggesting that some shows were better liked (e.g., viewing *Master Chef*:  $M = 2.29$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ; enjoying *Master Chef*:  $M = 3.71$ ,  $SD = 2.04$ ).

## Results

### General Findings

Although reality show producers often report mob scenes at their auditions, our results suggest that in the general population the interest in participating in reality shows was not very high ( $M = 2.03$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ). On a scale of 1 to 7 (7 = *high interest*) none of the shows scored a 3 or higher. Three shows – *Amazing Race*, *Survivor*, and *Master Chef* – scored between a 2.5 and a 3 suggesting some, but not much, interest. The other nine shows all scored below 2, suggesting very low interest. However, on all shows there were some respondents that reported high interest in participating. These results suggest that although only a minority of people are interested in participating in reality shows, the desire to participate by these few may be quite strong.

Given the interest in the notion of subgenres of reality, four factor analyses (method = PCA, varimax rotation) were conducted trying to group the 12 shows on each of the four questions (viewing, enjoyment, willingness to participate, and family participation). The goal was to see if any consistent groupings emerged across these four questions that could be interpreted based on content, size of rewards, context etc. No theoretically consistent groupings emerged, suggesting that the analysis should proceed at the program level and that none of the underlying factors we identified explained audience responses. We also examined the overall mean willingness to participate as a function of the predictor variables.

<sup>1</sup> Although single-item measures were used to measure viewing and enjoying each show, we computed reliabilities for these four scales across the shows, and they were all acceptable (Viewing frequency:  $\alpha = 0.79$ ; Enjoyment:  $\alpha = 0.84$ ; Willingness to participate:  $\alpha = 0.85$ ; and Participation of others:  $\alpha = 0.91$ ).

**Table 1.** Standardized regression coefficients and standard errors for predicting willingness to participate in reality shows

Variables	<i>Big Brother</i>	<i>Star Is Born</i>	<i>Born to Dance</i>	<i>Big Loser</i>	<i>Master Chef</i>	<i>Super Nanny</i>	<i>The Bachelor</i>	<i>Survivor</i>	<i>Beauty &amp; the Geek</i>	<i>Over-Budget</i>	<i>Amazing Race</i>	<i>Ambassador</i>	All the shows
TV View	-.03	-.05	-.01	-.04	.03	.10	-.04	-.04	-.13 <sup>#</sup>	-.17*	.01	-.06	-.12 <sup>#</sup>
Gender	-.14 <sup>#</sup>	-.09	.08	-.05	-.04	-.12	-.12	-.19*	-.03	-.01	-.12 <sup>#</sup>	-.11	-.16*
Age	-.04	-.18	-.05	-.04	-.05	-.03	.10	.03	.04	.06	-.16*	-.12 <sup>#</sup>	-.04
Self-Disclosure	.22*	.21*	.15 <sup>#</sup>	.10	.16*	.17*	.20*	.23*	.16*	.06	.19*	.03	.23*
Enjoy Program	.43*	.31*	.37*	.41*	.37*	.56*	.14 <sup>#</sup>	.59*	.38*	.43*	.58*	.60*	.41*
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.27	.17	.14	.17	.14	.31	.07	.51	.21	.21	.43	.38	.31
F	12.07	7.02	5.66	6.65	5.68	14.02	3.04	30.45	8.28	8.66	22.52	18.87	14.14

Notes. <sup>#</sup> $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . TV View: 1 = much less than average, 5 = much more than average. Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female. Self-Disclosure: 1 = low, 7 = high. Enjoy Program: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = often, 4 = always.

## Main Analysis

To test the hypotheses, we computed regression equations to identify predictors of willingness to participate on each of the 12 shows but also on average for all the shows (see Table 1). Willingness to participate was regressed on overall TV viewing, age, gender, trait self-disclosure, and on the extent to which respondents reported enjoying that show. Owing to very high correlations between frequency of viewing and enjoying (correlations ranged from 0.72 to 0.88), viewing was removed from the models to avoid collinearity. As can be seen in Table 1, general TV viewing had an effect on willingness to participate in only one reality show individually, and not on the overall average of willingness to participate ( $\beta = -.12$ , *ns*).

As expected, the trait self-disclosure was a consistent predictor of the extent to which people were interested in participating in a reality show. In eight of the 12 shows this correlation was positive and significant. On average, self-disclosure was a significant and positive predictor ( $\beta = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ ) of willingness to participate in reality shows. Thus, H1 was mostly supported. As expected, self-disclosure predicted willingness to participate but did not predict attitudes toward family members' participation, suggesting that people were able to meaningfully differentiate between the self and family member participation questions.

