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ABSTRACT

Technology is enhancing our amateur culture, which may provide counter-stereotype depictions. The present study reexamined the continuum model of impression formation by investigating how the mechanism of an amateur technology platform interacts with the depiction of amateur content created by social minority members to redirect people’s cognitive process of impression formation of minority members in the online amateur setting. More specifically, conducting a 2 × 2 (Stereotype Depiction) × 2 (Platform) experiment, this study looked at whether amateur platform YouTube encouraged people to go beyond stereotyping to form an counter-stereotypic impression of the mediated transgender person featured in the amateur content. Moreover, it examined whether the outcome of the impression formation would be transformed into attitudes toward the featured transgender person and transgender people as a whole. Furthermore, this study explored the psychological responses that caused the transformation from impression to attitudes in the impression formation process in the digital amateur phenomenon, integrating the theoretical framework of elevation.

The findings revealed that the counter-stereotypic depiction in amateur content would encourage people’s counter-stereotypic labeling individuation. Regardless of stereotype depiction, the amateur platform encouraged information seeking individuation. However, the consequent increased information seeking individuation might lead to less positive attitudes towards both the featured transgender person and transgender people as a whole. For attitudes towards the featured person, the regular platform and counter-stereotypic depiction optimized the viewers’ counter-stereotyping outcome. Aligned with platform’s influence on attitudes towards transgender people, the regular platform elicited significantly higher levels of elevation responses (i.e. affective responses, physical responses, motivational responses).
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Surrounded by endless encounters, individuals constantly process existing knowledge and incoming information to form impressions of other individuals (Fiske, Neuberg, Beattie, & Milberg, 1987). Inconsistency between the preexisting and incoming information is a trigger to encourage people to revise their initial stereotypical perceptions of the others. The result of this revision either confirms or reshapes one’s attitudes towards others from cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects (Fiske, 2004; Sanders, 2010). The impression formation of mediated characters shares a similar pattern, regardless of whether the characters are fictional or non-fictional, such as musicians, news anchors, and journalists (Sanders, 2010). More profoundly, both interpersonal contact and mediated contact with outgroup members can result in changes in attitudes toward social groups as a whole (Allport, 1954; Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2005).

While the increasing inclusion of social minority characters in media productions and accessible technology increase individuals’ chances to encounter outgroup members, there are still obstacles to such mediated contact. Psychologically, people’s tendency for selective exposure reinforces pre-existing views through avoiding contradictory information (Frey, 1986). Physically, the amount of effort it takes to look for and to process outgroup media materials keeps individuals from interacting with outgroup characters and further digest information about individual attributes (Zillmann & Bryant, 1985; Frey, 1986). Most importantly, social minority characters in mass media oftentimes are scripted based on stereotypes that are under the normative social influence, which reflect how the majority perceive the world (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2005; Nolan, Schultz, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Griskevicius, 2008; Dhaenens, 2012).

YouTube, the online video sharing platform, and its recommendation mechanism have brought considerable public attention to various minority social groups in an amateur form that
challenges the normative social narrative. This amateurism on YouTube cultivates a "new folk culture" that prompts "a wider practice of active personal engagement in the telling and retelling of basic cultural themes," and offers “new avenues for freedom" (Benkler, 2008, pp. 299-300). In light of these new avenues, social minority group members are able to express themselves as they are, which becomes a strategy of resistance to the stereotype and preexisting mind-set that the majority construct (Dhaenens, 2012). As a result, it might create more inconsistency of the preexisting and incoming representations of social minority groups among outgroup audiences.

With its aggregation mechanism of recommendation, YouTube is able to present additional related content. Decreasing the effort it takes for audiences to look for extra information and attributes to confirm or individuate their impression of a certain member from a social minority group. Also, the raw expression of amateur videos from social minority groups might qualify YouTube amateur videos by minority group members as meaningful media that trigger elevation for viewers (Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012). Therefore, mediated contact with a specific minority member on YouTube might further reshape audiences’ attitudes towards the minority social group that the mediated person represents. In sum, amateur content and the aggregation mechanism on YouTube might influence the process of impression formation.

If these aforementioned theoretical assumptions on YouTube reshaping impression formation exist, the impact will be global. In the aspect of audiences, YouTube reaches more US adults ages 18-34 than any cable network and attracts more than 1 billion unique users each month (YouTube, 2014). In the aspect of content, 100 hours of video are uploaded to YouTube every minute by members from different social groups all around the world (YouTube, 2014). Thus, the variety of content, the viewership and the mechanism of YouTube might work together to change people’s impressions of marginalized groups.
Among all the social minority groups, transgender individuals made it to national headlines multiple times in both 2013 because of YouTube. Following WikiLeaks leaker Manning’s coming out as a transgender female, California male-to-female transgender teen YouTuber Campbell made history through winning high school homecoming queen (Blake & Tate, 2013). Moreover, New Yorker’s A Reporter at Large featured a long form investigation on another 16 year-old female-to-male transgender person, YouTuber Skylar (Talbot, 2013). In early 2014, Facebook added 56 gender preferences into its gender options (Griggs, 2014). These phenomena reflect the entanglement of amateurism and new technology in relations to impression formation, intergroup relationships and social transitions. However, transgender people remain one of the most underrepresented, misrepresented and stereotyped social groups (Talbot, 2013; Griggs, 2014; Ryan, 2009).

The present study examined how amateur platform, YouTube, interacts with the stereotype depictions (i.e. stereotyping, counter-stereotyping) in social minority members’ amateur content to influence people’s impression formation process. More specifically, this study looked at how amateur content created directly by transgender people would work with YouTube platform to encourage people to form impression of transgender people based on attributes rather than stereotypes. Secondly, the study examined whether amateur videos and its raw expression can serve as meaningful media and facilitate elevation for viewers. Lastly, the study will further examine whether the impression formed for the social minority group member featured in the amateur video(s) be generalized as one’s attitudes towards the social minority group as a whole. In a word, the present study made theoretical contribution not only through adding technology platform and content as factors in the continuum model of impression formation, but also through testing the media effects of amateur content on stereotyping.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Impression Formation and Stereotype: From Interpersonal to Mediated Contact

The Continuum Model suggests that impression formation is a cognitive process involving processing preexisting and incoming information to form a comprehension of another individual (Fiske, Neuberg, Beattie, & Milberg, 1987). This process transpires between two parties—the perceiver and the target, and can be roughly divided into two kinds of processes—category-based (categorization) and attribute-based (individuation) processes.

Starting with immediately categorizing the target person and situation according to stereotypical social labels, how much the target fits the initial categorization and how relevant the target is to the perceiver will drive the process of impression formation. If the target is relevant to the perceiver, but the information attached to this particular target is incongruent with the initial category label accessed, it will motivate the perceiver to pay more attention to the target’s attributes to re-confirm his or her existing belief or re-categorize the target in another existing sub-category. If the inconsistency persists, the perceiver will move from the category-based process on to the individuating process. Through individuation, the perceiver will assess the target as a unique existence in a “piecemeal, attribute-by-attribute fashion” (Anderson, 1974; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999, p. 238). Throughout the whole process, the perceiver makes an explicit or implicit decision on whether to express “the cognitions, affect, and behavior associated with the impressions resulting from the process along the continuum” (Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999, pp. 231-254). As a result, the impression formed about the target individual will either stay stereotypic, turn counter-stereotypic, or rest somewhere in between.

For instance, if an individual (the perceiver) encounter a man (the target) in a Republican gathering, he/she immediately and initially form impression of this Republican through
categorizing him into the categories of Republican and attach all the existing stereotypic attributes of Republican to him (e.g. pro-life, conservative, opposing same-sex marriage, religious, etc.). This is the category-based process, the early stage of impression formation. But the perceiver may overhear this Republican’s conversation with a journalist in which he states that he actually supports same-sex marriage. This information is inconsistent from the Republican label/category. He found this Republican was not incongruent with his initial category, motivating the perceiver to seek more information about this particular Republican and form an impression based on the target’s individual characters. The perceiver moves from category-based categorization process to attribute-based individuation process.

Attention, motivations, and perceived trustworthiness serve as moderators for the transition from category-based process to attribute-based ones (Fiske, Neuberg, Beattie, & Milberg, 1987). Fiske et al. (1987) found that attention to the attribute information was correlated with the likelihood of individuation while such correlation did not exist for attention to category. Some scholars strengthened this finding through including other factors that influenced attention in their studies. Time pressure, arousal created by exercise, environmental noise, and anxiety were found to interfere with individuating and encourage stereotyping (Kaplan, Wanshla, & Zanna, 1993; Kim & Baron, 1988; Kruglanski & Webster, 1991; Wilder & Shapiro, 1989a; Wilder & Shapiro, 1989b). Moreover, Slepian et al. (2012) found that trustworthiness presentation of the target and the consequent perceived trustworthiness/credibility positively moderated the individuation and body reaction in impression formation.

The outcome of impression formation is a multidimensional evaluation of other individuals. The core dimensions that navigate judgment are agency versus communion (Abele, 2003; Bakan, 1966), warmth versus competence (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Fiske, Cuddy,
Glick, & Xu, 2002), and socially versus intellectually good–bad (Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968). Among them, studies showed that “warmth and competence are core dimensions on which perceivers judge others and that warmth has a primary role at various phases of impression formation” (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Brambilla, Sacchi, Rusconi, Cherubini, & Yzerbyt, 2012, p. 149).

When it comes to impression formation in the online setting, researchers have found social cues matters. Carr, Vitak, and McLaughlin (2013) examined how people of ingroup members perceived individuals belonging to various outgroups through a 2 (high cues vs. low cues) × 3 (ingroup, moderate outgroup, extreme outgroup affiliation) experiment. This study found that ingroup members with stronger social cues are more socially identifiable than ingroup members who provided few cues to their ingroup membership (Carr, Vitak, & McLaughlin, 2013). However, extreme outgroup members who minimize cues to their identity are more socially identifiable to ingroup members than outgroup members who provide numerous cues (Carr, Vitak, & McLaughlin, 2013). Van Der Heide, D'Angelo, and Schumaker (2012) found that cue elements in personal online presentation also influenced viewers’ judgment. According to their findings, while photographs significantly influenced more judgments of social orientation, textual cues influenced social orientation judgments only when accompanied by an introverted photograph as opposed to extraverted photograph. However, no study had treated stereotype depiction in online content as a form of social cue. Also, the existing studies was limited in online static online format and profiles; few study tapped into how cues interact with video format. Thus, it called for research look at how stereotyping depiction as social cues in online video content interact with the online platforms.
Following the same pattern, some scholars reconstructed the continuum model through integrating disposition theory to build a synthesized model of character impression formation (Zillmann & Bryant, 1985; Sanders, 2010). This model recognizes disposition as a crucial factor that influences impression formation process in an accumulative and continuous fashion. Meaning, the disposition about how a character should act (e.g. hero should do good things; villain should do bad things) will work with categorization and individuation mutually to impact impression formation of mediated characters in viewers’ entertainment/media experience (Sanders, 2010). These studies suggested that, when forming impression of a certain media character, viewers would either aggregate the individual attributes of this character on top of the disposition of the character, or revise their understanding of the disposition label through adding the individual attributes of the character (Sanders, 2010).

