How Consumer Personalities, Lifestyles, and Demographics Predict SVOD Genre and SVOD Platform Consumption

Abstract: Streaming video on demand (SVOD) services are comprised of digital media content creation and content distribution that provide a vast array of genre content playable on an assortment of different technology platforms. Additionally, these digital services are equipped to collect data and information on consumers. This data can explicate what consumers do while engaged in these services, but it may be limited in explaining why consumers engage in these services. To resolve this discrepancy, collecting external information such as complete demographics, personalities, and lifestyles of consumers can be useful in advancing SVOD consumer behavior knowledge. On the surface, it does not seem that SVOD firms are currently collecting this information. In fact, to sign up for a SVOD service, typical requested personal information includes a consumer's address, email address, name, birthdate, and gender (HBO Max, 2020; Hulu, 2020; Netflix, 2020). This illustrates a prime opportunity to investigate how demographics, lifestyles, and personalities may predict SVOD genre consumption and SVOD platform consumption. Together, these elements will help weave a refined model that will aid marketers in understanding how to target potential SVOD consumers as well as deconstruct SVOD platform and SVOD genre consumption preferences. This study performs a structural equation model to gain sense as to how well consumer personalities, lifestyles, and demographics can predict SVOD genre consumption and SVOD platform consumption.

Introduction

Streaming video on demand (SVOD) services are comprised of digital media content creation and content distribution that provide a vast array of genre content playable on an assortment of different technology platforms. Additionally, these digital services are equipped to collect data and information on consumers. Through streaming platforms, consumers have been introduced to unprecedented media behaviors, including binge-watching content as well as watching video and television programs on an assortment of smart devices. There are numerous types of genres and subgenres that are available for immediate consumer consumption. This digital media form is extremely flexible, allowing consumers to view any type of genre on any smart device. SVOD services are constructed to capture consumer information as well, harnessing clicks, view times, and thousands of other available metrics. This data can explicate *what* consumers do while engaged in these services, but it may be limited in explaining *why* consumers engage in these services. To resolve this discrepancy, collecting external information such as complete demographics, personalities, and lifestyles of consumers can be useful in advancing SVOD consumer behavior knowledge. On the surface, it does not seem that SVOD firms are currently collecting this information. In fact, to sign up for a SVOD service, typical requested personal information includes a consumer's address, email address, name, birthdate, and gender (HBO Max, 2020; Hulu, 2020; Netflix, 2020). This illustrates a prime opportunity to investigate how demographics, lifestyles, and personalities may predict SVOD genre consumption and SVOD platform consumption. Together, these elements will help weave a refined model that will aid marketers in understanding how to target potential SVOD consumers as well as deconstruct SVOD platform and SVOD genre consumption preferences.

There are several studies that have investigated how demographics, personalities, and lifestyles can explicate media consumption. There is a previous study by Villani (1975) that

found that measuring for lifestyle alone explained 7-17% of television viewing variance, measuring for demographics alone explained 0-6% of television viewing variance, and personality alone explained 2-8% of television viewing variance. Together, these measurements accounted for 8-21% of television viewing. A study by Palomba (2020a) examined frequent movie consumers' movie genre and movie platform consumption. The study found demographics explained 5%-19% of movie genre consumption and 4%-20% of movie platform consumption. When demographics and lifestyles were added together, this captured 4%-14% of movie genre consumption and 5%-29% of movie platform consumption. Finally, when personality was added with demographics and lifestyle, these measures together explained 4%-17% of movie genre consumption and 5%-30% of movie platform consumption. Additionally, the structural equation model demonstrated that personalities and lifestyles were key variables in predict movie platform frequency consumption. Past studies have also examined how brand loyalty (Palomba, 2016; Palomba, 2020b), active emotions management (Palomba, 2018), and time of year (Palomba, 2019) can influence and explain variation in media consumption habits. Therefore, there is evidence that indirectly related media consumption variables can capture unexplained variance potentially left over from directly related media consumption variables.

SVOD services are uniquely different from traditional television and movie consumption across genres and platforms. SVOD services are predicated on consumers' abilities to customize their own media consumption experiences across genre and platform. There are unlimited video and television series that are available to consumers instantaneously, meaning that consumers can choose to watch any genre that they wish at any moment. There are currently over five hundred television and SVOD series that are currently being broadcasted and streamed, creating a ruthless marketplace that has made it difficult to compete in. Compounded against rising above

the line talent (e.g. actors, writers, producers, directors), SVOD content has become increasingly expensive to produce and distribute to consumers.

The structure of this study is similar in nature to Palomba (2020a), which considered demographics, lifestyles, and personalities of frequent movie genre consumption and frequent movie platform consumption. Admittedly, while SVOD consumption is passive, it is a type of consumption that is platform agnostic in nature, meaning its content can be viewed on a wide variety of technology platforms. It is uniquely positioned to capture digital consumer touchpoints, advancing analytics and ability to track actual consumer behavior. This has helped inform creative decisions, and it also allows consumers to consume a multitude of different genres and subgenres at any time.

To understand how consumers choose media for consumption, one model proposes that this is based around a) program characteristics (e.g. genre preferences), b) individual differences (e.g. demographics and lifestyles), cognitive and effective elements (psychographics) and media habits and preferences (e.g. platform preferences and consumption frequencies) (Rubin, 2009). This study places together a theoretical framework including trait theory and media selection. A literature review will be written that explains how the aforementioned variables are key in predicting SVOD platform consumption and SVOD genre consumption. Multiple linear regressions will be run to see how these key predictors predict individual platform and genre consumption. Structural equation modeling is performed to simultaneously test relationships and compare the conceptual model to the actual data matrix.

SVOD Consumption

The SVOD marketplace is one of the most competitive industries within the media and entertainment industries. Recently, Nielsen conducted a study that looked at SVOD consumers in

the United States. It found that 96% of respondents between the ages of 18-34 years old subscribed to a premium SVOD service, and about 73% of US households have at least one streaming subscription (Easton, 2020). Given its digital nature, consumers interested in adopting platforms to view SVOD content must are inclined to adopt technology. Despite the plethora of SVOD options available, consumers have increased consumption of content from these services, and are willing to subscribe to multiple services. SVOD consumption has doubled in roughly two years. Younger adults are inclined to have multiple subscriptions, particularly those who are ages 18-34 years old (Porter, 2020).

The SVOD marketplace has become hotly contested, raising barriers to entry into the market. Parrot Analytics released a report that examined 2019 Q1 SVOD consumption behavior in the United States. The SVOD marketplace is largely dominated by Netflix (63.1%), Amazon Prime Video (9.7%), Hulu (7.9%), DC Universe (5.6%), and CBS All Access (4.6%) (Parrot Analytics, 2019). Recently, Disney +, Peacock, and HBO MAX have entered into the marketplace. According to Digital TV Research (Easton, 2020), Disney + is poised to go from 17.32 million users to 47.95 million by 2025, surpassing Hulu to have the third highest amount of subscribers to its SVOD service. Peacock, which was introduced in April 2020, is poised to hit 12.3 million subscribers by 2025, placing it in the middle of the SVOD marketplace (Dixon 2020; Easton, 2020). HBO Now has roughly 10 million subscribers, and, with the help of HBO MAX, is poised to reach nearly 22 million by 2025 (Dixon, 2020, Easton 2020). The proliferation in content and instant consumer access has extended the amount of time a viewer takes to select a show to watch.Viewers usually take seven minutes to select what to watch (Hayes, 2019). Therefore, consumers may grapple with selecting content, particularly since much OTT content is culturally progressive and is geared to push artistic boundaries (Opie,

2019). Understanding how external variables may help inform consumption habits can serve as a way to help marketers fine-tune algorithms and menu carousels. This is also dependent on access to technology platforms, and willingness to use them to consume SVOD content.