In examining RQ1, respondents' enjoyment of the show was the most predictive factor of willingness to participate. Not only did enjoyment significantly predict the interest in participation in 11 of the 12 shows, but the coefficients were always the most substantial. The coefficient for the overall effect was substantial ( $\beta = .41$ ,  $p < .05$ ) suggesting that the more a person enjoyed reality shows, the more he or she reported an interest in participating in them. In sum, according to our findings, enjoyment is not related to humiliation but rather to a positive assessment of participating in reality shows. This conclusion can be derived from the consistent positive relationship of willingness to participate with enjoyment.

## Family Member Participation

Because media discourse about reality shows has made participating in them socially undesirable, this study used *willingness to participate* as a stand-in for attitudes toward reality shows. However, the desire to participate is also related to personal traits that may have nothing to do with attitudes. Thus, we asked respondents what they would think if a loved one would want to participate in a reality show, as a way to circumvent social desirability as well as the effects of personal traits (i.e., disclosure or self-esteem). Thus, this was a method to measure of attitudes toward participation in reality shows at a slight distance and is a validation of our results.

As a whole, the mean approval for family participation across the 12 shows was higher than the mean desire for self-participation ( $M = 2.94$ ,  $SD = 1.5$ ). That said, it should be noted that the highest score for approval of family participation was for *Master Chef* and that even this score was no higher than 4, suggesting that the general attitude toward reality show participation cannot be characterized as positive. Overall, the results for family members (see Table 2) resemble the pattern of results for respondents' own willingness to participate. What is clear, however, from comparing Table 1 and Table 2 is that, as expected, whereas self-disclosure predicted desire for self-participation it did not predict approval of family members participating. Only for two of the 12 shows (*Master Chef* and *Amazing Race*) was self-disclosure found to be a significant predictor for family participation. This is compared to 10 shows for which self-disclosure was a significant predictor of desire to participate. Conversely, as with the results for the desire to participate, approval of family participation was clearly predicted by enjoyment of the show. As can be seen in Table 2, this was true for all 12 shows.

## Multilevel Modeling

Another way to analyze these data is by considering the data to be hierarchical, such that the 12 shows are nested



**Table 2.** Standardized regression coefficients and standard errors for predicting reactions to family member's participation in reality shows

	<i>Big Brother</i>	<i>Star Is Born</i>	<i>Born to Dance</i>	<i>Big Loser</i>	<i>Master Chef</i>	<i>Super Nanny</i>	<i>The Bachelor</i>	<i>Survivor</i>	<i>Beauty &amp; the Geek</i>	<i>Over-Budget</i>	<i>Amazing Race</i>	<i>Ambassador</i>	All the shows
TV View	.00	.12	.03	.05	.04	.00	-.08	-.12 <sup>#</sup>	-.02	-.06	-.02	-.07	-.00
Gender	-.18*	-.10	-.02	-.07	-.08	-.07	-.23*	-.08	-.23*	.05	-.03	-.09	-.14
Age	.09	-.03	.07	-.14 <sup>#</sup>	-.08	-.05	.13 <sup>#</sup>	.15*	.10	.03	-.09	-.02	.03
Self-Disclosure	.07	.05	.06	.05	.18*	.06	.07	.11	.00	.02	.21*	.08	.10
Enjoy Program	.39*	.44*	.36*	.42*	.39*	.72*	.17*	.52*	.51*	.47*	.39*	.45*	.49*
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.19	.18	.10	.17	.17	.20	.09	.34	.32	.20	.21	.23	.27
F	7.8	7.46	4.11	6.97	6.91	8.04	3.93	16.02	14.33	7.90	8.58	9.69	11.72

Notes. <sup>#</sup> $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . TV View: 1 = much less than average, 5 = much more than average. Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female. Self-Disclosure: 1 = low, 7 = high. Enjoy Program: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = often, 4 = always.

within individual viewers. A mixed-model multilevel modeling analysis (using the SAS GLIMMIX procedure) with a random intercept was tested such that the respondent was the second level of analysis and the rest of the variables were treated as fixed factors.<sup>2</sup> One model was tested for the self-participation dependent variable and another for family participation. For the sake of parsimony, any interaction term of an independent variable with a program that was not significant was removed from the model. Following this, any main effect that was not significant was also removed. Consequently, for the equations predicting participation, the general viewing variable was removed, and for models predicting family-member participation, both general viewing and self-disclosure were removed. The Appendix presents the regression equations for each of the programs for both variables. Owing to missing values, 149 of 163 respondents were included in these analyses. The intraclass correlation coefficients were 0.22 for participation and 0.37 for family participation.