Similarly, the Contact Hypothesis states that contact with outgroup members leads to changes in the attitude of ingroup members towards outgroup members, and the manner in which ingroup members categorize outgroup members (Allport, 1954; Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2005). Positive contact experiences could lead to prejudice reduction. This effect also exists when people have contact with mediated fictional or non-fictional characters.

With the development of media, people arguably have more chances to have contact with mediated individuals from social minority groups. Schiappa et al. (2005) connected the Contact Hypothesis with parasocial interactions to build the Parasocial Contact Hypothesis. The Parasocial Contact Hypothesis claims that when direct in-person contact is minimal, media, such as television, could play an influential role in audiences’ attitudes about outgroup members (Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2005). Like the Contact Hypothesis, parasocial contact could reduce individuals’ prejudice toward ourgroup members if one’s parasocial contact with
outgroup members was positive (Armstrong, Neuendorf, & Brentar, 1992; Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2005; Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2006). Schiappa et al. (2006) conducted a survey to examine parasocial contact on college students’ reactions to TV show, *Will & Grace*, finding that viewing frequency was positively associated with audiences’ parasocial involvement with mediated characters, and that the level of prejudice toward gay men was negatively associated with viewing frequency and parasocial involvement. Also, the negative association between prejudice and parasocial involvement was stronger among those who have few or no direct gay acquaintances, and was not significant among those who have gay friends (Schiappa et al., 2006). These findings were later supported by similar results for three experiments (Schiappa et al., 2005).

While some studies explored people’s parasocial interaction with non-fictional mediated “characters” (e.g. news anchors, athletes, comedians), there was few stereotype-related literature on impression formation or Parasocial Contact Hypothesis examining non-fictional mediated figures that were personal and non-institutional as is in the case of YouTubers (Giles, 2002; Gregg, 2005). Also, both interpersonal and mediated impression formation had been long seen as a process transpiring between two individuals and mediated by individual differences from both sides (e.g. attention, motivations, personal needs, personality traits) (Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999). However, the existing models fail to take into consideration how new technology mechanisms that provide amateur content created by minority members can redirect people’s impression formation process and influence outgroup members’ attitudes towards social minority groups.
Transgender People as a Marginalized Social Group

According to the continuum model of impression formation, the further re-categorization or individuating processes are more likely to occur when:

1) People have limited contact with members from a certain social group;

2) The “less well developed and entrenched” social categories are more likely to make perceivers to question the accountability of such categories for the social groups that they represent;

3) There is a high level of inconsistency of the perceiver’s initial categorization and target information;

4) There is a high level of credibility discrepancy between preexisting and incoming information (Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999).

The present study chose minority social group based on these four criteria.

Transgender, as the minority social group to examine in this study, meet these four criteria because:

1) While people’s interpersonal and parasocial contact with gays and lesbians is increasing, their contact with transgender oftentimes is zero to limited; in this way, their response will have less social desirability involved;

2) Transgender is a group/category that is under-presented, highly stereotyped, and not well-developed in society, media, and academia;

3) The amateur content from real transgender people are counter-stereotypic depictions that might create inconsistency of existing and incoming information people have about transgender people;
4) Such content directly from transgender people might be seen more credible than media reports and second-hand information (Herek, 1987; Schiappa et al. 2005; Walch et al., 2012.)

Also, researchers have utilized LGBT context to examine the effects of intergroup contact, parasocial contact, and other mediated character-viewer relationship (Herek, 1987; Schiappa et al. 2005; Walch et al., 2012). However, most studies have focused on the aspect of this community dealing with sexuality rather than gender preference. Because of the lack of contact and media representation, most people’s knowledge about transgender people is dominantly stereotypic categories and labels. Therefore, transgender people are the ideal social minority group about which to examine impression formation in this era.

Transgender, a term that lacks consensus, has a changing and multifaceted definition. Transgender not only includes transsexuals, but also includes various individuals who violate traditional gender norms, such as cross-dressers and those who consider themselves as “inbetweeners,” meaning their gender expressions and practices cannot be fully depicted by the traditional gender binary categories of “man” or “woman” (Stone, 1991; Roen, 2002). According to the widely cited definition of GLAAD (the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation) Media Reference Guide, “transgender is an umbrella term (adj.) for people whose gender identity and/or gender expression differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. The term may include but is not limited to: transsexuals, cross-dressers and other gender-variant people. Transgender people may identify as female-to-male (FTM) or male-to-female (MTF). Use the descriptive term (transgender, transsexual, cross-dresser, FTM or MTF) preferred by the individual. Transgender people may or may not decide to alter their bodies hormonally and/or surgically” (GLAAD, 2010, para. 7).
In terms of the stereotypes and labels of transgender people, the stereotypes/archetypes of transgender representation in media productions could be roughly divided into four stereotypes— the Transgender Deceiver, the Transgender Mama, the Transgender Monster and the Transgender Revolutionary (Ryan, 2009). The Transgender Deceiver refers to those who attempt to fool and trick others, mostly into sexual situations, by presenting themselves in a gender role that does not match their biological sex. Transgender Mama refers to “drag queen and transgender stock characters that have a bundle of stereotypic traits in common: being angelic, more spiritual than average, rehabilitators, advice givers, best pals, side-kicks, sassy queens and sexually dysfunctional beings” (Ryan, 2009, p. 52). Transgender Monster deals with gender diversity as a “threatening form of criminality,” in which transgender people are depicted as “she-male psychos” or killers that have “a mixture of human and animal components” (Ryan, 2009, p. 53). Transgender Revolutionary often appears in documentaries as tragic victims, sex-change freaks, circus sideshows or protestors, emphasizing the shared humanity of transgender people. Although the mass media is the main or only source of transgender contact for most people, the mass media, however, continue to transmit disturbing and highly stereotyped images that “more often than not present gender-variant persons as objects rather than fully constituted subjects” (Ryan, 2009, p. 23).

The existing research on people’s attitudes and perceptions of transgender people were only conducted when most respondents only had contact in special medical scenarios or had zero direct or indirect contact with transgender people. Conducted in the medical system and using medical professionals and psychiatrists as the sample, Green, Stoller, and MacAndrew (1966) found that the majority of these professionals agreed that transsexuals were “severely neurotic” (Norton & Herek, p. 2). When it came to investigating general audiences’ attitudes towards
transgender people, several studies conducted in different countries (Canada, Hong Kong, the United States, and United Kingdom) showed that males were more likely to have negative attitudes toward transgender people than females (Tee & Hegarty, 2006; Nagoshi, Adams, Terrell, Hill, Brzuzy, & Nagoshi, 2008). Also, education level and personal contact with sexual minority group members were negatively associated with levels of negative attitudes towards transgender people in Hong Kong and Sweden (King, Winter, & Webster, 2009; Landén & Innala, 2000). Moreover, age, religiosity, and authoritarianism were found to be positively associated with negative attitudes toward transgender people (Tee & Hegarty, 2006; Nagoshi, Adams, Terrell, Hill, Brzuzy, & Nagoshi, 2008). Norton and Herek’s (2012) recent study showed that negative attitudes toward transgender people were positively associated with levels of binary conception of gender, psychological authoritarianism, political conservatism, and anti-egalitarianism (Norton & Herek, 2012). Moreover, they revealed that heterosexuals’ prejudicial attitudes towards gays/lesbians/bisexuals were positively correlated with their prejudicial attitudes towards transgender (Norton & Herek, 2012).

In terms of the influence of direct contact with transgender people on people’s attitudes towards them, Walch et al. (2012) found that exposing students face-to-face to a transgender speaker panel resulted in a decrease of transphobia. However, the transgender literature body could be expanded by research tapping into how contact with mediated transgender figures influenced people’s attitudes towards transgender people. Also, the existing transgender researcher mainly focused on the result aspect of contact effects. Thus, it calls for research on the aspect of its cognition process. Most importantly, with the enhanced amateur culture that allows social minority members express themselves directly, it is necessary to examine the roles of the
amateur content created by transgender people and the mechanisms of amateur platform in the
cognition process of impression formation.

**Amateurism: Content and Platform**

**Amateurism: From Cave Painting to Digital Productions.** Amateurs are those who
have taken time from their usual labors and obligations to pursue a disciplined study of some
subject outside their usual sphere. Distinguished from those who execute tasks in a certain
subject professionally, amateurs cultivate the skills and use them as a pastime (Haley, 1976;
Paasonen, 2010). As a fact, amateurism has existed longer than modern civilization; “the cave
paintings at Lascaux and many earlier artifacts give every sign of having been made to satisfy
some urge for individual expression rather than with any object of gain” (Haley, 1976, p. 253).
As a concept, on one hand, Oxford English Dictionary conceptualized amateurism for the first
time in the 19th century when the rise to dominance of a complex economy and of bureaucratic
states created new and rigid ideas about professions and professionalism (Haley, 1976). On the
other hand, the categories of amateurism and professionalism are both social formations and
ideologies that emerged and developed in tandem in the late 19th century with the invention of
leisure, as well as attempts to differentiate the private sphere from the public and “cater products
to the emerging amateur markets” (Slater, 1991; Zimmermann, 1995; Paasonen, 2010, p. 1303).
In the process, the amateur “shifted from the older, aristocratic notion of the lover, to the newer
middle-class notion of the hobbyist” (Armstrong C., 2000, p. 102). The terms amateur and
professional “produce […] and define each other by mutual affinities and exclusions” (Garber,
2001, p. 5). All in all, while amateurism emphasized earnestness, professionalism was associated
with materialism and industrialization.
While the existence of amateurism and its distinction from professionalism has a long history, amateurism’s rise as a distinct and powerful class and a massive media culture progressed rapidly in the 21st century, as a result of the blossom of democratized new technology (Nicholls, 2007). The popularity of mobile devices and the development of social media and multimedia streaming technology in this era democratized the production and circulation of amateur content through low cost of both time and money (Anderson, 2004). This led to the prosperity of user-generated content, which is the leading form of amateur content in the digital age (Anderson, 2004). User-generated content (UCG) is a broader term cover all kinds of content created and uploaded from the user end to the platform; it is an umbrella for both amateur content and professional content (Anderson, 2004). In terms of reaching audiences, these web-based media sharing platforms could accommodate audiences ranging from “bored children and eager parents” to “emerging and established artists of many genres and disciplines” (Salvato, 2009, p. 72). Micro-targeting, recommendation systems, aggregation feeds and sharing mechanisms on social media have facilitated in pushing amateur or niche content to target social groups or broader content consumers (Paasonen, 2010). As a result, these aforementioned elements together blurred the boundaries between producers and consumers and increased the centrality of user-generated content (UCG), which became the characteristics of Web 2.0 and contemporary media culture at large (Paasonen, 2010, p. 1297).

**Amateur Content.** Besides the promoting mechanisms of new technology, user-generated content plays an essential role in enhancing amateur culture and maintaining the ecology of such culture; it not only allows sharing knowledge of different subcultures and social minority groups, but also allows the formation of affective ties and sense of community among
the platforms, content creators and audiences through affect and authenticity. Amateur user-generated contents creators have these characteristics:

1) They are driven by the love for a certain social groups or subculture, and labored away from work in free time or leisure time;
2) They are “voluntarily given and unwaged, enjoyed and exploited” labors (Terranova, 2000, p. 33);
3) They associate amateur content with peer-to-peer practices based on the principles of pleasure (Jacobs, 2004; Tola, 2005);
4) They follow the rule of “deviance is the norm” to create content that different from professional production and mainstream depictions (Halavais, 2005, p. 21);
5) They invest emotion and showed authenticity with less external interferences (Paasonen, 2010);
6) Their content serves as the amplifiers of the voices of social minority groups and subculture groups (Dhaenens, 2012).