RQ1: Across SVOD consumers, how do demographics, lifestyles, and personalities predict individual SVOD platform frequency consumption?

Diffusion of Innovation

Interest in viewing SVOD services relies in part in consumers' proclivities to adopt new technology. Typically, consumers who are youthful as well as high income earners are inclined to spend money and purchase new technology (Rogers, 2003). The diffusion of innovation spectrum begins with innovators, who seek to adopt the latest technology, through laggards, who are disinclined to adopt technology unless it is necessary to do so in order to keep up with daily living and cultural norms (Rogers, 2003).

Past studies have looked at how consumers adopt media platforms. Content distributors must be prudent in their dissemination of content, as the same content aired or made available on different platforms can create cannibalization of content (Shay, 2015). It is necessary to consider how consumers adopt technology to view SVOD services. However, frequent movie consumers are extraordinarily inclined to adopt technology, so much so that proclivity to adopt technology largely did not serve as a key predictor in movie genre consumption or movie platform consumption (Palomba, 2020a). A recent study by Pew Research illustrates that roughly half of US consumers own a tablet, and nearly 90% own a smartphone. As technology adoption has penetrated numerous demographic populations, it stands that owning smart devices is less unique (Pew Research, 2019). As such, this theory is not directly tested here, and instead serves as a theoretical beam in this study. Selecting a media platform is usually one of the first steps in

media selection, as other decision-influencing parameters must be also be considered for further elucidation.

Media Selection

Consumers must consider which platform to access before consuming media, but this is only one step that is considered here. As stated earlier, Rubin (2009) illustrates that program traits, consumer differences, consumer media habits and preferences as well as cognitive characteristics lead media selection. This is supported by previous literature regarding uses and gratifications theory to further examine media consumption. As stated earlier, Rubin (2009) illustrates that program traits, consumer differences, consumer media habits and preferences as well as cognitive characteristics lead media selection. While it is not directly implicated in this study, the uses and gratifications approach tracks how consumers make choices and find use from media consumption, alongside anticipated gratifications from their engagement.

Past studies focused in media selection have found that social media use, advertising tolerance, and interest in multi-tasking help inform media selection. Consumers are inclined to multi-task and interact with consumers through social television viewing. Social TV usage leads to network loyalty as well as TV program commitment (Lin, Chen, & Sung, 2018). Consumers perceive advertising avoidance to facilitate a higher quality media experience (Tefertiller, 2020). Additionally, consumers are inclined to multi-task consumption across numerous different media platforms. Migration activities are related to narrative engagement, and experienced feelings, thrills, and inspiration from engagement (Shade, Kornfield, & Oliver, 2015). Media selection is rooted in a sequence of choices, spurred in part by consumers' personal inclinations to be open to different types of content and risk tolerance (Dumaraog, 2017).

Trait Theory

Consumer personalities dictate how open consumers are to particular media genres, and to a lesser extent may predict how consumers select media platforms. This theory suggests that consumers' personalities vary to an extent, illustrating that personalities can be predictive in nature (Buss and Craik, 1983). Over a period of time, consumers may display instances of a characteristic at a high or higher than normal frequency. The variation within these internal dispositions signifies that personalities are often stable over a long period of time, as traits can help discern particular personalities (Pervin,1989). Psychographics have been used in the past to better understand what types of consumers may be more open than others to particular products and services (Solomon, 2015).

Past media studies have used personality as a key variable to predict media consumption. Personalities have been found to predict genre consumption across television and movie consumption (Palomba, 2020a; Villani 1975). Personality has been found to be more predictive than demographics in understanding television show consumption among consumers (Sandy et al., 2013). A study by Langstedt and Atkin (2013) evaluated consumers' perceived personalities against television consumption. The study found that neuroticism was predictive of viewing television to fulfill companionship as well as fulfill the need to relax. Neuroticism has been found to predict soap opera consumption, and extraversion has been found to predict reality show consumption (Shim & Paul, 2007).

Demographics

Personality traits allow us to understand how consumers may relate to consumed products and services, demographics will shed a light on how consumer backgrounds can predict consumption. Traditionally, demographics have been employed to create cluster profiles for consumers. Demographics are based around how consumers identify with groups of others as

8

well as provide context for their own lifestyles. Demographics are an important component in understanding media audiences, and provide context for them (Villani, 1975). Gender has been found to serve as a key predictor in mobile device ownership (Chan-Olmsted & Shay, 2016). Race and ethnicity have been found to be predictive of desktop and DVD player movie platform consumption (Palomba, 2020a). Age has also been found to be a key determinant for frequent movie genre consumption, including animation and superhero movies (Palomba, 2020a). Demographics are a useful metric to bring initial context to an audience-centric study, as variables such as education and income are also related to the expected lifestyles that consumers have constructed for themselves.

Lifestyles

Though not as widely used as demographic information, lifestyles offer a window into consumer lives, and vast prospects to connect with consumers. These offer unique opportunities to understand what activities consumers prize doing, and what resonates with consumers themselves. This can help inform what consumers may wish to see in their consumed SVOD content, too. Consumers who are athletes or may pride themselves as amateur painters or sculptors may migrate to content that reflects or exhibits their own lifestyles.

Previous studies have crafted and tested a wide assortment of lifestyle scales, targeting different facets of daily living. One prominent scale, values, attitudes, and lifestyles (VALS) scale, examines values, beliefs, needs and drives in daily living in the United States. This includes need-driven groups including survivors, consumers who are poor and lie on the fringes of mainstream society in the United States, through inner-directed groups including I-Am-Me, which demarcates consumers who are impulsive and young. The VALS scale is not particularly varied to capture all phases of daily living. Differently, the activities, interests, and opinions

(AIO) scale (Plummer, 1974), employs over one hundred questions to look at consumer-lifestyle, which can become a cumbersome measurement to deploy to understand consumer behavior. This study has elected to use the Green et al. (2006) scale that considers myriad lifestyle activities with far fewer indicators. The ability to track consumer lifestyles is relevant in tracking technology adoption (Rogers, 2003). Consumer lifestyles are informed in part by age, as adolescence and newly settled adults are interested in experiencing novelty (Weinberger, Zavisca, & Silva, 2017). Cultural capital is engendered from these experiences, inculcating consumers into ingratiating themselves into a range of activities that support their overall individual lifestyle mosaic.

Genres

Lifestyles are useful in understanding how consumers gravitate toward content, which may be further categorized around genres. Television marketers rely on genres to help manage consumer expectations, and to guide them to select a particular television program. Genres are one of the most crucial items for audience members in selecting movies to view (Austin & Gordon, 1987). Viewing SVOD content is a similarly passive activity, though its digital component allows for greater customization for consumers.