These analyses revealed that indeed the regression equations differed by show and that for some of the different shows the slopes for the independent variables were different (see Appendix). The difference in the slopes for enjoyment across shows was significant both for participation,  $F(11, 1520) = 1.95$ ,  $p < .001$ , and family participation,  $F(11, 1537) = 3.27$ ,  $p < .001$ . The significant  $p$  values simply mean that not for all shows did enjoyment predict (family) participation to the same extent, but this does not mean that they were all significantly different from each other. An examination of the equation in the Appendix provides a sense of which programs were more alike and which were different. Although the regression slopes were different in size across shows, the slopes for enjoyment were all positive, replicating the general aforementioned analysis. In other words,

enjoyment was a positive predictor of participation and family participation across all shows, but to a different degree.

A closer look at the size of the coefficients of enjoying the show (see Appendix) did not reveal that the shows were grouped in any theoretically meaningful way. For example, it could be expected that for shows including much humiliation (e.g., *Greatest Loser* or *Super Nanny*) the slopes would be similar and smaller compared with talent competition shows, but this was not the case. Indeed, there did not seem to be any systematic logic to the differences in the sizes of the slopes. Nor were these differences identical across the two dependent variables (i.e., participation and family participation). Thus, beyond concluding that the specific shows matter, it was not clear how and why they mattered.

## Discussion

Scholars have likened reality shows to the Roman Coliseum where early Christians were thrown to lions as entertainment and gladiators fought to the death for cheering crowds. Other motives for viewing reality TV notwithstanding (Nabi et al., 2003; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007), the present study sought to provide an innovative and critical test of the role of humiliation as a motive, and found that is in not central. Returning to the Roman Coliseum metaphor, it is hard to imagine that the joyful Roman viewers would report that they, or their loved ones, would like to be thrown to the lions.

The methodological approach used in this study was based on a suspicious approach to direct self-report (Kahneman, 2011), and assumes that rather than directly asking about motivations it is better to assess underlying feelings and motivations through responses to hypothetical

<sup>2</sup> We also estimated a random intercepts and random slopes model. Although the difference in the slopes for enjoyment across shows was greater, the results for the individual shows were quite similar. Importantly, for the family participation model the variance of the random slopes was too small and so the model did not converge. In order to be consistent across both models, we present the random intercepts model.

personal and specific situations. A similar approach was used by Bogardus (1925) to measure social distance by asking specific hypothetical questions about intergroup contact (e.g., “I would accept a member of this group as one of my business partners”).

## Limitations and Future Research

Because reality shows differ from each other, and in order to assess attitudes regarding reality shows more directly, questions about viewing, enjoyment, and willingness to participate were asked separately for each of a dozen programs. Thus, the number of variables we could measure and control for was limited and the survey did not assess some relevant perceptions such as the effects of reality shows (Cohen & Weimann, 2008), a measure of perceived norms regarding viewing these shows, or other variables relevant to participating in several of the shows (interest in singing or dancing, athletic abilities). These variables could have provided a more complete theoretical model of why individual may or may not want to participate. Other limitations have to do with our nonrandom sample and the setting in which the data were collected. Finally, the order in which the shows was presented to respondents was not randomized and could have produced an order effect. However, it should be pointed out that the order was not purposeful or systematic in any way.

It could be argued that the association between enjoyment of reality shows and the willingness to participate is a spurious relationship that is actually based on the degree to which individuals perceive reality shows as normative. Although no data currently exist to test this notion, it is important to note that even if this hypothesis is true, it does not contradict our main thesis. If participation in reality shows is linked to perceptions of how normative they are, this still suggests that participation is not considered humiliating and that watching them is not based on the desire to see others degraded but rather on a sense of normativity.

Another objection to our conclusion may be that the positive correlation between enjoyment and willingness to participate is due to respondents who enjoy gloating over others' downfall but still want to participate because they believe that they, unlike others, would succeed in the reality show. In other words, enjoyment comes from downward social comparison, whereby the more one sees others fail and the more one believes that he or she would do well, the more one enjoys the show. Although we must leave testing this intriguing possibility for future studies, it is unlikely that this pattern would extend to family members.

As with any correlational study it is also possible that the causal direction we propose can be reversed. Possibly, those

who wish to participate, are those who are willing to admit to watching the shows and enjoying them, while those who see participants as worthy of pity, refuse to report that they watch and enjoy the show. Although this is a possible sequence, it is more likely that people only consider possible participation after having first viewed and formed opinions about the genre. Indeed, it is quite likely that many of our respondents never really thought about whether they would like to participate in reality shows, or how they would react to a family member doing so, until faced with this question in the current study.