As Attwood (2007) argued, both creator and viewers became members of “a taste culture which functions to bind them together in relations of cultural production and consumption, which are also relations of community” (Paasonen, 2010, p. 1301). Meaning, user-generated content is a form of “affective engagement and immaterial labor” (Attwood, 2007; Paasonen, 2010, p. 1301). As a driven force of digital media, amateur user-created content on social media is largely about affective investments, social networks and immaterial products (O’Reilly, 2005).

As opposed to user-generated contents creators, professional content creators’ characteristics include:

1) They conduct content creation activities for work;
2) They are compensated with wage (Terranova, 2000);
3) They practice based on the principles of industrial standardizations of mass-production, passive consumption and the logic of sameness (Tola, 2005; Jacobs, 2004);
4) They consider more about external interferences, such as sponsors, finances and audiences;
5) They repeat and stress the existing stereotypes of social minority groups and subculture groups for general audiences’ easy digestion.

To a degree, amateur productions have come to connote a more honest, authentic and real kind of depiction that is ethical in its principles of production, but also somehow more real, raw and innovative than commercially produced (i.e. mainstream, professional) content (Barcan, 2002; Van Doorn, forthcoming).

In general, amateur content created by minority members was arguably perceived more counter-stereotypic and trust-worthy. Moreover, trustworthiness and credibility are positive moderators of individuation (Slepian, Young, Rule, Weisbuch, & Ambady, 2012). As a result, it is possible that amateur content itself could encourage individuation through providing more counter-stereotypic labels and knowledge of marginalized social groups. However, it had not been examined how counter-stereotypic depiction in amateur content influence people’s impression formation as opposed to stereotypic depiction.

**Amateur Platform.** Even though amateur user-generated content offers alternative narratives and direct expression, the characteristics of the platforms that host these content might influence audiences’ perception of levels of amateur and rawness of these amateur content. Studies showed that the integration of User-generated Content in news output in television broadcasts and their associated websites or blogs become part of the workflow in the newsroom
(Wardle & Dubberley, 2013). The audiences might perceive the amateur footage presented on this platform as amateur style professional production; the selection, promotion and organization of the amateur content reflect and serve the purposes of the professional organization. On the other side, research revealed that regardless of professional or amateur production, content on amateur platforms, especially amateur net-porn websites, significantly gave impressions showing higher level of emotion investment, authenticity, credibility and counter-stereotyping because of less external interferences (Paasonen, 2010). With the influences of platforms, content might be seen with professional or amateur characteristics that their host platforms had, regardless whether the contents were professionally or amateurishly created. It is necessary to investigate how amateur content interact with different platforms (amateur platforms vs. regular platform) to influence audiences’ impression formation of the minority member featured in the amateur video.

Mechanism wise, amateur platforms’ user-generation nature determines that they heavily rely to the automatic recommendation, tagging, and aggregation systems to organize and promote their content. In this way, it has lower level of interference of real time editors that organize content according to the majority mind-set. Also, with recommended content on the side, people do not need to take extra efforts in information seeking. As a result, it is possible that amateur content itself could encourage individuation through decreasing the difficulty of information seeking.

Amateur Content and Amateur Platform: A Catalyst of Individuation in Impression Formation

In most circumstances, the impression formation process stops at the category-based level because of the ease of categorization, and the difficulties in information seeking and digesting new information/labels (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999). “Stereotype dilution,” the stage where the individuating process supersedes category-based processing,
happens only when the target attributes are highly inconsistent to the point that the perceiver finds it impossible to “construe the attribute information as stereotype-consistent” (De Dreu, Yzerbyt, & Leyes, 1995; Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999, p. 238). Therefore, the continuum model claims that the perceiver’s interpretation of the “category-attribute fit” determines use of the continuum (De Dreu, Yzerbyt, & Leyes, 1995; Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999, p. 237).

**Stereotyping and Counter-stereotyping.** Stereotypes are preexisting and developing cognitive structures organizing “the knowledge, beliefs, and expectations a person has about a group of individuals” (Sanders & Ramasubramanian, 2012, p. 18). These structures determine how people select and translate information to form impression about individuals, which oftentimes results in unfair and inaccurate impressions (Dixon, 2000). Media are the stabilizing and populating forces that create “cognitive structures and linkage between social groups and certain shared characteristics” for general population in a large scale (Entman & Rojecki, 2000; Sanders & Ramasubramanian, 2012, p.18). Counter-stereotypes are the pieces of information or the cognitive structures that are inconsistent and not widely accepted in the stereotypic cognitive structures (Dixon, 2000; Entman & Rojecki, 2000; Sanders & Ramasubramanian, 2012). They serve as resistant forces against the stereotypes.

The counter-stereotyping nature of social minority members’ amateur productions may be able to serve as a catalyst that created stereotype inconsistency and prompted the individuating process. Mass culture criticism argued that industrial and professional products were seen as standardized, mass-produced, passively consumed and representative of the logic of sameness (Adorno, 2001; Tola, 2005; Shah, 2007). Their depictions of social minority groups repeated the same stereotypes (Adorno, 2001; Tola, 2005; Shah, 2007). However, existing qualitative research stated that amateur production from a certain social minority groups was
more than a form of expression; it was a strategy of resistance to those stereotypic depictions (Dhaenens, 2012). Their narratives and depictions were “deviant” from professional and mainstream ideology. In the case of homosexuals, Dhaenens (2012) argued that homosexuals’ fan-made re-edited videos of soap operas “embed the potential to expose and challenge the way that heteronormativity functions” (p. 442).

**Two Dimensions of Individuation: The Collaboration of Amateur Content and Platforms.** Employing the model of user-generated content and promoting system, YouTube not only cultivates a mass amateur culture, but also makes it easier to further prompt individuation by bringing raw expressions and “deviant” dictions of various minority social groups to the public. YouTube users play a dual role of audience and producer, which strengthens the “RW (Read/Write) culture” and amateur power, and consequently brings a diversity of media content (Lessig, 2008, p. 33). Instead of strictly following professional and aesthetic principles of video production, most user-generated videos on YouTube are recorded by webcams in a spontaneous or loosely scripted manner. Broad creative autonomy allows social minority groups to express themselves as they want, which oftentimes challenges the portrayal and narrative of these minority groups created by members from the majority. As a result, this counter-stereotypic presentation might enhance inconsistency and discourage reliance on stereotypes.

As previously mentioned, attention and motivation are the moderator of individuation, YouTube’s recommendation system and content format might facilitate the transition from category-based process to attribute-based ones through increasing audience’s attention and motivating them to click on related videos and to seek extra attribute information (Davidson, et al., 2010). In terms of increasing viewers’ attention, YouTube capability of aggregating related videos (e.g. the videos that share the same creator, similar topics, tags, or channels) relieves the
audience from the time pressure—users could simply click the related video on the right without worrying about the time for seeking external information. Also, this aggregation lowers the threshold of the effort it takes for the audience to look for extra attribute information when category-attribute inconsistency occurs. Moreover, the recommendation algorithm might also filter out most “environmental noise,” distracting and irrelevant videos. Furthermore, the top recommended videos are either hosted or created by the same person. Most importantly, video, YouTube’s core content format, could activate and attract both attention and emotion in the human brain through visual cues (Vuilleumier, 2005). Therefore, along with the resistant and counter-stereotypic amateur content, the enhancement of attention and motivation by YouTube mechanism might increase inconsistency and consequently encourage viewers to click related videos to seek further information so as to reconfirm, to re-categorize, or to individuate the target conveniently. In other words, the present study argued that the amateur content might work with amateur platform to encourage individuation through reducing the levels of difficulty in counter-stereotypic labeling and information seeking. Thus, the individuation process of impression formation in the digital age has two dimensions/stages: one is information seeking which reflects on people’s clicking activities (i.e. the amount of relevant page viewed), the other is categorization and labeling (i.e. the amount of stereotypic or counter-stereotypic label people put on the featured social minority member.).

As discussed above, all these digital phenomena called for a reexamination of the continuum model of impression formation in the digital age. There was few studies had been done to examine the media effects of user-generated content’s counter-stereotypic media productions on how general audiences processed such content and form impression of mediated
outgroup members. Also, the amateur phenomenon on digital platforms showed the need of integrating the technology platform mechanism into research in impression formation.

To examine whether the uprising of amateur culture interacts with platforms to prompt the individuation process from its two dimensions, labeling and information seeking, I put forward the below research question:

RQ1a: How will people’s information seeking individuation (Relevant Clicking Activities) of the featured transgender person after exposure vary as a function of platform (Amateur Platform vs. Regular Platform) and stereotype depiction in the video (stereotyping vs. counter-stereotyping)?

RQ1b: How will people’s labeling individuation of the featured transgender person vary as a function of platform (Amateur Platform vs. Regular Platform) and stereotype depiction in the video (stereotyping vs. counter-stereotyping)?

**Individuation and its Outcome Generalization**

Some studies showed that one’s perception of and attitudes towards an individual could be generalized to his or her perception of and attitudes towards the social group that the perceived individual belonged to. Desforges, et al., (1991) found that deeper and more mutual outcome dependency like cooperation not only facilitated the individuating process for the target outgroup member, but also decreased perceiver’s prejudice toward the group as a whole. Also, Herek’s (1987) study demonstrated that the generalization also happened for individual contact with outgroup member college students who had pleasant interactions with a homosexual tended to generalize the specific contact experience to be the overall impression of homosexuals as a group. Schmid et al.’s (2012) found individuals who were low in the level of accepting the idea of social
dominance were more motivated to have both primary and secondary contact with outgroup individuals, and to migrate their attitudes formed to the group as whole through generalization.

When it comes to face-to-face interpersonal impression formation, this generalization of attitudes also exists. Existing studies revealed that as the appearance frequency of the people with a certain kind of stereotype inconsistency increased, people began to form a novel incongruent category that brought in the inconsistent attributes for not only a specific individual, but also for the whole group of people that had similar stereotype-inconsistent attributes (Hastie, Schroeder, & Weber, 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Hutter & Crisp, 2006; Siebler, 2008; Wood & Hutter, 2011, p. 323). They then became not only a powerful new category but also a newly defined social group that had their own “stereotypic” labels. This phenomenon was called incongruent category conjunctions. It involved “more than a simple addition of constituents, requiring more effortful processingand resulting in the formation of a new complex category representation containing emergent attributes” (Wood & Hutter, 2011, p. 324). The findings of multiple studies supported that “novel incongruent category conjunctions in particular prompt greater use of emergent attributes (relative to more familiar congruent conjunctions), often accompanied by a reduced reliance on constituent attributes (traits also attributed to the constituent categories)” (Hastie, Schroeder, & Weber, 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Hutter & Crisp, 2006; Siebler, 2008; Wood & Hutter, 2011, p. 323). Meaning, the growing of novel incongruent categories was negatively associated with people’s reliance on stereotypes (Wood & Hutter, 2011).