This organization scheme has proven fruitful to scholars to unearth what antecedent variables may predict each type of genre consumption behavior. It has been found that personality can be predictive of movie genre consumption (Palomba, 2020a). There is evidence to suggest that being identified as an extravert may predict reality television show viewing (Shim & Paul, 2007) or that male frequent movie consumers prefer adventure and superhero movies while frequent female movie consumers prefer comedy and romance (Palomba, 2020a).

RQ2: Across SVOD consumers, how do demographics, lifestyles, personalities predict individual SVOD genre frequency consumption?

Method

To measure for demographics, gender, age, sex, education, household income, and political affiliation were used here. This study relied on a set of questions from the General Social Survey (Kim, 2017; Smith et al., 2017). Gender and race/ethnicity were accounted for on categorical scales, while ordinal scales were used to measure political affiliation and education. Age was measured on an interval scale.

To measure for platform uses, consumers were asked to evaluate how often they engaged media platforms to view SVOD content. The list of platforms included laptop computers, desktop computers, smartphones, tablets, video game consoles, and smart TVs. This 6-item Likert scale ranged from 1=Never to 5=Always.

To measure for genre preferences, the Internet Movie Database (IMDB) (Guo and Chan-Olmsted, 2015) was used here. The list of genres included horror, science fiction, romance, action, comedy, thriller, drama, mystery, animation, crime, adventure, fantasy, and superhero. This 13-item Likert scale ranged from 1= Never Watch to 5= Watch All The Time.

To measure for personalities, a scale from a study by Oliver and Srivastava (1999) was employed here. This scale was used for parsimony, as other considered scales were long in nature. This scale asked consumers to consider how they perceive themselves. Some of the indicators included "I see myself as someone who is talkative," and "I see myself as someone who generates a lot of enthusiasm." This 44-item Likert scale ranged from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree.

To measure for lifestyles, a scale by Green et al. (2006) and a scale by Mitchel (1983) were used here. These two scales were used to ensure that all phases of consumer lifestyle were measured here. Several indicators included "Take vacations away from home at least once a year," and "Attend cultural events, concerts or other performing arts." This 45-item Likert scale ranged from 1=Never to 5=Always.

Data Collection

To fund this study, a CUNY research grant was secured, and the researcher applied for and secured IRB approval. A survey-pretest was performed on Amazon Mechanical Turk, relying on a non-randomized sample of one hundred United States adults (n=100). Participants understood the language in the survey, and the answers were reasonably varied across questions. A final survey was disseminated through Qualtrics to a national randomized sample of SVOD consumers. Qualtrics is a data collection firm that also secures consumer panels for survey research (Qualtrics, 2019). Qualtrics compensates participants on its own in each study. This study was interested in gaining a sample of SVOD consumers, and so consumers were required to watch SVOD programs at least once a month to participate in the study.

Results

The age break down was varied across age groups, including 18-27 years old (18.66%), 28-37 years old (28.57%), 38-47 years old (26.27%), 48-57 years old (12.44%), 58-67 years old (11.98%), and 68 years old and older (2.07%). The gender break down was roughly even between males (50.70%) and females (49.30%). The race and ethnicity breakdown included Caucasians (66.10%), Black or African-American (13.80%), Asian or Asian-American (6.00%), Hispanic or Hispanic American (18.00%), and other (2.10%). 36.10% of participants earned at least $70,000. The political affiliation of consumers varied across extremely liberal (15.00%),

liberal (16.70%), slightly liberal (14.50%), moderate (middle of the road) (28.50%), slightly

conservative (10.10%), conservative (15.20%). Finally, 43.20% of participants earned at least a

bachelor's degree.

Before multiple linear regressions were run, factor analyses were run for lifestyle and

personality variables to reduce the amount of indicators necessary to explain variance for either

variable in the data matrix. For the lifestyle factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)

measure of sampling adequacy was .969, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically

significant (p<.001). The first factor analysis, Group Activities (α=.89), scored an eigenvalue of

17.91, and explained 44.77% of the variance in the data matrix. The indicators included live

somewhere else three or more months out of the year (.78), attend religious services and church

gatherings (.75), work as a volunteer in organized youth activities, such as sports, scouts, arts

(.73), spend time at your vacation home or property, including time-shares (.73), and participate

actively in a civic club or community service organization (.72). The second factor analysis,

Leisure Purchases (α=.79), scored an eigenvalue of 2.59 and explained 6.47% of variance in the

data matrix. The indicators include eat out in restaurants including fast food, or order take-out

food at least 2 times a week (.64), purchase items online (.60), get together socially with friends

or neighbors (.59), purchase items at a mall (.57), and attend cultural events, concerts, or other

performing arts (.57). Finally, the third factor analysis, Stay Informed (α=.83), scored an

eigenvalue of 1.50 and explained 3.75% of variance within the data matrix. This included recycle

household products such as glass, paper, or plastic (.62), read magazines (.60), read newspapers

(.58), read news business or professional magazines (.56), and keep informed about the latest

consumer technology and gadgets (.47) (Table 2).

For personality, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .92, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant (p<.001). The first factor analysis, Unsocial (α=.83), scored an eigenvalue of 9.45 and explained 21.49% of variance in the data matrix. The indicators include is depressed and blue (.76), is sometimes rude to others (.73), tends to find fault with others (.71), gets nervous easily (.71), can be somewhat careless (.70). The second factor analysis, Innovative (α=.79), scored an eigenvalue of 6.99 and explained 15.89% of variance in the data matrix. The indicators include is original and comes up with new ideas (.72), is inventive (.71), has an active imagination (.66), likes to reflect play with ideas (.63), and is sophisticated in art music literature (.60). The third factor analysis, Generous (α=.75), scored an eigenvalue of 2.56 and explained 5.81% of variance in the data matrix. The indicators include is considered and kind to almost everyone (.75), is generally trusting (.62), is helpful and unselfish with others (.60), likes to cooperate with others (.56), and has a forgiving nature (.55) (Table 3).

Multiple linear regressions were run to determine key predictors for SVOD genre consumption. A multiple linear regression was run for comedy (F=3.30, p<.001). Key predictors included age (β=-.14, p<.009), and Personality Unsocial (β=.15, p<.012). A multiple linear regression was run for science fiction (F=12.13, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Stay Informed (β=.15, p<.033), Personality Unsocial (β=.13, p<.014), Personality Innovative (β=.22, p<.001), and male sex (β=-.32, p<.001). A multiple linear regression was run for horror (F=8.57, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Stay Informed (β=.22, p<.003), education (β=-.14, p<.016), age (β=-.19, p<.001), Personality Unsocial (β=.13, p<.019), and male sex (β=-.12, p<.016). A multiple linear regression was run for romance (F=11.22, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Group Activities (β=.26, p<.001), Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.14,

p<.033), Personality Unsocial (β=.15, p<.006), Personality Generous (β=.10, p<.04), and female sex (β=.25, p<.001). A multiple linear regression was run for action (F=6.42, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.24, p<.001), conservative political affiliation (β=.12, p<.014), Personality Generous (β=.15, p<.009), and male sex (β=-.19, p<.001) (Table 4).