Future research should focus more narrowly on identifying what features of reality shows make them more or less attractive to viewers. This will be another way of exploring how the celebrity versus disclosure/humiliation trade-off is seen and experienced by potential participants and viewers. Perhaps through systematically varying the extent of private information exposed and types of tasks to be faced, on the one hand, and the prizes, on the other hand, a better understanding can be gained of how reality shows reflect current norms and perceptions of important concepts such as dignity, privacy, and shame.

## References

- Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality TV: The work of being watched*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Aslama, M., & Pantti, M. (2006). Talking alone: Reality TV, emotions and authenticity. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(2), 167–184. doi: 10.1177/1367549406063162
- Australian Communication and Media Authority. (2007). *Reality television review, Vol. 1*. Retrieved from [http://www.acma.gov.au/webwr/\\_assets/main/lib310007/acma\\_realitytvreview\\_finalreport\\_vol1\\_30mar07.pdf](http://www.acma.gov.au/webwr/_assets/main/lib310007/acma_realitytvreview_finalreport_vol1_30mar07.pdf)
- Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Measuring social distance. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 9(2), 299–308.
- Cohen, J., & Weimann, G. (2008). Who's afraid of reality shows? Exploring the effects of perceived influence of reality shows and the concern over their social effects, on willingness to censor. *Communication Research*, 35(3), 382–397. doi: 10.1177/0093650208315964
- Coyne, S. M., Robinson, S. L., & Nelson, D. A. (2010). Does reality backbite? Physical, verbal, and relational aggression in reality television programs. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 54(2), 282–298. doi: 10.1080/08838151003737931
- Dubrofsky, R. E. (2011). Surveillance on reality TV and Facebook: From authenticity to flowing data. *Communication Theory*, 21(2), 111–129. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2011.01378.x
- Hall, A. (2006). Viewers' perceptions of reality program. *Communication Quarterly*, 54(2), 191–211. doi: 10.1080/01463370600650902
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Lundy, L. K., Ruth, A. M., & Park, T. D. (2008). Simply irresistible: Reality TV consumption patterns. *Communication Quarterly*, 56(2), 208–225. doi: 10.1080/01463370802026828
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(6), 1234–1244. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.6.1234

- Nabi, R. L. (2007). Determining dimensions of reality: A cognitive mapping of reality TV programs. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51, 371–389. doi: 10.1080/08838150701307111
- Nabi, R. L., Biely, E. N., Morgan, S. J., & Stitt, C. R. (2003). Reality-based television programming and the psychology of its appeal. *Media Psychology*, 5, 303–330. doi: 10.1207/S1532785XMEP0504\_01
- Papacharissi, Z., & Mendelson, A. L. (2007). An exploratory study of reality appeal: Uses and gratifications of reality TV shows. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(2), 355–370. doi: 10.1080/08838150701307152
- Reiss, S., & Wiltz, J. (2004). Why people watch reality TV? *Media Psychology*, 6, 363–378. doi: 10.1207/s1532785xmep0604\_3
- Schick, F. (1997). On humiliation. *Social Research*, 64(1), 131–147.
- Tamir, D. I., & Mitchell, J. P. (2012). Disclosing information about the self is intrinsically rewarding. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(21), 8038–8043. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1202129109
- Waring, E. M. (1990). Self-disclosure of personal constructs. *Family Process*, 29, 399–413. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.1990.00399.x
- Weimann, G., Cohen, J., & Bar-Sinai, I. (2009). A star is degraded: An examination of the relationship between degradation in reality shows and viewers' enjoyment of these shows. *Media Frames: Israeli Journal of Communication*, 3, 1–26.

Received March 1, 2015

Revision received December 21, 2015

Accepted January 15, 2016

Published online August 26, 2016

**Michal Hershman Shitrit**

Department of Communication  
University of Haifa  
31905 Haifa  
Israel  
jcohen@com.haifa.ac.il



Jonathan Cohen (PhD, 1995, University of Southern California) is Associate Professor of Communication at the Department of Communication, University of Haifa. His research focuses on the psychology of relationships with media characters and narrative persuasion. He has published more than 40 articles, chapters and research reports on these topics.



Michal Hershman-Shitrit (PhD, 2015, University of Haifa) recently completed her dissertation titled: “Why Do They Do It: Predictors of Reality TV Participation” and conducts research on reality shows and media psychology. Her teaching includes courses such as “Rhetoric – The Art of Speech and Persuasion” and “Reality TV Shows – Theory and Criticism.”