However, there are few studies looking at whether the generalization and the so-called novel incongruent category conjunctions also happened in terms of impression formation through mediated contact. That is, whether the impression formed through parasocial contact
with an mediated individuals from a social minority group would be generalized to one’s attitude toward the group as a whole. Generalizing the outcome of impression formation would arguably go through two phases: one is generalizing the outcome of impression formation to the specific outgroup member that individuals encounter; the other is generalizing the outcome of impression formation of this particular outgroup member to the social group he or she belongs to. Thus, I pose the below research questions:

RQ2: How will people’s explicit attitudes towards the featured transgender person in the amateur content differ as a function of platform and stereotype depiction in the video?

RQ3: How will people’s explicit and implicit attitudes towards transgender people as a social group differ as a function of platform and stereotype depiction in the video?

Elevation: Amateur YouTube Videos as Meaningful Entertainment

If the transformation and generalization of impression formation outcome into attitudes exist, it is meaningful to look at the psychological responses that cause such transformation and generalization. After examining the cognitive process of impression formation of social minority members through amateur content and platforms, the affective and conative responses to this amateur setting would be another place to start. The impression formation process of a non-fictional mediated figure via YouTube should be complimented with motivation for and affective and conative responses to entertainment/media consumption. Interactions with YouTubers through amateur videos stand at the intersection of both parasocial interactions with characters in mass media production and interpersonal interactions. Viewers might watch YouTube videos for both entertainment and interpersonal needs/motivations. Like motives to and expected outcomes from forming impression of a target, entertainment consumption also consists of ultimate “goal” or pursued “outcome” (Vorderer, Klimmt, & Ritterfeld, 2004). Therefore, it is important to
examine how amateur YouTube videos from social minority members fulfill viewers’ dual needs, and further examine how this fulfillment is related to the impression formation of mediated non-fictional figures on YouTube.

**Meaningful Entertainment and Elevation.** Research on motivations and outcome in the consumption of entertainment materials started with hedonic concerns (e.g. enjoyment and pleasure). Disposition-based theories supported the idea that enjoyment increased as the outcomes depicted for liked characters became more positive in the storyline; level of enjoyment was increased as disliked characters suffered (Raney, 2006; Zillmann & Cantor, 1977). In terms of the motivation to consume entertainment content, the expectation of good/liked characters having good ending drove people to expose themselves to entertainment content in most circumstances (Raney, 2006; Zillmann & Cantor, 1977). Also, Zillmann (1985) found in mood-management theory that the potential to optimize positive states and terminate negative states guided viewers’ choices of entertainment content. However, these frameworks were constructed and conceptualized in hedonistic terms that emphasized appreciation of positive affect. This limited their capabilities to account for appreciation of negative affect and meaningful entertainment that depicted and activated profound mixed feelings.

With the consideration of the aforementioned limitation, scholars studying motivations and outcomes of media consumption made a shift from hedonic concerns (e.g. pleasure and enjoyment) to eudaimonic concerns (e.g. truth and meaningfulness). In this aspect of motivation, they conceptualized and operationalized the paradoxical appreciation of meaningful cinematic entertainment featuring portrayals of moral virtues (i.e. sad, dramatic entertainment) as mixed affect (Oliver & Raney, 2011). Oliver and Raney (2011) broadened the conceptualization of entertainment selection and created a scale to include both “pleasure-seeking (hedonic
concerns)” and “truth-seeking (eudaimonic concerns)” as motivators (pp. 984). In terms of the outcome and response to such entertainment, Oliver, Hartmann, and Woolley (2012) identified the feelings triggered by eudaimonic concerns as elevation which was signified as meaningful affect, mixed affect and physical responses. Furthermore, the elevation caused by meaningful entertainment would also prompt “motivations to embody moral virtues, such as being a better person or helping others” (Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012, p. 360).

Meaningful and Emotional Contents Enhance Individuation in Impression Formation. The existing literature bridges the positive relationship of meaningful content and the individualization in impression formation. Rahhal, Berry, and Leighton (2005) found that when people had difficulty retrieving contextual information to proceed with individuation, adding emotional context could prompt people’s individuation process. Moreover, Cassidy and Gutchess (2012) revealed that the amount of content and self-relevant context was positively associated with the processing and memorizing of the target’s attributes.

Based on these findings, if the answers to our previously RQs support that counter-stereotypic amateur videos created by social minority members encourages individuation, amateur content is supposed to be able stimulate people’s elevation responses.

Elevation for Meaningful Amateur Content and Platform. In the aspect of content, the characteristics of the amateur video content created by YouTubers from social minority group might be able to serve as meaningful mediated content through activating viewers’ truth seeking and moral perception. In the videos, sharing the difficult and unusual experience as a social minority members are oftentimes part of the narrative, which might be perceived as a reflection of moral virtues to influence how viewers perceive them and their other videos. Also, the videos created by social minority YouTubers would be tied to and be interpreted as
opinion, directly reflecting the social groups that he or she belongs to. In other words, these videos might be seen as credible sources because of the YouTuber’s identity. Moreover, YouTubers are able to document themselves, to interact with viewers directly through comments and YouTube Q & A videos. Furthermore, videos, as stimuli and instructions, were able to stimulate people’s causal uncertainty, “accuracy goals,” and “thoughtful and systematic processing of all available information” (Weary, Jacobson, Edwards, & Tobin, 2001; Tobin, Weary, Brunner, Gonzalez, & Han, 2009, p. 918; Vaugh & Weary, 2003).

Platform wise, YouTube’s amateur brand image and capabilities of recommendation and aggregation might also enhance the outcome of consuming meaningful amateur content. Despite the fact that most people less frequently actively check out content about outgroups, YouTube’s free marketplace mechanism for videos increases the possibility that people encounter amateur content featuring social minority members. Also, YouTube’s recommendation system aggregates related videos that allow viewers to be continuously exposed to more aspects of the target, including the good and the bad times that the YouTuber has been through. Thus, YouTube’s capabilities to recommend and aggregate might make the viewers feel more mixed affects, physical responses, and motivational responses when exposed to videos on YouTube as opposed to a regular platform. So, this study looked at whether people would have elevation responses if people accidentally encounter amateur content featuring outgroup members. If so, whether amateur platform enhance these meaningful elevation responses. Thus, I posed the below research questions:

RQ4: How will people’s meaningful affect vary as a function of platform (Amateur Platform vs. Regular Platform) and stereotype depiction in the video (stereotypic vs. counter-stereotypic)?
RQ5: How will people’s mixed affect vary as a function of platform and stereotype depiction in the video?

RQ6: How will people’s physical responses vary as a function of platform and stereotype depiction in the video?

RQ7: How will people’s motivations to embody or enact moral virtues vary as a function of platform and stereotype depiction in the video?

Figure 1 shows the theoretical relationships of the present study. This study examined people’s impression formation process when they encounter a transgender person in the amateur content created by transgender people. Moreover, it investigates whether the outcome of such impression formation process would be transformed into people’s attitudes toward the encountered transgender person. If this transformation exists, whether the attitudes towards this particular person would be generalized into people’s attitudes transgender people social group as a whole. Furthermore, integrating elevation responses into the impression formation theoretical framework, this study explores the possible psychological responses that cause the attitude transformation and generalization in the impression formation process.
Figure 1. Theoretical Relationships
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Study Design

A between-subjects factorial design experiment was conducted to examine how viewing platform (Amateur Platform vs. Regular Platform) and stereotype depiction/consistency in the video (stereotyping vs. counter-stereotyping) influence the participants’ levels of individuation after exposure to stimuli. The present study looked at how the two dimensions of individuation—information seeking (the amount of the videos/pages clicked) and labeling vary as a function of platform and stereotype depiction in the video in relationships attitudes and elevation responses after exposure. As Figure 2 shows, the treatment conditions included stereotype-consistent video on YouTube, stereotype-consistent video on the regular platform, stereotype-inconsistent video on YouTube, and stereotype-inconsistent video on the regular platform.

Stimuli

For the present study, we chose two transgender YouTubers’ channels. Sixteen videos—the total number of the featured video and related videos recommended on the side of a YouTube video page—were selected for each channel. The criterion of the video selection was that it had to be a collection of videos showing the transgender YouTuber’s different aspects of life. The researcher cut out video about sensitive political issues and edited them into equal length. The selected YouTubers were real transgender people and presented themselves without the interference of third parties.

One of the two transgender YouTubers was Misty Eyez, a male-to-female transgender (MTF). She was a transgender drag queen, and maintains a flamboyant image that fit most
people’s stereotype of transgender (according to the existing literature, most people actually mistake drag queens for transgender people because of their common qualities of appearance and behavior) (Ryan, 2009). The other one was JohnnyBoyox, a music artist. While also being an MTF, she gave an impression of a blond “girl next door,” which might be a presentation that was inconsistent with the transgender stereotype. They were both adult, longtime YouTubers who had posted a large amount of videos of their opinions on social issues, personal life, and professional works. Misty Eyez’s videos were planned to serve as the stereotypic depiction treatment in both YouTube and regular platform conditions; JohnnyBoyox’s was the counter-stereotypic treatment in both platform conditions. A pilot study was conducted to validate people’s stereotype perceptions of the two selected YouTubers. They were aligned with the intention of the treatment condition that they were assigned to serve.
For comparison purpose, I created an amateur platform layout—a YouTube video page—and a regular platform layout—an opinion blog. For the YouTube layout, the initial featured video was placed on the spot of visual focus, the rest of the 15 videos were displayed as recommended videos on the right sides with small screen shots. The YouTube bio box would lead the audience to a page with collection of her videos. This platform represented the amateur platform. For the regular platform, I only placed one video—the initial featured video in the center. The regular platform looked like an opinion blog whose content comes from contributing writer, which is neither a professional news site nor an amateur platform. The blogger bio box would lead the audience to a page with collection of her videos. In this way, the YouTube platform would be perceived higher in amateurism and lower in professionalism; the regular platform will be perceived relatively lower in amateurism. This study also validated people’s amateurism level perceptions of these two platforms in the pilot study.

The main video for all conditions was one that the featured person recorded for “It Gets Better,” an online campaign encouraging people to upload videos to help those LGBT teenagers who feel isolated and suicidal. Also, the videos were edited to share a similar content structure, visual elements, and length. They were embedded in the main visual focal point on both layouts separately. In this way, the featured main video can serve as the stimulus that set the baseline. However, when choosing the videos in their recommendation or their content collection pages, this study used the videos that share equal length and avoid the videos that related to strong religious and political opinions. In this way, this study could minimize the noise and optimized the validity of the stimuli.
Pilot Test/Independent Variables

Overview. To test the effectiveness of the stimulus manipulation, I conducted a 2 by 2 between-subjects experiment, platforms (Amateur Platform vs. Regular Platform) x stereotyping (Stereotypic Featured Person vs. Counterstereotypic featured Person). The results determined the videos and the platforms used in the main study.

Sample. The sample of this pilot test consisted of 74 participants recruited from an undergraduate student subject pool. Extra course credits are the incentives for their participation. The pilot test participants ranged in age from eighteen to thirty-six years old (M = 19.93 ; SD= 2.38). Among them, twenty-three percent were male (n = 17) while 77% percent were female (n = 57). The majority (79.7%) were White/Caucasian, with the remainder of participants reporting that they belonged to an ethnic minority group.

Procedure. In the procedure of pilot test, I randomly assigned the participants to the four resulting conditions, Stereotyping-YouTube condition (n = 21), Stereotyping-Webpage condition (n = 20), Counterstereotyping-YouTube condition (n = 20), or Counterstereotyping-webpage condition (n = 13). After viewing only the main video in the assigned conditions, the participants were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their perceptions of the featured persons and the platforms.