A multiple linear regression was run for thriller (F=6.06, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Stay Informed (β=.21, p<.004), and male sex (β=-.14, p<.006). A multiple linear regression was run for sports (F=13.95, p<.001). Key indicators included Lifestyle Group Activities (β=.24, p<.001), Lifestyle Stay Informed (β=.20, p<.003), and male sex (β=-.24, p<.001). A multiple linear regression for drama (F=4.56, p<.001) was run here. Key indicator include female sex (β=.21, p<.001). A multiple linear regression for mystery (F=5.75, P<.001) was run here. Key indicators include Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.18, p<.02), Lifestyle Stay Informed (β= .18, p<.02), age (β=.13, p<.012), and Personality Innovative (β=.12, p<.001). A multiple linear regression for crime (F=3.32, p<.001) was run here. Key indicators included Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.23, p<.003) (Table 5).

A multiple linear regression for animation was run here (F=8.82, p<.001). Key predictors included age (β=-.16, p<.001), and Personality Unsocial (β=.21, p<.001). A multiple linear regression for adventure (F=7.68, p<.001) was run here. Key indicators included Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.15, p<.030), Personality Generous (β=.20, p<.001), and sex (β=-.12, p<.022). A multiple linear regression for fantasy (F=8.40, p<.001). Key indicators included Lifestyle Stay Informed (β=.15, p<.042), age (β=-.14, p<.006), Black or African American (β=.18, p<.021), Personality Unsocial (β=.16, p<.004), Personality Innovative (β=.16, p<.005), and male sex (β=-.18, p<.001). A multiple linear regression for superhero (F=7.73, p<.001) was run here. Key indicators included age (β=-.11, p<.032), Personality Unsocial (β=.12, p<.001),

Personality Innovative (β=.11, p<.050), Personality Generous (β=.15, p<.005), and male sex (β=-.23, p<.001) (Table 6).

Multiple linear regressions were run to determine key predictors for SVOD platform consumption. A multiple linear regression was run to isolate key predictors for laptop frequency consumption (F=10.51, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Group Activities (β=.20, p<.003), Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.14, p<.034), Personality Unsocial (β=.12, p<.025), Personality Innovative (β=.14, p<.014), and male sex (β=.-11, p<.027). A multiple linear regression was run to isolate key predictors for desktop computer (F=16.75, p<.001). Key predictors included lifestyle group activities (β=.31, p<.001), and male sex (β=-.16, p<.001). A multiple linear regression was run for smartphone (F=7.95, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Group Activities (β=.20, p<.005), age (β=-.14, p<.007), Personality Unsocial (β=.16, p<.004) (Table 7). A multiple linear regression was run for tablet (F=11.62, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Group Activities (β=.15, p<.027), Lifestyle Leisure Purchases (β=.16, p<.001), Lifestyle Stay Informed (β=.15, p<.027), and Personality Unsocial (β=.15, p<.004). A multiple linear regression was run for video game console (F=16.47, p<.001). Key predictors included Lifestyle Group Activities (β=.14, p<.027), age (β=-.28, p<.001), Personality Unsocial (β=.26, p<.001), male sex (β=-.09, p<.017) and Personality Generous (β= .11, p<.02). A multiple linear regression was run for Smart TV (F=4.25, p<.001). Key predictors included income (β=.19, p<.002), and not identifying as Asian-American (β=-.162, p<.017) (Table 8).

To determine how well the multiple linear regressions explained predictive power of multiple linear regressions models, coefficients of determination were tracked along demographics, lifestyles, and personalities (Table 9). Stepwise regressions were run here to understand how every additional slate of variables helped explained variation in SVOD

consumer behavior. Demographics alone were able to explain 16% of SVOD science fiction consumption and 23% of SVOD sports consumption. It was able to explain 22% of SVOD desktop computer consumption as well as 23% of SVOD video game console consumption. The addition of lifestyles explained 25% of SVOD romance consumption and 33% of SVOD romance consumption. Together, these aggregate variables were able to explain 37% of SVOD desktop computer consumption and 32% of SVOD video game console consumption. Finally, with the addition of personalities, it was possible to explain to 29% of SVOD science fiction consumption and 32% of SVOD sports consumption. Additionally, it was possible to explain 37% of SVOD desktop consumption and 36% of SVOD video game console consumption (Table 9).

While multiple linear regressions are useful to test individual dependent variables, this does not test for type one errors, or account for truly causal relationships. Structural equation modeling is remarkably useful for accounting for these issues (Hair et al., 2010). The results of the multiple linear regression were used to develop new hypotheses to test in the structural equation model. To further test the personality and lifestyle factor analyses, convergent validity was illustrated through the factor loadings and associated statistical significant as well as composite reliability and divergent validity was considered through the variance extracted to the square of the correlation (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bellini et al., 2017). Average variance explained (A.V.E.) and composite reliability (C.R.) scores were processed and examined against Cronbach's alpha scores. For the lifestyle factor loadings, Group Activities (A.V.E.=.55, C.R.=.81, α=.89) scored well, and Leisure Purchase (A.V.E.=.35, C.R.=.68, α=.79), and Stay Informed (A.V.E.=.32, C.R.=.64, α=.83) scored below .50 A.V.E. and .70 C.R. thresholds. For the personality factor loadings, Unsocial (A.V.E.=.52, C.R.=.79, α=.83) scored well, and

Innovative (A.V.E.=.44, C.R.=.74, α=.79), as well as Generous (A.V.E.=.38, C.R.=.70, α=.75) scored below .50 A.V.E. thresholds. Based on the results of the multiple linear regressions, several hypotheses are placed below to test the structural equation model (Table 10).

H1: Frequent SVOD consumers' personalities is a positive predictor of SVOD genre frequency consumption.

H2: Frequent SVOD consumers' lifestyles is a positive predictor of SVOD genre frequency consumption.

H3: Frequent SVOD consumers' demographics is a positive predictor of SVOD genre frequency consumption

H4: Frequent SOVD consumers' lifestyles is a positive predictor SVOD platform frequency consumption.

Before selecting a SVOD platform, consumers must decide to select a SVOD genre first. Additionally, particular genres may lend themselves to certain platforms, as a superhero film may be best viewed on a smart TV compared to a romance comedy that may be intimately viewed on a tablet. SVOD genre frequency consumption should be predictive of SVOD platform frequency consumption.

H5: Frequent SVOD consumers' genre frequency consumption is a positive predictor of SVOD platform frequency consumption.

The model was statistically significant, and did not precisely fit: X^2=2990.261, RMSEA=.099, CFI=.579, NFI=.531, PCFI=.524. The statistical significance here illustrates that there is a notable difference between the estimated and observed data matrices here. Although the model did not fit the data here, it is worth to note that the paths themselves were statistically significant. Personalities (β=.35, p<.001) and lifestyles (β=.17, p<.001) were predictive of SVOD

genre frequency consumption. Demographics (β=.08, p=.085) were not a positive predictor of SVOD genre frequency consumption. Lifestyles (β=.51, p<.001), and SVOD genre frequency consumption (β=.91, p<.001) were predictive of SVOD platform frequency consumption.

Discussion

This study was focused in looking at consumers' personalities, demographics, and lifestyles may predict SVOD genre frequency and SVOD platform frequency consumption. Overall, the findings illustrate that demographics, lifestyles, and personalities vary in predictive ability. The structural equation model illustrated that these relationships are strong in nature.