## Appendix

### Multilevel Regression Equations for Self-Participation (Level 1 = Show, Level 2 = Respondent)

1. *Big Brother*:  $\text{parti} = 0.27 + 0.59*\text{enjoy} + 0.52*\text{male} - 0.004*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.38*\text{view}$
2. *Star Is Born*:  $\text{parti} = 1.84 + 0.43*\text{enjoy} + 0.15*\text{male} - 0.024*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.55*\text{view}$
3. *Born to Dance*:  $\text{parti} = 2.02 + 0.66*\text{enjoy} - 0.37*\text{male} - 0.005*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 1.19*\text{view}$
4. *Big Loser*:  $\text{parti} = 0.58 + 0.44*\text{enjoy} + 0.03*\text{male} - 0.004*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.26*\text{view}$
5. *Master Chef*:  $\text{parti} = 1.04 + 0.79*\text{enjoy} + 0.04*\text{male} - 0.004*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.59*\text{view}$
6. *Super Nanny*:  $\text{parti} = 0.90 + 1.04*\text{enjoy} - 0.17*\text{male} - 0.012*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 1.57*\text{view}$
7. *The Bachelor*:  $\text{parti} = 0.40 + 0.70*\text{enjoy} + 0.40*\text{male} + 0.019*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 1.09*\text{view}$
8. *Survivor*:  $\text{parti} = -0.75 + 0.93*\text{enjoy} + 1.19*\text{male} - 0.007*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.05*\text{view}$
9. *Beauty & the Geek*:  $\text{parti} = 0.60 + 0.48*\text{enjoy} + 0.19*\text{male} + 0.003*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.59*\text{view}$
10. *Over-Budget*:  $\text{parti} = -0.86 - 0.01*\text{enjoy} + 0.07*\text{male} - 0.017*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} + 0.69*\text{view}$
11. *Amazing Race*:  $\text{parti} = 0.50 + 0.66*\text{enjoy} + 0.42*\text{male} - 0.049*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} + 0.73*\text{view}$
12. *Ambassador*:  $\text{parti} = -0.19 + 0.71*\text{enjoy} + 0.72*\text{male} - 0.001*\text{age} + 0.19*\text{selfdisc} - 0.50*\text{view}$

$$\text{ICC} = \frac{0.5335}{0.5335 + 1.943} = 0.215$$

### Multilevel Regression Equations for Family-Member Participation (Level 1 = Show, Level 2 = Respondent)

1. *Big Brother*:  $\text{parti} = 0.53 + 0.69*\text{enjoy} + 0.70*\text{male} - 0.017 - 0.65*\text{view}$
2. *Star Is Born*:  $\text{parti} = 3.26 + 1.04*\text{enjoy} + 0.06*\text{male} - 0.001*\text{age} - 1.32*\text{view}$
3. *Born to Dance*:  $\text{parti} = 2.22 + 1.25*\text{enjoy} - 0.03*\text{male} - 0.020*\text{age} - 1.52*\text{view}$
4. *Big Loser*:  $\text{parti} = 2.53 + 0.97*\text{enjoy} + 0.26*\text{male} - 0.023*\text{age} - 0.90*\text{view}$
5. *Master Chef*:  $\text{parti} = 2.04 + 1.21*\text{enjoy} + 0.58*\text{male} - 0.009*\text{age} - 0.71*\text{view}$
6. *Super Nanny*:  $\text{parti} = 1.89 + 0.71*\text{enjoy} - 0.05*\text{male} - 0.002*\text{age} - 0.75*\text{view}$
7. *The Bachelor*:  $\text{parti} = 0.15 + 0.74*\text{enjoy} + 0.92*\text{male} + 0.025*\text{age} - 0.72*\text{view}$
8. *Survivor*:  $\text{parti} = -0.25 + 0.90*\text{enjoy} + 0.81*\text{male} - 0.020*\text{age} + 0.01*\text{view}$
9. *Beauty & the Geek*:  $\text{parti} = 0.47 + 0.66*\text{enjoy} + 1.14*\text{male} + 0.003*\text{age} - 0.39*\text{view}$
10. *Over-Budget*:  $\text{parti} = -0.09 + 0.36*\text{enjoy} + 0.10*\text{male} - 0.022*\text{age} + 0.27*\text{view}$
11. *Amazing Race*:  $\text{parti} = 1.14 + 0.39*\text{enjoy} + 0.24*\text{male} - 0.031*\text{age} + 1.30*\text{view}$
12. *Ambassador*:  $\text{parti} = -0.71 + 0.84*\text{enjoy} + 0.95*\text{male} + 0.019*\text{age} - 0.003*\text{view}$

$$\text{ICC} = \frac{1.4233}{1.4233 + 2.3796} = 0.374$$