Results. Stereotypic Depiction of the Featured Transgender Persons. To test how stereotypic the featured transgender person was for the participants, I applied two scales/indices. Using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= “Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Strongly Agree,” one index asked the participants to provide their agreement with 13 perception statements, such as “Misty Eyez/Johnny Boy matches my idea of transgender people,” “Misty Eyez/Johnny Boy reflects the society’s stereotype of transgender people,” “I can hardly tell that Misty Eyez/Johnny
Boyz is transgender people if she doesn’t reveal herself,” and “Misty Eyez/Johnny represents the majority of transgender people” (Cronbach’s a = .85).

A 2 (Stereotyping) X 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted to examine the stereotypic perception of the featured transgender persons. As Table 1 shows, the analysis revealed a main effect for stereotyping, as the participants actually perceived the stereotypic featured person, Misty Eyez, more stereotypic as a transgender person (M = 4.58, SE = .12) than the counter-stereotypic featured person, Johnny Boy (M = 3.41, SE = .14), F (1, 70) = 39.10, p < .001, partial \( \eta^2 = .02 \). However, there was no main effect for platform, F (1, 70) = .93, p > .05, partial \( \eta^2 = .004 \).

Table 1. Pretest ANOVA Statistics for Stereotype Perception of the Selected Featured Transgender Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Stereotype Perception of the Featured Transgender Persons</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>M = 4.51&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>M = 3.24&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpage</td>
<td>M = 4.66&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>M = 3.58&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (1, 70) = 39.10, p < .001, partial \( \eta^2 = .02 \).
Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.

In order to look at what were perceived as the stereotypes of transgender people, the other index asked participants to rate how well each word in a vocabulary collection of fifteen adjectives described the featured transgender person on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = “Not at all Describes,” 7 = “Very Much Describes”). This gave us more detailed insight into what is manipulated in the stimuli. These pilot test measures went beyond assessing traditional notions of attractiveness and femaleness to address stereotypic characteristics, which revealed different
depths and dimensions of stereotypes of transgender people. However, it was worth noting that traditional notions of attractiveness and femaleness were somewhat intertwined with stereotypes. The words were obtained from existing qualitative literature regarding the depiction of transgender people in the media (Ryan, 2009; Ringo, 2002; Gazzola, 2012). An exploratory factor analysis using principal components extraction and varimax rotation was employed to examine participants rating of these words. The final subsequent analysis revealed three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 that accounted for 53.07% of the variance. Table 2 reports the factors and factor loadings for these three factors. The first factor labeled “Eccentric Quality” covered “Perverted,” “Freakish,” “Deceptive,” ”Twisted,” “Immoral,” “Tragic,” and “Deviant” (Cronbach’s a = .88, M = 15.36, SD = 8.37). The second factor was labeled “Positive Qualities,” including the variables “Brave,” “Believable,” “Caring,” “Authentic,” and “Strong” (Cronbach’s a = .81, M = 28.59, SD = 5.49). The final factor labeled “Pseudo Qualities” included variables “Flamboyant,” “Queer,” “Artificial,” and “Natural” (Cronbach’s a = .78, M = 16.23, SD = 6.20). Three scales were created by averaging the ratings of the variables that represented these three factors. All scales showed high internal consistency (Eccentric Qualities, Cronbach’s a = .88, M = 15.36, SD = 8.37; Postive Qualities, Cronbach’s a = .81, M = 28.59, SD = 5.49; Pseudo Qualities, Cronbach’s a = .78, M = 16.23, SD = 6.20).

To further examine whether people’s perception of stereotypic and counter-stereotypic featured persons differed in these three dimensions of transgender stereotyping, a 2 (Stereotyping) X 2 (Platform) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the three dimensions of transgender stereotypes—Positive Qualities, Pseudo Qualities, and Eccentric Qualities—entered into the model as dependent variables. As Table 3 shows, the results yielded a significant main effect for stereotyping, Wilks’ λ = .88, F(3, 68) = 3.12, p < .05, partial η² = .12.
Table 2. Pretest Factor Analysis Statistics for the Stereotypes of Transgender people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading Using Principal Component and Varimax Rotation</th>
<th>Eccentric Qualities</th>
<th>Motherly Qualities</th>
<th>Pseudo Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perverted</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freakish</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisted</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brave</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamboyant</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>- .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Variance</td>
<td>22.26%</td>
<td>17.01%</td>
<td>12.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Pretest MANOVA Statistics for Stereotype Perception as a Function of Stereotype Depiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotypic Perception as a Function of Stereotype Depiction</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counterstereotypic</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric Qualities</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postive Qualities</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Qualities</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSQ</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo Qualities</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>7.86*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate: Wilks' $\lambda = .88$, $F(3, 68) = 3.12$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$.

* $p < .01$
The univariate analysis for Pseudo Qualities revealed a significant main effect for stereotyping, with participant exposed to the stereotypic featured transgender person, Misty Eyez, reporting significantly higher on Pseudo Qualities for the featured person (M = 4.52, SE = .23) than did those who were exposed to Johnny Boy in the counter-stereotypic condition (M = 3.52, SE = .26). F (1, 70) = 7.86, p < .01, partial $\eta^2 = .10$. However, no main effect was obtained for the other two dimensions, Positive Qualities, F (1, 70) = .75, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and Eccentric Qualities, F (1, 70) = .55, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. While the results yielded no main effect for Positive Qualities and Eccentric Qualities, the means and the data patterns showed that the participants’ ratings on the words in these two dimensions were in the expected and necessary directions. This further supported that our stimuli went beyond traditional notions of attractiveness and femaleness to address transgender stereotypes from three different depths and dimensions—Eccentric Qualities, Positive Qualities, and Pseudo Qualities. Thus, the two stereotyping manipulations featuring Misty Eyez and Johnny Boy respectively should be used in the study based on the results of the aforementioned factorial ANOVA and this MANOVA analysis.

**Amateur Levels of Platforms.** To evaluate how amateur people perceived the two platforms to be, this study asked how much they agree with statements describing their general perception of whole package of the platform and content. Responding to a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= “Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Strongly Agree,” the participants were asked to rate how much they agreed with statements like “the YouTuber/author creates this video/blog content for the sheer love of it,” “I think the blog author/YouTuber received compensation for their efforts,” “the blogger/r is content creator associated with some institutions,” “The Video/Blog Content is manufactured,” “the Video/Blog Content looks spontaneous,” “the
YouTuber/author creates the video/blog content for work,” and “the YouTuber/author creates the video/blog content in free time or leisure time” (Cronbach’s a = .80). These statement items were created based on the qualitative literature based on amateurism and professionalism (Paasonen, 2010; Howard, 2012; Salvato, 2009; Dhaenens, 2012).

A 2 (Stereotype depiction) X 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted to examine people’s amateurism perception of the two platforms. As Table 4 shows, the analysis revealed main effects for platform, as the participants actually perceived the YouTube platform more amateur as a (M = 5.27, SE = .10) than the regular platform (M = 4.87, SE = .11), F (1, 70) = 7.03, p < .05, partial η² = .09. However, the results yielded no main effect for stereotype, F (1, 70) = .31, p > .05, partial η² = .002. Thus, the two platform manipulations were used in the main study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables: Amateurism Perception of the Platforms</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counterstereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YouTube</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.11_aA</td>
<td>5.42_aA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.99_aB</td>
<td>4.75_aB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (1, 70) = 7.03, p < .05, partial η² = .09.
Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.

**Participants**

The research was conducted in a public university in the southern United States, recruiting undergraduate students as sample. The participants were rewarded with a modest amount of extra course credits. Of the final sample (N=174), 14.4% were male (n=25), and 85.6% were female (n=149). The average age of the participants was 20.09 (M=20.09, SD=2.87).
Seventy-nine percent of the participants reported their ethnicity as White/Caucasians (n=136); 12.6% identified themselves to be Black/African-American (n=22); 5.7% identified themselves as Other Hispanic (n=10); 2.9% were American Indian (n=5); 2.9% reported to be Puerto Rican (n=5); 2.3% were Asian American (n=4); and 1.7% were Mexican American (n=3). Twenty-five percent of participants reported the income of their household growing up as less than $69,999 (n=44), 45% claimed theirs to be between $70,000 and $149,999 (n=94), 20.7% reported theirs to be $150,000 or more (n=36). In terms of political affiliations, 46.6% identified themselves as Republican (n=81), 25.3% identified to be Democratic (n=44), 20.7% were independent (n=36), 5.7% were Libertarian (n=10), 0.6% were Green Party (n=1), and 1.1 identified to be Other (n=2).

**Procedure**

After signing up for the study, the participants were asked to come to the Media Effects Lab. The researcher randomly assigned the participants to one of the four treatment conditions—stereotype-consistent video on amateur platform, stereotype-consistent video on regular platform, stereotype-inconsistent video on amateur platform, and stereotype-inconsistent video on regular platform. The former two conditions feature drug queen MTF Misty Eyez, the latter two feature singer/songwriter MTF JohnnyBoyox. The researcher gave oral instructions, telling the participants that during the next twenty-minute period they should watch a three-minute main video in their assigned conditions and that after watching the main video, they could do whatever they wanted to do. When the twenty-minute period was over, they were asked to complete an IAT (Implicit Association Test) which was followed by a posttest questionnaire. The questionnaire asked questions examining the participant’ post-exposure activities, explicit
attitudes towards transgender people, perception of the featured YouTuber after exposure, rating of affective, physical and motivational responses.

**Dependent Variables and Measures**

**Labeling Individuation Score.** The present study created a scoring scale to measure how far participants went in the individuating process. This scale was intended to measure where in between the category end and attribute end of the continuum the participant stood when forming impressions in the experiment. This measurement includes two items. The first item calculated how stereotypic the participant’s impression towards the featured transgender person was after exposure. It started with a question, “which of the words and phrases listed below best describe the person featured in the video(s) that you just watched? If the word reflects how you think of the featured person, type in -1; If not, keep 0 the box” (M = -2.04, SE = 1.72). Below the question, there was a list of stereotype-consistent words that were selected from the factor analysis of transgender stereotyping that I conducted in the pilot test for this study. The list included 10 stereotype-consistent words, such as “perverted,” “freakish,” “flamboyant,” “artificial,” and “queer.” The second item calculated how counter-stereotypic the participant’s impression towards the featured transgender person was after exposure. It started with a question, “which of the words and phrases listed below best describe the person featured in the video(s) that you just watched? If the word reflects how you think of the featured person, type in 1; If not, keep 0 the box” (M = 2.13, SE = 2.02). Below the question, there was a list of stereotype-inconsistent words that were the antonyms of the ten words listed for the last item. The list includes 10 stereotype-inconsistent words, such as “pure,” “normal,” “ingenuous,” “natural,” and “ordinary.” The sum of all the numbers that the participants entered for these two items was computed to get the labeling individuation score for each participant (M = .10, SE =
3.03). The higher score the participant got, the further he or she go in terms of individuation in the impression formation process.