The findings regarding platform and genre use help further literature on diffusion of innovation (Rogers, 2003), media selection (Rubin, 2009), alongside trait theory (Pervin, 1989). Consumers who were young were inclined to view SVOD programs on smartphones, and video game consoles, supporting young adults and their penchant to adopt and use new technology (Rogers, 2003). Personality and lifestyle are useful in predicting SVOD genre consumption, as demographics and lifestyle are useful in predicting SVOD platform consumption.

The media selection put forth by Rubin (2009) was supported here, illustrating that its framework is appropriate for deep analysis into SVOD consumption. Particularly through the stepwise regressions as well as the structural equation model, it illuminates how well program traits (genres), cognitive and effective elements (personalities), media habits (platform preferences), and individual differences (lifestyles) are forerunners for media consumption. This advances this framework to better understand how media consumption can be anticipated and predicted by carefully laid out measurements.

Consumer personalities were useful in predicting SVOD genre consumption, but less so SVOD platform consumption. Consumers who were identified as unsocial were inclined to

consume SVOD comedy, science fiction, horror, animation, fantasy, and superhero SVOD genre content. Consumers who were identified as innovative were inclined to view science fiction as well as mystery. Finally, generous personalities were inclined to view adventure and superhero genres. This illustrates that consumers perceptions of themselves can be key predictors of SVOD genre consumption. The identified personality groups suggest that being unsocial may induce consumers to view movies that provide an escape from reality. Those identified as innovators may seek out novel storylines or other content that requires sharp focus and a critical audience lens. Generous personalities may seek opportunities to help others through character actions, and protagonists are often implicated in these matters across adventure and superhero genres. Regarding platforms, consumers identified as unsocial were inclined to view SVOD content on laptop computers and smartphones, while generous consumers were inclined to view on video game consoles. Laptops and smartphones are singular devices in nature, and are meant for individual engagement. This allows consumers to ensconced themselves Video game consoles allow for connecting with others as well as simultaneous engagement with multiple players in a room. This lends the device to being a group touchstone.

Consumer lifestyles were predictive of genre consumption, but even more predictive of platform consumption. Consumers who were active in group activities consumed sports SVOD genre and consumers identified as engaged in staying informed were inclined to consume thriller, sports, fantasy, and mystery SVOD genres. Consumers who made leisurely purchases were inclined to consume mystery, crime, and adventure genres. Consumers engaged in group activities were inclined to engage with laptops, desktops, and smartphones as well as tablets and video game consoles. Consumers who made leisure purchases were inclined to watch SVOD content on laptops as well as tablets. Consumers who were eager to stay informed were inclined

to view SVOD content on tablets. Tablets allow for much multi-tasking, and media consumption beyond SVOD content, including print news, podcasts, and radio. Laptops and tablets are efficient and easy to access. While tablets are an additional expense to consumers, some laptops are more expensive than average smart TVs and smartphones (Apple MacBook Pro, 2020; Best Buy Flat Screen TVs, 2020).

Consumer demographics were predictive of SVOD genre consumption and SVOD platform consumption. Younger consumers were inclined to view horror, animation, fantasy, comedy and superhero SVOD content and older consumers were inclined to view mystery SVOD content. Males were inclined to view science fiction, horror, action, adventure, thriller, sports, fantasy, and superhero as females were inclined to view romance and drama. Conservatives were inclined to view action SVOD content. For SVOD platform consumption, younger consumers were inclined to view SVOD content on smartphones and video game consoles. Males were inclined to view SVOD content on laptop computers, desktop computers, and video game consoles. Asian-Americans were less inclined to view SVOD content on smart TVs, though those earning higher incomes were inclined to do so. The gender split across different SVOD genres was reflective of results from Palomba (2020a). Youthful consumers were more inclined to adopt different types of technology more than older consumers (Rogers, 2003). Asian-Americans disinclination to view SVOD content on smart TVs may be explained through their interest to streaming content on other devices. YouTube has served as a destination for many Asian-Americans who are bilingual and seek out culturally relevant content on YouTube (Umstead, 2018). Though YouTube consumers are increasingly viewing YouTube on smart TV screens, 70% of YouTube watch time takes place on mobile devices (Spangler, 2019).

The structural equation model did not fit the data, but four out of the five paths were found to be statistically significant. Notably, demographics was not a key predictor for SVOD platform consumption. SVOD services are ubiquitous, as are platforms that are capable of accessing SVOD content. Since these services are either based on subscriptions, ad-supported models that allow for free viewing, or transaction-based charging consumers based on content viewed at a time, these services are democratized for all to consume. Compared to Palomba (2020a) which looked at frequent movie consumer consumption across genres and platforms, the SVOD business does not incorporate a window or delayed exhibition business strategy. Therefore, using metrics beyond traditional demographic information is clearly useful for practitioners and academics to consider here.

Practical Implications

This study was meant to help illuminate how demographics, personalities, and lifestyles may explicate unexplained variance that is available to SVOD executives. While the entertainment form is explicitly digital in nature, creating opportunities to capture digital consumer touchpoints to predict appeal of performance art and information, there is clearly available variance that is currently not captured by SVOD membership accounts. Similar models may be construed to understand consumer trends and consumption behaviors, but to also predict what consumers may like, rather than basing it around what consumers' SVOD consumption histories. Consumers' emotional proclivities dictate consumption behavior more so than rational thinking (Lindstrom, 2010). This is linked to numerous activities that consumers engage in, as these satiate particular emotional needs. Harnessing consumers' living states through lifestyles and perceived personality traits are invaluable measurements. In profitable fashion, media managers may use this framework to understand on a microscopic and macroscopic level how

these variables may predict SVOD consumption behavior. There may be alternative indices

available to incorporate different classifications of genres or platforms, too. Content creation

may be directed toward consumer lifestyles and perceived personalities, steeping select cadres of

consumers in niche programs. If consumers find content that resonates with them on deeper

levels, they may be less inclined to leave SVOD services.

Limitations

There were several limitations in this study. The structural equation model did not fit the

data, disallowing it to serve as a generalized model. This study relied on a sample of participants

who viewed SVOD programs at least once a month. Moreover, this study relied on survey data,

which is based on participant evaluation. While the measurements proved to be predictive, they

were reliant on consumers' perceptions of themselves, which is subjective in nature.

Future Research Directions

Future studies should examine why personalities and lifestyles are greater predictors of

SVOD consumption than demographic information. As these services are consumed by

numerous types of consumers, further investigation into why personalities and lifestyles can

unlock what types of SVOD genre and SVOD platforms consumers engage in can be used to

predict what types of content will resonate with consumers. Additionally, content analyzing and

securing Netflix recommendations against consumer lifestyles and personalities would provide

further illumination as to how strong Netflix recommendations are in predicting satisfaction with

content. Since Netflix does not appear to collect personalities-based or lifestyles-based

information, but makes recommendations based on consumer consumption, media audience

consumption literature would be advanced here. Harvesting consumer Netflix or Hulu histories,

in a digital ethnographic context, can help merge actual consumer data with reported consumer

data, raising necessary inquisitions into whether both data sets together can increase predictive

aptitude toward SVOD consumer behavior.