**Information Seeking Individuation Score.** This measurement measures the degree of information seeking after exposure. In the amateur platform conditions with stereotypic or counter-stereotypic depiction, it started with a yes-no question asking, “did you click and watch any of the recommended videos on the right of the YouTube Page?” If the participant chose yes, the system would ask the participant type in the amount of videos that he or she clicked. If he or she chose no, the questionnaire will jump to next question, asking ask whether the participant visit any web page after watching the video in the form of a yes-no question. If the participant chose yes, the survey system would ask participant to recall and enter the amount of other LGBT-related external pages that he or she clicked in the 20-minute period if there is any. Only numeric value can be entered into the boxes. In the regular platform conditions with stereotypic or counter-stereotypic depiction, I use the same items. Except that the survey system would skip the item asking about the YouTube viewing and asked about people’s external LGBT-related pages clicking activity. The sum of the numbers that the participants entered in these two boxes would be computed to form their information seeking activity score (M = 2.57; SE = 2.99).

**Implicit Association Test (IAT) of Attitudes toward Transgender People.** While the IAT for homosexuals could be found, there was no existing IAT test of prejudicial attitudes toward transgender people. I adapted based on the homosexual IAT. The final newly-adapted IAT of transgender people’s materials consisted of a set of words stimuli representing the target categories “Transgender” and “Non-transgender,” such as “Male-to-Female,” “Transsexual,” “Gender Reassignment,” “Biological Male,” and “Real Woman” (Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2006). The attribute categories “good” and “bad” were represented by eight positive words (e.g.,
“respectable”) and eight negative words (e.g., “unethical”). Also, I applied the IAT whose algorithm had five blocks, including two critical pairing blocks (Graham & Cnaan, 2012; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2006). The IAT d-score should be translated in this way, a positive d-score indicates positive attitude toward target heterosexuals and attribute good; a score of zero means holding a neutral attitude toward target heterosexuals and attribute good; a negative score means that participants connect attribute good to the other target, transgender people.

The Explicit Scale of Attitudes toward the Featured Transgender Person and Transgender People. The explicit attitudes toward homosexuals were assessed by feeling thermometers. This one was once utilized in a national survey looking at heterosexual attitudes toward transgender people (Norton & Herek, 2012). In this study, it measures attitudes toward the featured transgender person and transgender people as a social minority group with two separate 100-point feeling thermometers. The feeling thermometers started with a question, “Using a scale from zero to 100, please tell us your personal feelings toward each of the following groups. As you do this task, think of an imaginary thermometer. The warmer or more favorable you feel toward the group, the higher the number you should give it. The colder or less favorable you feel, the lower the number. If you feel neither warm nor cold toward the group, rate it 50” (Transgender People: M = 59.27, SE = 22.82). In order to reduce the effects of social desirability and to familiarize participants with the response format, they were first presented with several thermometers for other social groups; the thermometer for transgender was shown somewhere in between (Norton & Herek, 2012; Haddock et al.1993; Herek 2002b; Herek and Capitanio1999). To measure explicit attitudes toward the featured person, the word “groups” in the instructions were changed into “the transgender person featured in the video” (The Featured Transgender Person: M = 62.63, SE = 22.77).
Elevation Responses. Affective Responses. To assess these three affective responses, the present study applied the scales constructed by Oliver, Hartmann and Woolley (2012). Responding to a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Not at All, 7 = Very Much), participants rated how much they experience each emotion under meaningful affect (touched, moved, emotional, meaningful, compassion, inspired, and tender; $M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.52$, $\alpha = .93$), Positive Affect (Cheerful, happy, joyful, and upbeat; $M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.67$, $\alpha = .94$), and Negative Affect factors (sad, gloomy, depressed, and melancholy; $M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.17$, $\alpha = .80$).

Mixed-affect scores were computed to see each participant’s minimum score on either positive affect or negative affect (Ersner-Hershfield, Mikels, Sullivan, & Carstensen, 2008; Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012) (Mixed Affect: $M = 2.08$, $SD = .98$). That was, a person’s mixed-affect score would be low when both positive (e.g. $M_p = 2$) and negative affect ($M_n = 3$) were low, or one was higher or lower than the other ($M_p = 6; M_n = 2$); a person’s mixed-affect score would be high when both positive affect ($M_p = 5$) and negative affect ($M_p = 6$) were reported to be at high levels (Ersner-Hershfield, Mikels, Sullivan, & Carstensen, 2008).

Physical Responses. Combine Algoe and Haidt’s (2009) 10 items of bodily reactions and Silvers and Haidt’s (2008) one item pertaining crying and tears, physical manifestations of affective responses will be measured on a 7-point Likert scale (Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012). It includes 11 items, such as “lump in throat,” “tears crying,” “rising or open chest,” or “muscles tensed” (Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012). This scale yielded good reliability ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 1.05$, $\alpha = .87$).

Motivational Responses. Using a 7-point Likert scale, participants were required to respond to a list of items about how the video(s) may have motivated them to act and behave (Algoe & Haidt, 2009; Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012). The items were created by Oliver et
al. (2012) based on Algeo and Haidt’s (2009) motivational effects of elevation, including items like “being a better person,” “to do something good for others,” and “to seek what really matters in life” (p. 367). This scale yielded high reliability (M = 3.84, SD = 1.50, α = .94).

**Demographics, socio-economic Status, and Others.** There are questions asking about individual demographic information, including biological gender, ethnicity, growing-up household income, and education (Schmid, Hewstone, Kupper, Zick, & Wagner, 2012). Other than that, items about personal contact with homosexuals or transgender people, opinions on social issues, political and religious affiliations, and sex orientation are also listed (Graham & Cnaan, 2012)
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RQ1a asked how people’s information seeking individuation score varied as a function of and stereotype consistency in the video. A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted, entering the sum of clicking activities to be the dependent variable with stereotype and platform as the two independent variables in the analysis. The analysis revealed a main effect for platform, as the participants exposed to the video on the amateur platform checked out significantly more pages (M = 3.87, SE = .28) than did those who were exposed to the video on regular platform (M = 1.16, SE = .29), F (1, 170) = 44.40, p < .001, partial $\eta^2 = .21$. However, the results did not yield a main effect for stereotype, F (1, 170) = 1.19, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .007$, nor a Stereotype Depiction X Platform interaction effect, F (1, 170) = .27, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .002$. See Table 5 for statistics.

RQ1b asked how people’s labeling individuation varied as a function of platform (Amateur Platform vs. Regular Platform) and stereotype consistency in the video (Stereotypic vs. Counter-stereotypic). A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted, treating the labeling individuation score as the dependent variable with stereotype and platform to be the two independent variables in the analysis. The analysis revealed a main effect for stereotype; regardless of the platform, the participants exposed to a counter-stereotypic depiction had significantly more counter-stereotypic perception of the featured person (M = .60, SE = .32) than did those who were exposed to the stereotypic depiction (M = -.39, SE = .33), F (1, 169) = 4.70, p < .05, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. However, the results did not yield a main effect for platform, F (1, 169) = 1.12, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .007$, nor a Stereotype Depiction X Platform interaction effect, F (1, 169) = .09, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. See Table 6 for detailed statistics.
Table 5. ANOVA Statistics for Information Seeking Individuation as a Function of Stereotype Depiction and Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Information Seeking/ Clicking Activities</th>
<th>Sterotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.54&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.20&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.05&lt;sub&gt;aB&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.128&lt;sub&gt;aB&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stereotype Depiction X Platform: \( F(1, 170) = .27, p > .05, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .002 \)

Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at \( p < .05 \).
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at \( p < .05 \).

Table 6. ANOVA Statistics for Labeling Individuation as a Function of Stereotype Depiction and Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Labeling Individuation</th>
<th>Sterotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.57&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.29&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.22&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.91&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stereotype Depiction X Platform: \( F(1, 169) = .09, p > .05, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .001 \).

Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at \( p < .05 \).
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at \( p < .05 \).

RQ 2 asked how people’s explicit attitudes towards the featured transgender person in the amateur content differed as a function of platform and stereotype consistency in the video. A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted, treating people’s explicit attitudes towards the featured transgender person in the video as the dependent variable with stereotype and platform to be the two independent variables in this particular factorial ANOVA analysis. The analysis revealed a main effect for stereotype, as the participants exposed to the video with counter-stereotypic depiction had significantly more positive explicit attitudes.
towards the featured transgender person (M = 66.20, SE = 2.38) than did those who were exposed to stereotypic depiction (M = 59.26, SE = 2.41), F (1, 170) = 4.21, p< .05, partial η² = .02. Also, the results yielded a main effect for platform, which indicated that the participants exposed to the video on regular platform had significantly more positive attitudes on the featured transgender person (M = 66.91, SE = 2.43) than did those who were exposed to the video on the amateur platform (M = 58.54, SE = 2.35), F (1, 170) = 6.12, p< .05, partial η² = .04. However, the analysis did not revealed a Stereotype Depiction X Platform interaction effect, F (1, 170) = .01, p> .05, partial η² = .00. Table 7 demonstrates detailed statistics.

RQ3 asked how people’s explicit and implicit attitudes towards transgender people as a social group differed as a function of platform and stereotype consistency in the video. A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted, treating explicit attitudes towards transgender people as a whole to be the dependent variable with stereotype and platform to be the two independent variables in the analysis. The analysis revealed a main effect for stereotype, as the participants exposed to the video featuring the counter-stereotypic depiction reported significantly more positive explicit attitudes towards transgender people as a whole (M = 63.48, SE = 2.42) than did those who were exposed to the video featuring the stereotypic transgender people (M = 55.08, SE = 2.44), F (1, 169) = 5.99, p< .05, partial η² = .03. However, the results did not yielded a main effect for platform, F (1, 169) = .67, p> .05, partial η² = .001, nor a Stereotype Depiction X Platform interaction effect, F (1, 169) = .73, p> .05, partial η² = .004. See Table 8 for detailed statistics.

For implicit attitudes toward transgender people as a whole, a 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) analysis of variance was conducted, entering implicit attitudes towards transgender people as a whole to be the dependent variable with stereotype and platform to be the two
Table 7. ANOVA Statistics for Explicit Attitudes towards the Featured Transgender Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Explicit Attitudes towards the Featured Transgender Person</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>55.20&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>61.89&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>63.32&lt;sub&gt;aB&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>70.51&lt;sub&gt;bB&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stereotype Depiction X Platform: F (1, 170) = .01, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .00

Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.

Table 8. ANOVA Statistics for Explicit Attitudes towards Transgender People as a Social Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Explicit Attitudes towards Transgender People</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>52.89&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>64.22&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>57.27&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>62.74&lt;sub&gt;bA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stereotype Depiction X Platform: F (1, 169) = .73, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .004

Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.

The analysis revealed neither a main effect for stereotype, F (1, 166) = .34, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .002, a main effect for platform, F (1, 166) = .57, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .003, nor a Stereotype Depiction X Platform interaction effect, F (1, 166) = .18, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .001. Table 9 demonstrates a more detailed statistics.
Table 9: ANOVA Statistics for Implicit Attitudes towards Transgender People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Implicit Attitudes towards Transgender People</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.29&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.30&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.26&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.29&lt;sub&gt;aA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stereotype Depiction X Platform: F(1, 166) = .18, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .001.
Within rows, means with no lowercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.
Within columns, means with no uppercase subscript in common differ at p < .05.

RQ4 and RQ5 asked how people’s meaningful affect and mixed affects varied as a function of platform and stereotype consistency in the video. A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed, treating people’s affective responses (meaningful, positive, negative, and mixed affects) as the dependent variables with stereotype and platform to be the two independent variables in the analysis. This analysis revealed as significant main effect for platform, Wilks’ λ = .91, F(4, 123) = 3.03, p < .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .09. However, it revealed no main effect for stereotype, Wilks’ λ = .98, F(4, 123) = .78, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .03, nor Stereotype Depiction X Platform interaction, Wilks’ λ = .96, F(4, 123) = 1.52, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .05. See Table 10 and Table 11 for detailed statistics.

The univariate analysis for Meaningful Affects revealed a significant main effect for platform, with participants exposed to the video on regular page feeling significantly higher level of meaningful affects (M = 2.30, SE = .15) than did those who were on the amateur platform (M = 1.92, SE = .10), F(1, 126) = 5.69, p < .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .04. However, no main effect for stereotype was revealed, F(1, 126) = .22, p > .05, partial η<sup>2</sup> = .01.
Table 10. MANOVA Statistics for Affective Responses as a Function of Platform Participants’ Ratings as a Function of Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amateur</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.72a</td>
<td>4.38b</td>
<td>5.69*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.92a</td>
<td>2.30b</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.60a</td>
<td>3.69a</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.18a</td>
<td>2.54a</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate: Wilks’ $\lambda = .91$, $F(4, 123) = 3.03$, $p<.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$.
*p<.05, **p<.001, ***p<.001

Table 11. MANOVA for Affective Responses as a Function of Stereotype Depiction Participants’ Ratings as a Function of Stereotype Depiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.88a</td>
<td>4.22a</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.00a</td>
<td>2.22a</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.40a</td>
<td>3.89a</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.29a</td>
<td>2.43a</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multivariate: Wilks' $\lambda = .98$, $F(4, 123) = .78$, $p> .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$.

*p<.05, **p<.001, ***p<.001

The univariate analysis for Mixed Affects revealed a significant main effect for platform, with participants exposed to the video on regular page feeling significantly higher level of mixed affects ($M = 4.38$, $SE = .23$) than did those who were on the amateur platform ($M = 3.72$, $SE = .16$), $F(1, 126) = 4.49$, $p< .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. While there was no main effect for stereotype, $F(1, 126) = 1.50$, $p>.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, the results yielded an Stereotype X Platform interaction effect, $F(1, 126) = 4.02$, $p< .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. This interaction effect showed that while the regular platform made people experienced significantly more mixed effect than the amateur platform did no matter these platforms featured stereotypic or counter-stereotypic videos, people watched the counter-stereotypic videos on the regular platform experience higher levels of mixed affect than (Regular Platform X Stereotypic: $M = 2.02$, $SE = .23$; Regular Platform X Counter-stereotypic: $M = 2.59$, $SE = .18$) those who watched the counter-stereotypic videos on the amateur platform (Amateur Platform X Stereotypic: $M = 1.99$, $SE = .15$; Amateur Platform X Counter-stereotypic: $M = 1.86$, $SE = .15$). Moreover, the participants exposed to the counter-stereotypic video on the regular platform ($M = 2.59$, $SE = .18$) were more likely to have significantly higher level of mixed affects than those who were exposed to the stereotypic video on the regular platform ($M = 2.02$, $SE = .15$).

The univariate analysis for positive affects revealed no significant main effect for platform, $F(1, 126) = .08$, $p>.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$, nor stereotype, $F(1, 126) = 2.44$, $p>.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$.

The univariate analysis for negative affects revealed no significant main effect for platform, $F(1, 126) = 2.98$, $p>.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, nor stereotype, $F(1, 126) = .43$, $p>.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$. 
RQ 6 asked how people’s physical responses varied as a function of platform and stereotype consistency. A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted, treating people’s physical responses as the dependent variables with stereotype and platform to be the two independent variables in the analysis. This analysis revealed as significant main effect for platform, Wilks’ λ = .81, F(11, 160) = 3.03, p<.001, partial η² = .20. However, it revealed no main effect for stereotype, Wilks’ λ = .90, F(11, 160) = 1.54, p>.05, partial η² = .10, nor Stereotype X Platform interaction, Wilks’ λ = .96, F(11, 160) = .67, p>.05, partial η² = .04. Table 12 and Table 13 demonstrated more detailed statistics.

The univariate analyses for rising or open chest and laughter revealed a significant main effect for platform, with participants exposed to the video on regular page experiencing significantly higher level of open chest (M = 2.40, SE = .17) than did those who were on the amateur platform (M = 1.90, SE = .17), F_{open chest}(1, 170) = 4.34, p<.05, partial η² = .03. However, when it came to laughter, people experienced more of it on the amateur platform (M = 2.89, SE = .20) than on the regular platform (M = 2.14, SE = .21), F_{laughter}(1, 170) = 6.90, p<.05, partial η² = .04. Also, the results yielded a main effect for stereotype, F_{open chest}(1, 170) = 4.41, p< .05, partial η² = .03, F_{laughter}(1, 170) = 6.80, p< .05, partial η² = .04. This indicated that the participants exposed to the counter-stereotypic video (M = 2.40, SE = .17) experienced more rising or open chest and laughter than those who exposed to stereotypic video (M = 1.90, SE = .17).

The univariate analyses for warmth in chest and chills only revealed a significant main effect for platform, with participants exposed to the video on regular page experiencing significantly higher level of warmth in chest (M = 2.93, SE = .19) and chills (M = 1.86, SE = .15) than did those who were on the amateur platform (Warmth in Chest: M = 2.19, SE = .19;
Table 12. MANOVA Statistics for Physical Responses as a Function of Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Ratings as a Function of Platform</th>
<th>Amateur</th>
<th>Regular Web</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lump in Throat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.67a</td>
<td>1.77a</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tears Crying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.38a</td>
<td>1.34a</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle Tensed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.78a</td>
<td>1.75a</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising or Open Chest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.90a</td>
<td>2.40b</td>
<td>4.36*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.63a</td>
<td>1.86b</td>
<td>1.22*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth in Chest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.19a</td>
<td>2.93b</td>
<td>7.51*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Heart Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.69a</td>
<td>1.75a</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bouncy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.24a</td>
<td>2.25a</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.58a</td>
<td>2.21a</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.89a</td>
<td>2.14b</td>
<td>6.90**</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscles Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.48a</td>
<td>3.36a</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate: Wilks’ λ = .81, F(11, 160) = 3.03, p<.001, partial η² = .20.
*p<.05, **p<.001, ***p<.001
Table 13. MANOVA Statistics for Physical Responses as a Function of Stereotype Depiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Ratings as a Function of Stereotype</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lump in Throat</td>
<td>1.66a</td>
<td>1.89a</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tears Crying</td>
<td>1.31a</td>
<td>1.41a</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle Tensed</td>
<td>1.76a</td>
<td>1.77a</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising or Open Chest</td>
<td>1.90a</td>
<td>2.40b</td>
<td>4.41*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chills</td>
<td>1.67a</td>
<td>1.82a</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth in Chest</td>
<td>2.48a</td>
<td>2.63a</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Heart Rate</td>
<td>2.04a</td>
<td>2.45a</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bouncy</td>
<td>1.98a</td>
<td>2.80a</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy</td>
<td>1.93a</td>
<td>2.80b</td>
<td>9.80**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td>2.14a</td>
<td>2.89b</td>
<td>6.80**</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscles Relaxed</td>
<td>3.42a</td>
<td>3.42a</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate: Wilks’ $\lambda = .90$, $F(11, 160) = 1.54$, $p>.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .10$

*p<.05, **p<.001, ***p<.001
Chills: M = 1.63, SE = .14), F(1, 170) = 7.51, p< .05, partial η2 = .04. However, the results yielded no main effect for stereotype, F(1, 170) = .31, p> .05, partial η2 = .002.

The univariate analysis for high energy and chills only revealed a significant main effect for stereotype, with participants exposed to the video on the amateur platform experiencing significantly higher level of high energy (M = 2.80, SE = .18) than did those who were on the regular platform (M = 1.93, SE = .19), F(1, 170) = 9.80, p< .01, partial η2 = .05. However, the results yielded no main effect for platform, F(1, 170) = 2.02, p>.05, partial η2 = .01.

When it came to other physical responses, as Table 12 and Table 13 show, the univariate analysis revealed no significant main effect for either platform, stereotype, or Platform X Stereotype interaction.

RQ7 asked how people’s motivations to embody or enact moral virtues varied as a function of platform and stereotype consistency in the video. A 2 (Stereotype) x 2 (Platform) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed, treating people’s motivational responses as the dependent variables with stereotype and platform to be the two independent variables in the analysis. This analysis revealed as significant main effect for platform, Wilks’ λ = .89, F(11, 160) = 1.88, p<.05, partial η2 = .11. However, it revealed no main effect for stereotype, Wilks’ λ = .95, F(11, 160) = .84, p>.05, partial η2 = .05, nor Stereotype X Platform interaction, Wilks’ λ = .95, F(11, 160) = .73, p>.05, partial η2 = .04. See Table 14 and Table 15 for more detailed statistics.

The univariate analyses for “do things to other people,” “seek what really matters,” “live my life a better way,” “adjust my life to what I really want,” and “work hard to achieve success” revealed a significant main effect for platform, with participants exposed to the video on regular page experiencing significantly higher level of these motivational feelings (Do things to other
Table 14. MANOVA Statistics for Motivational Responses as a Function of Platform
Participants’ Ratings as a Function of Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Response</th>
<th>Amateur (M)</th>
<th>Regular Web (M)</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a better person</td>
<td>4.33a</td>
<td>4.87a</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do good things for other people</td>
<td>4.27a</td>
<td>4.90b</td>
<td>4.67*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek what really matters in life</td>
<td>4.27a</td>
<td>4.89b</td>
<td>.4.28*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live my life a better way</td>
<td>3.86a</td>
<td>4.73b</td>
<td>8.50**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust my life to what I really want</td>
<td>3.54a</td>
<td>4.32b</td>
<td>5.64*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make people laugh</td>
<td>3.66a</td>
<td>3.60a</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy myself</td>
<td>4.50a</td>
<td>4.75a</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hard to achieve success</td>
<td>3.51a</td>
<td>4.20a</td>
<td>5.04*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet new friends</td>
<td>3.73a</td>
<td>4.07a</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a lot of money</td>
<td>2.23a</td>
<td>1.25a</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be popular</td>
<td>2.14a</td>
<td>2.13a</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate: Wilks’ λ = .89, F(11, 160) = 1.88, p<.05, partial η² = .11.
*p<.05, **p<.001, ***p<.001
Table 15. MANOVA Statistics for Motivational Responses as a Function of Stereotype Depiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Ratings as a Function of Stereotype</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a better person</td>
<td>M 4.63a</td>
<td>4.58a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do good things for other people</td>
<td>M 4.52a</td>
<td>4.65a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek what really matters in life</td>
<td>M 4.52a</td>
<td>4.65a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live my life a better way</td>
<td>M 4.30a</td>
<td>4.28a</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust my life to what I really want</td>
<td>M 3.87a</td>
<td>3.98a</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make people laugh</td>
<td>M 3.83a</td>
<td>3.86a</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy myself</td>
<td>M 4.51a</td>
<td>4.74a</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .22</td>
<td>.2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hard to achieve success</td>
<td>M 3.78a</td>
<td>3.94a</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet new friends</td>
<td>M 3.88a</td>
<td>3.93a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a lot of money</td>
<td>M 2.33a</td>
<td>2.16a</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be popular</td>
<td>M 2.21a</td>
<td>2.07a</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE .14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate: Wilks’ λ = .95, F(11, 160) = .84, p>.05, partial η² = .05.