References

Anderson, J., & Gerbing, D. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and
recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*(3), 411-423.

Apple. (2020, July 7). MacBook Pro. In *Apple*. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from
https://www.apple.com/shop/buy-mac/macbook-pro/16-inch

Austin, B., & Gordon, T. (1987). Movie genres: Toward a conceptualized model and
standardized definition (Vol. 3). , *Current research in film: Audiences, economics, and
law*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Bellini, S., Cardinali, M., & Grandi, B. (2017). A structural equation model of impulse buying
behaviour in grocery retailing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *36*, 164-171.

Best Buy. (2020, July 7). Flat-Screen TVs. In *Best Buy*. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from
https://www.bestbuy.com/site/tvs/all-flat-screen-tvs/abcat0101001.c?id=abcat0101001

Buss, D., & Craik, K. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological
Review*, *90*(2), 105-126.

Chan-Olmsted, S., & Shay, R. (2016, January). Understanding tablet consumers: Exploring the
factors that affect tablet and dual mobile device ownership. *Journalism & Mass
Communication Quarterly*, *93*(4), 857-883.

Dixon, C. (2020, March 2). 'Originals' image keeps Netflix tops through 2025 in the U.S.
In *NScreenMedia*. Retrieved June 25, 2020, from https://nscreenmedia.com/netflix-
originals-keeps-it-tops/

Dumaraog, A. (2017, May 31). Netflix CEO pushing creative team to 'Take more risks'.
In *ScreenRant*. Retrieved June 25, 2020, from https://screenrant.com/netflix-original-tv-
movies-risks/

Easton, J. (2020, February 12). Majority of consumers happy to pay for more SVOD services,
says Nielsen. In *Digital TV*. Retrieved June 11, 2020, from
https://www.digitaltveurope.com/2020/02/12/majority-of-consumers-happy-to-pay-for-
more-svod-services-says-nielsen/

Green, G., Cordell, H., Betz, C., & DiStefano, C. (2006). Construction and validation of the
national survey on recreation and the environment's lifestyles scale. *Journal of Leisure
Research*, *38*(4), 513-535.

Gruenwedel, E. (2020, June 15). Report: Daily SVOD consumption tops 1 hour . In *Media Play
News*. Retrieved June 16, 2020, from https://www.mediaplaynews.com/report-daily-
svod-consumption-tops-1-hour/

Guo, M., & Chan-Olmsted, S. (2015). Predictors of social television viewing: How perceived
program, media, and audience characteristics affect social engagement with television
programming. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *59*(2), 240-258.

Hayes, D. (2019, July 1). Streaming overload? Nielsen report finds average viewer takes 7 minutes to pick what to watch; just one-third bother to check menu. In *Deadline*. Retrieved June 25, 2020, from https://deadline.com/2019/07/streaming-overload-netflix-nielsen-report-average-viewer-takes-7-minutes-to-pick-what-to-watch-1202640213/

HBO Max. (2020). Home Page. In *HBO Max*. Retrieved June 19, 2020, from https://play.hbomax.com/page/urn:hbo:page:home

Hulu. (2020). Home Page. In *Hulu*. Retrieved June 19, 2020, from https://signup.hulu.com/plans

Kantar. (2020). Netflix: Leading or misleading the cultural conversation?. In *Kantar*. Retrieved June 25, 2020, from https://consulting.kantar.com/growth-hub/netflix-leading-or-misleading-the-cultural-conversation/

Kim, D. (2017). Demographic differences in perceptions of media brand personality: A multilevel analysis. *The International Journal on Media Management*, *19*(3), 197-221.

Langstedt, E., & Atkin, D. (2013). An examination of personality traits and television viewing motives using patterns of interrelation and quadratic analysis. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, *21*, 278-293.

Lin, J., Chen, K., & Sung, Y. (2018). Understanding the nature, uses, and gratifications of social television: Implications for developing viewer engagement and network loyalty. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *62*(1), 1-20.

Mitchell, A. (1983). *The Nine American Lifestyles*. New York, NY: Warner Books.

Netflix. (2020). Home Page. In *Netflix*. Retrieved June 19, 2020, from https://www.netflix.com/

Oliver, J., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 102-138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Opie, D. (2019, April 18). Why Netflix is leading the way when it comes to LGBTQ+ representation on TV: how the streaming service is besting its rivals. In *Digital Spy*. Retrieved June 25, 2020, from https://www.digitalspy.com/tv/ustv/a27194507/netflix-lgbtq-shows/

Palomba, A. (2016). Brand personalities of video game consoles. *American Communication Journal*, *18*(1), 63-82.

Palomba, A. (2018). Virtual perceived emotional intelligence: How high brand loyalty video game players evaluate their own video game play experiences to repair or regulate emotions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *85*, 34-42.

Palomba, A. (2019). Digital seasons: How time of year may shift video game play habits. *Entertainment Computing*, *30*, 1-18.

Palomba, A. (2020a). Consumer personality and lifestyles at the box office and beyond: How demographics, lifestyles and personalities predict movie consumption. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *55*, 1-14.

Palomba, A. (2020b). How high brand loyalty consumers achieve relationships with virtual worlds and its elements through presence. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 1-18.

Pew Research Center. (2019, June 12). Mobile Fact Sheet. In *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved June 22, 2020, from https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/mobile/

Plummer, J. (1974). The concept and application of lifestyle segmentation. *Journal of Marketing*, *38*(1), 33-37.

Qualtrics. (2019). Qualtrics Panel Book. In *Qualtrics*. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://www.jjay.cuny.edu/sites/default/files/contentgroups/psychology/Qualtrics%20Information%20Guide.pdf

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovation* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Rubin, A. (2009). Uses and gratifications: An evolving perspective of media effects. In R. Nabi & M. Oliver (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of media processes and effects* (pp. 147-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shade, D., Kornfield, S., & Oliver, M. (2015). The uses and gratifications of media migration: Investigating the activities, motivations, and predictors of migration behaviors originating in entertainment television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *59*(2), 318-341.

Shay, R. (2015). Windowed distribution strategies for substitute television content: An audience-centric typology. *The International Journal on Media Management*, *17*(3), 175-193.

Shim, J., & Paul, B. (2007, January). Effects of personality types on the use of television genre. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *51*(2), 287-304.

Smith, A. (2017, January 12). Record shares of Americans now own smartphones, have home broadband. In *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved January 12, 2017, from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/01/12/evolution-of-technology/

Smith, T., Hout, M., & Marsden, P. (2017). *General social survey, 1972-2016 [Cumulative File]* (11th ed., pp. 11-14). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [Distributor], National Opinion Research Center [Distributor].

Solomon, M. (2015). *Consumer Behavior* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Spangler, T. (2019, May 3). YouTube now has 2 billion monthly users, who watch 250 million hours on TV screens daily. In *Variety*. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://variety.com/2019/digital/news/youtube-2-billion-users-tv-screen-watch-time-hours-1203204267/

Tefertiller, A. (2020). Cable cord-cutting and streaming adoption: Advertising avoidance and technology acceptance in television innovation. *Telematics and Informatics*, *51*, 1-9.

Umstead, R. (2018, December 10). Horowitz: Asian-Americans spend more time streaming content than watching live TV. In *Multi Channel*. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://www.multichannel.com/blog/asian-americans-spend-more-time-streaming-content-than-watching-live-tv

Villani, K. (1975). Personality/lifestyle and television viewing behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *12*(4), 432-439.

Weinberger, M., Zavisca, J., & Silva, J. (2017, January). Consuming for an imagined future: Middle-class consumer lifestyle and exploratory experiences in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *44*(1), 332-360.

Table 1.
Participant Demographics.

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Gender			
Male	220	50.70	50.70
Female	214	49.30	100.00
Age			
18-27	81	18.66	
28-37	124	28.57	47.23
38-47	114	26.27	73.50
48-57	54	12.44	85.94
58-67	52	11.98	97.92
68+	9	2.07	100.00
Education			
Less than high school graduate	7	1.60	
High school graduate	101	23.30	24.90
Some college but no degree	85	19.60	44.50
Associate degree in college (2-year)	53	12.20	56.70
Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)	99	22.80	79.50
Master's degree	70	16.10	95.60
Doctoral degree	8	1.80	97.50
Professional degree (JD, MD)	11	2.50	100.00
Household Income			
Less than $10,000	32	7.40	
$10,000 to $19,999	50	11.50	18.90
$20,000 to $29,999	49	11.30	30.20
$30,000 to $39,999	47	10.80	41.00
$40,000 to $49,999	34	7.80	48.80
$50,000 to $59,999	37	8.50	57.40
$60,000 to $69,999	29	6.70	64.10
$70,000 to $79,999	22	5.10	69.10
$80,000 to $89,999	20	4.60	73.70
$90,000 to $99,999	25	5.80	79.50
$100,000 to $149,999	51	11.80	91.20
$150,000 or more	38	8.80	100.00
Ethnicity			
Caucasian	147	66.10	
African-American	60	13.80	79.90
Hispanic-American	78	18.00	97.90
Asian-American	26	6.00	103.90
Mixed/Other	9	2.10	106.00
Political Identity			
Extremely liberal	61	15.00	
Liberal	68	16.70	31.70

Slightly liberal	59	14.50	46.20
Moderate, middle of the road	116	28.50	74.70
Slightly conservative	41	10.10	84.80
Conservative	62	15.20	100.00

Table 2. Factor Analysis of Consumer Lifestyles.

Factor	1	2	3
Group Activities (α=.89)			
Live somewhere else three or more months out of the year	0.78		
Attend religious services and church gatherings	0.75		
Work as a volunteer in organized youth activities, such as sports, scouts, arts	0.73		
Spend time at your vacation home or property, including time-shares	0.73		
Participate actively in a civic club or community service organization	0.72		
Leisure Purchases (α=.79)			
Eat out in restaurants including fast food, or order take-out food at least 2 times a week		0.64	
Purchase items online		0.60	
Get together socially with friends or neighbors		0.59	
Purchase items at a mall		0.57	
Attend cultural events, concerts, or other performing arts		0.57	
Stay Informed (α=.83)			
Recycle household products such as glass, paper, or plastic			0.62
Read magazines			0.60
Read newspapers			0.58
Read news business or professional magazines			0.56
Keep informed about the latest consumer technology and gadgets			0.47

Table 3. Factor Analysis of Consumer Personalities.

Factor	1	2	3
Unsocial (α=.83)			
Is depressed, blue	0.76		
Is sometimes rude to others	0.73		

Tends to find fault with others	0.71				
Gets nervous easily	0.71				
Can be somewhat careless	0.70				
Innovative (α=.79)					
Is original, comes up with new ideas		0.72			
Is inventive		0.71			
Has an active imagination		0.66			
Likes to reflect, play with ideas		0.63			
Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature		0.60			
Generous (α=.75)					
Is considerate and kind to almost everyone			0.75		
Is generally trusting			0.62		
Is helpful and unselfish with others			0.60		
Likes to cooperate with others			0.56		
Has a forgiving nature			0.55		

Table 4. Impact of demographics, lifestyles, and personalities on comedy, science fiction, horror, romance, and action SVOD genres.

	Comedy	Science Fiction	Horror	Romance	Action

	Thriller		Sports		Drama		Mystery		Crime	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Caucasian	-.10	.23	.07	.25	-.08	.31	.07	.25	-.02	.24
African-American	-.05	.26	.10	.28	-.001	.34	.01	.27	.14	.26
Asian or Asian-American	-.05	.31	.04	.33	-.04	.40	.03	.32	.04	.31
Hispanic or Hispanic-American	.01	.22	.06	.23	.04	.28	.06	.23	.11	.22
Income	.11	.02	-.06	.02	.05	.02	.06	.02	-.07	.02
Political Affiliation	-.01	.03	-.02	.04	-.03	.04	-.02	.04	.12*	.03
Education	-.05	.04	.02	.04	-.14*	.05	.05	.04	-.01	.04
Age	-.14**	.00	-.01	.01	-.19***	.01	.03	.01	.04	.004
Sex	.06	.11	-.32***	.12	-.12*	.15	.25***	.12	-.19***	.12
Lifestyle Group Activities	-.09	.07	-.06	.07	-.05	.09	.26***	.07	-.02	.07
Lifestyle Leisure Purchases	.11	.09	.07	.10	.08	.12	.14*	.09	.24***	.09
Lifestyle Stay Informed	.06	.08	.15*	.09	.22**	.10	.07	.08	.05	.08
Personality Unsocial	.15*	.06	.13*	.07	.13*	.08	.15**	.07	.06	.06
Personality Innovative	.04	.08	.22***	.09	.11	.11	.02	.09	.03	.08
Personality Generous	.10	.09	.08	.09	.01	.11	.10*	.09	.15**	.09
F	3.30		12.13		8.57		11.22		6.42	
R	.34		.56		.50		.55		.45	
R²	.08		.29		.22		.27		.17	
Sig. of Model	p<.001		p<.001		p<.001		p<.001		p<.001	

*=p<.05
**=p<.01
***=p<.001

Table 5. Impact of demographics, lifestyles, and personalities on thriller, sports, drama, mystery, and crime SVOD genres.

	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Caucasian	-.05	.27	.02	.29	.14	.24	-.08	.24	-.01	.25
African-American	.10	.30	.06	.32	.16	.26	.04	.26	.04	.28
Asian or Asian-American	-.09	.35	.03	.38	.004	.31	-.05	.31	-.08	.33
Hispanic or Hispanic-American	.04	.25	.12	.27	.12	.22	.04	.22	.09	.23
Income	.02	.02	.05	.02	.04	.02	.02	.02	.03	.02
Political Affiliation	.05	.04	-.05	.04	-.02	.03	.06	.03	-.02	.04
Education	-.05	.05	.05	.05	.03	.04	-.05	.04	-.02	.04
Age	.03	.01	-.04	.01	.04	.004	.13*	.004	.03	.01
Sex	-.14**	.13	-.24***	.14	.21***	.12	.02	.12	.04	.12
Lifestyle Group Activities	-.08	.08	.24***	.08	.03	.07	.01	.07	-.07	.07
Lifestyle Leisure Purchases	.13	.10	-.09	.11	.10	.09	.18*	.09	.23**	.10
Lifestyle Stay Informed	.21**	.09	.20**	.10	.13	.08	.18*	.08	.03	.08
Personality Unsocial	.07	.07	.07	.078	.01	.06	.02	.06	.08	.07
Personality Innovative	.07	.09	-.04	.10	.07	.08	.12*	.08	.05	.09
Personality Generous	.09	.10	.01	.11	.10	.09	.04	.09	.10	.09
F	6.06		13.95		4.56		5.75		3.32	
R	.43		.59		.39		.43		.34	
R²	.16		.32		.12		.15		.08	
Sig. of Model	p<.001		p<.001		p<.001		p<.001		p<.001	

*=p<.05
**=p<.01
***=p<.001

Table 6. Impact of demographics, lifestyles, and personalities on animation, adventure, fantasy, and superhero SVOD genres.

	Animation		Adventure		Fantasy		Superhero	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.

Caucasian	.05	.27	-.08	.22	.14	.26	.08	.28
African-American	.11	.301	.05	.24	.18*	.29	.10	.31
Asian or Asian-American	.03	.357	-.06	.29	.04	.34	.05	.36
Hispanic or Hispanic-American	.12	.25	.09	.20	.06	.24	.13	.26
Income	-.06	.021	-.06	.02	-.06	.02	-.01	.02
Political Affiliation	.03	.038	.06	.03	.02	.04	-.001	.04
Education	.08	.045	-.09	.04	-.02	.04	-.06	.05
Age	-.16***	.005	.03	.004	-.14**	.01	-.11*	.01
Sex	-.05	.133	-.12*	.11	-.18***	.13	-.23***	.14
Lifestyle Group Activities	.07	.076	.03	.06	-.04	.07	-.02	.08
Lifestyle Leisure Purchases	.08	.104	.15*	.08	.05	.10	.04	.11
Lifestyle Stay Informed	.13	.09	.13	.07	.15*	.09	.06	.09
Personality Unsocial	.21***	.072	.05	.06	.16**	.07	.20***	.07
Personality Innovative	.002	.095	.10	.08	.16**	.09	.11*	.10
Personality Generous	.08	.099	.20***	.08	.10	.09	.15**	.10
F	8.82		7.68		8.40		7.73	
R	.50		.48		.49		.48	
R²	.22		.20		.22		.20	
Sig. of Model	p<.001		p<.001		p<.001		p<.001	

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

***=p<.001

Table 7. Impact of demographics, lifestyles, and personalities on laptop computers, desktop computers, and smartphones as SVOD platforms.

	Laptop computer	Desktop computer	Smartphone

	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Caucasian	-.12	.29	.08	.28	-.13	.30
African-American	-.05	.32	.11	.31	-.06	.34
Asian or Asian-American	-.078	.38	-.01	.37	.03	.40
Hispanic or Hispanic-American	-.02	.27	.09	.26	-.01	.28
Income	-.003	.02	-.01	.02	.04	.02
Political Affiliation	-.002	.04	-.05	.04	-.03	.04
Education	.06	.05	.09	.05	-.09	.05
Age	-.06	.01	-.07	.01	-.14**	.01
Sex	-.11*	.14	-.16***	.14	-.01	.15
Lifestyle Group Activities	.20**	.08	.31***	.08	.20**	.09
Lifestyle Leisure Purchases	.14*	.11	.07	.19	.12	.12
Lifestyle Stay Informed	-.01	.10	.10	.09	.01	.10
Personality Unsocial	.12*	.08	.04	.08	.16**	.08
Personality Innovative	.14*	.10	.04	.10	.004	.11
Personality Generous	-.09	.11	.01	.10	-.02	.11
F	10.51		16.75		7.95	
R	.54		.63		.48	
R²	.26		.37		.20	
Sig. of Model	p<.001		p<.001		p<.001	

*=p<.05
**=p<.01
***=p<.001

Table 8. Impact of demographics, lifestyles, and personalities on tablets, video game consoles, and smart TVs as SVOD platforms.

	Tablet		Video game console		Smart TV	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Caucasian	.08	.29	.01	.29	-.11	.33
African-American	.07	.32	.04	.33	-.03	.37
Asian or Asian-American	.07	.38	-.03	.39	-.16*	.44
Hispanic or Hispanic-American	.12	.27	-.01	.27	.01	.31
Income	-.03	.02	.07	.02	.19**	.03
Political Affiliation	-.03	.04	-.06	.04	.004	.05
Education	.001	.05	-.07	.05	-.01	.06
Age	-.06	.01	-.28***	.01	-.004	.01
Sex	-.05	.14	-.09*	.14	.06	.16
Lifestyle Group Activities	.15*	.08	.14*	.08	-.02	.09
Lifestyle Leisure Purchases	.16*	.11	.07	.11	.14	.13
Lifestyle Stay Informed	.15*	.10	.09	.10	.01	.11
Personality Unsocial	.15**	.08	.26***	.08	.10	.09
Personality Innovative	.03	.10	-.09	.10	.07	.12
Personality Generous	.05	.11	.11*	.11	.05	.12
F	11.62		16.47		4.25	
R	.56		.62		.37	
R²	.28		.36		.11	
Sig. of Model	p<.001		p<.001		p<.001	

*=p<.05
**=p<.01
***=p<.001

Table 9. Coefficients of determination for SVOD genre and SVOD platform.

	R² - Demographics	R² - Demographics + Lifestyles	R² - Demographics + Lifestyles + Personalities
Genre			
Comedy (Freq.)	.04**	.06***	.08***
Science Fiction (Freq.)	.16***	.23***	.29***
Horror (Freq.)	.13***	.20***	.21***
Romance (Freq.)	.07***	.25***	.27***
Action (Freq.)	.07***	.15***	.17***
Thriller (Freq.)	.06***	.14***	.16***
Sports (Freq.)	.23***	.33***	.32***
Drama (Freq.)	.04**	.10***	.12***
Mystery (Freq.)	.02	.14***	.15***
Crime (Freq.)	.01	.07***	.08***
Animation (Freq.)	.12***	.20***	.22***
Adventure (Freq.)	.04**	.15***	.20***
Fantasy (Freq.)	.11***	.16***	.22***
Superhero (Freq.)	.11***	.13***	.20***
Platform			
Laptop Computer (Freq.)	.14***	.24***	.26***
Desktop Computer (Freq.)	.22***	.37***	.37***
Smartphone (Freq.)	.10***	.19***	.20***
Tablet (Freq.)	.10***	.27***	.28***
Video Game Console (Freq.)	.23***	.32***	.36***
Smart TV (Freq.)	.07***	.10***	.11***

*=p<.05
**=p<.01
***=p<.001

Table 10

Pathway results of SEM.

Path			Coefficients	S.E.	C.R.	p-value	Hypothesis Supported/ Not Supported
Personalities	→	SVOD Genres	.35	.07	4.743	p<.001	Supported
Lifestyles	→	SVOD Genres	.17	.03	5.613	P<.001	Supported
Demographics	→	SVOD Genres	.08	.05	1.722	.085	Not supported
SVOD Genres	→	SVOD Platforms	.91	.19	4.867	p<.001	Supported
Lifestyles	→	SVOD Platforms	.51	..05	10.034	P<.001	Supported