*p<.05, **p<.001, ***p<.001
people: M = 4.90, SE = .21; Seek what really matters: M = 4.89, SE = .22; Live my life a better way: M = 4.73, SE = .22; Adjust my life to what I really want: M = 4.31, SE = .23; Work hard to achieve success: M = 4.20, SE = .22) than did those who were on the amateur platform (Do things to other people: M = 4.33, SE = .20, F (1, 170) = 4.67, p< .05, partial η2 = .03; Seek what really matters: M = 4.27, SE = .20, F (1, 170) = 4.28, p< .05, partial η2 = .03; Live my life a better way: M = 3.86, SE = .21, F (1, 170) = 8.50, p< .01, partial η2 = .05; Adjust my life to what I really want: M = 3.54, SE = .23, F (1, 170) = 5.64, p< .05, partial η2 = .03; Work hard to achieve success: M = 3.51, SE = .21, F (1, 170) = 5.04, p< .05, partial η2 = .03). However, the results yielded no main effect for stereotype for the same motivational responses (Do things to other people: F (1, 170) = .18, p> .05, partial η2 = .001; Seek what really matters: F (1, 170) = .18, p> .05, partial η2 = .001; Live my life a better way: F (1, 170) = .01, p> .05, partial η2 = .00; Adjust my life to what I really want: F (1, 170) = .11, p> .05, partial η2 = .001; Work hard to achieve success: F (1, 170) = .28, p> .05, partial η2 = .001).

As the Table 14 and Table 15 shows, when it came to “be a better person,” “make people laugh,” “enjoy myself,” “meet new friends,” and “make a lot of money,” the univariate analysis revealed no significant main effect for neither platform, stereotype, nor Platform X Stereotype interaction.

In sum, the results indicated that the counter-stereotypic depiction in amateur content would encourage people’s counter-stereotypic labeling individuation. Regardless of stereotype depiction, the amateur platform encouraged information seeking individuation. However, the consequent increased information seeking individuation might lead to less positive attitudes towards both the featured transgender person and transgender people as a whole. For attitudes towards the featured person, the regular platform and counter-stereotypic depiction optimized the
viewers’ counter-stereotyping outcome. Aligned with platform’s influence on attitudes towards transgender people, the regular platform elicited significantly higher levels of elevation responses (i.e. affective responses, physical responses, motivational responses).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Contributions

Together, these results contribute to the research in media psychology in a number of aspects. First, it re-examines the continuum model of impression formation in the online amateur setting, taking into the consideration platform and stereotype depiction in content as factors. Second, it operationalizes the individuation in impression formation information as a multidimensional process—information seeking and labeling; that is, this study creates and applies new scales measuring people’s information seeking and labeling as a more comprehensive way that allows researchers to discover the complexity and nuances in the individuation process in various conditions. Third, to go beyond cognitive process responses, this study integrates elevation responses into the theoretical framework to explore the affective and conative processes that influences the outcome of impression formation. Fourth, using experimental design, this research not only goes beyond entertainment portrayals and investigates elevation in response to non-fictional amateur depiction, but also taps into the roles of technology platforms play in elevation responses. Fifth, this study also expands the impression formation theoretical framework through examining whether the outcome of impression formation of an individual in online amateur setting be generalized into people’s emergent perception of and attitudes towards minority social groups. Last, the study also enriches the emerging literature of media effects of amateur content, laying the theoretical foundation for future researchers who are interested in parasocial effects of amateur media.

Implications

In general, our findings revealed that while counter-stereotypic depiction in amateur content prompt individuation and the formation of counter-stereotypic impression, the higher
level of information seeking promoted by the platform did not necessarily lead to forming counter-stereotypic impression. In the labeling dimension of individuation process, people’s impression formation in the context of digital amateur phenomenon is aligned with the rules of the continuum model of impression formation in traditional interpersonal setting. Regardless of the platform, people exposed to the counter-stereotypic depiction of transgender people were more likely to label the featured transgender person with counter-stereotypic labels and to move farther in the individuation process compared to those who were exposed to the stereotypic depiction. In the information seeking dimension of individuation, people in the amateur platform conditions actively explored out more pages and sought more relevant information about transgender people after watch the video than those who watched the same video on a regular platform. However, the amateur platform did not significantly interact with transgender amateur content. Meaning, while counter-stereotypic amateur depiction of transgender people creates stereotype inconsistency for people and encourage counter-stereotypic individuation, the amateur platform’s facilitation in information seeking could lead to counter-stereotypic individuation outcome as well as stereotypic outcome. It is not guaranteed that both dimensions of individuation work together to form impression in the same direction or to the same degree. All in all, more information seeking does not mean better information digestion. These findings revealed the complex and conflictive effects that platform and content might have on impression formation.

The findings thus far suggest that if persuasion and applicability of a specific message are the ultimate result that the content creators or communicators want to achieve, they should focus on depiction and narrative of the content rather than the platform to transmit the content. Depiction and narrative of the content significantly determine how people label and perceive the
person featured in the content. However, if accessibility of information is the ultimate wanted result, the content creator or communicators should choose platforms like YouTube.

When it comes to how impression formation in the digital amateur phenomenon is related to people’s attitudes, the present study shows that people’s generalization of impression formation outcome to attitudes varies in two generalization phases. In the phase of generalizing the impression to a specific outgroup member that individuals encounter, people exposed to a mediated transgender person through regular platform have significantly more positive attitudes towards the featured transgender person. Also, those who are exposed to counter-stereotypic depiction hold significantly more positive attitudes towards the featured transgender person. However, when it comes to the second phase, generalizing the outcome of impression formation of this particular outgroup member to the social group he or she belongs to as a whole, the relationship only exists for depiction. This showed that while platform and depiction both play roles in translating the outcome of impression formation into attitudes for a specific mediated transgender person, depiction is a the key factor in both generalizing people’s attitudes toward the featured person and towards his or her social group as a whole.

While these findings indicate that platform’s facilitation in generalizing attitudes is limited to attitudes towards the mediated person encountered, it should be interpreted with caution. A series of studies revealed that when a certain kind of stereotype inconsistency occurs frequently enough, rather than lead to individuation, this inconsistency instead encourages the creation of new categories and labels to be used (Hastie, Schroeder, & Weber, 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Hutter & Crisp, 2006; Siebler, 2008; Wood & Hutter, 2011, p. 323). The new formed category is called novel incongruent category, it brings in the emergent inconsistent attributes (Hastie, Schroeder, & Weber, 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Hutter & Crisp, 2006;
In the process of forming a new category, the appearance frequency of individuals with certain emergent stereotype-inconsistent attributes matters. It has to go through an accumulation process in people’s mind in order to form a new group, class and category with the mixed attributes. It might also need to experience this accumulative process for people to generalize their attitudes towards an individual to attitudes towards the group that he or she belongs to. However, the experimental design of the present study did not include the examination of repetitive appearance of different transgender individuals and people’s responses over time.

The findings thus far suggest that if content creators want to reshape people’s attitudes towards a specific social group or a subject, depiction and platform both matter. To optimize the result, they should create content that is counter-stereotypic and different from existing normative social narratives, and transmit the content through regular platform rather than a platform like YouTube.

The most striking finding is that people have significantly higher levels of elevation responses—affective, physical, and motivational responses—when they watch to the video through the regular platform than when they watch it through the amateur platform. In previous results, the amateur platform encouraged people’s relevant information seeking. Altogether, information seeking might be negatively associated with the levels of meaningfulness and elevation people receive from the content; over exposure to transgender-related content might lead to less meaningful perception. These results share the direction of and echo the relationship that this study finds between attitudes towards the featured transgender person, labeling categorization, and platform. However, this striking finding might partially due to the perception that people have of YouTube.
This is different from what was expected. Theoretically, the amateur platform’s recommendation and aggregation mechanisms make it easier for audiences to have parasocial contact with transgender persons and to be exposed to more aspects of the featured transgender person so as to know her better. According the Parasocial Contact Hypothesis, frequency and depth of contact with outgoup members could lead to less prejudice. Also, the previous finding of the present study supported the idea that the amateur platform does encourage people to seek more relevant information. With these together, I expected people would have more elevation responses to the featured transgender person. However, the results indicate that when people watch the video on the regular platform and consequently seek less relevant information, they actually have more affective, physical and motivational responses.

To explain the findings in labeling, attitudes and elevation responses that are opposite to the theoretically predicted direction, I look at the following three possibilities. The first one is the relatively more conflictive experience that the audiences gain from more parasocial contact with transgender person through the amateur platform. Conflictive experiences with mediated characters created by opinion differences, interpersonal contact with homosexuals, ideology and SES does significantly influence parasocial contact’s effect on prejudice after exposure (Li, 2013). The larger discrepancy between the opinion of the audience and the minority character is on issues, the higher level of prejudicial attitudes they will have. When people have more parasocial contact experience with transgender individuals, they are more likely to recognize the differences and consequently have less positive attitudes toward transgender people than those who have less exposure and are less encouraged by the platform on to seek more relevant information (Li, 2013). Thus, the aggregation of the content created by the same person on the
amateur platform might increase the amount of conflictive experience that people have, which subsequently lead to less elevation responses.

Second, this might have resulted from the over-exposure of the featured transgender person’s social cues through the amateur platform. Carr, Vitak, and McLaughlin (2013) found that extreme outgroup members who minimize cues to their identity are more socially identifiable to ingroup members than outgroup members who provide numerous cues. The more people know about the featured transgender person’s social cues, the less likely they are to socially identify and have positive perception of transgender people; in other words, less is more.

Additionally, another evidence of over-exposure leading to adverse effect is reflected in repeated exposure—frequency—in advertising, which can also be applied to the amateur content context. While repeated exposure’s influence on online advertising effectiveness is well documented in research literature, whether repeated exposure will increase the likelihood of changing consumer awareness and attitudes towards a brand depends on the time span over which multiple exposures occur (Elmore, 2012). “As inundating someone with a high number of exposures in a short period of time can have an adverse effect” (Elmore, 2012). Similarly, Fombrun and Shanley’s (1990) research on mere exposure found that higher levels of media exposure are associated with lower reputations for companies, even when the mere exposure is mostly positive. Elmore (2012) further revealed that ten is the benchmark; when more than ten exposures are seen within one day, an advertising campaign is significantly more ineffective than those campaign whose impressions are spread out over a month. The average of amount of recommended videos aggregated on a YouTube video page is 16 which is more than 10. This might lead to an adverse effect for amateur videos created by social minority members.
This could also be caused by the stimuli for this study. The main/first video that this study requires students to watch is their video created for the “It Gets Better Campaign,” which includes content that emphasizes sympathy and virtue. This might stimulate high level of elevation responses and social desirability, initially. However, the amateur platform’s mechanism encourages relevant information seeking which reveals more aspects of the featured person. This revelation might show the conflicts and make them realize the differences that individuals have against transgender people, which lowers their elevation responses to featured transgender person in general and takes them out of an elevated state. Also, this might be because the regular platform appears to be more formal and professional as opposed to the amateur platform. When mentioning campaign, people might take message conveyed through relatively formal and professional platforms and presentations more seriously.

Broadly speaking, people’s affective, physical, and motivational responses generally are not significantly different across stereotypic depiction and counter-stereotypic depiction. The results support that counter-stereotypic depiction of transgender people in amateur content facilitates individuation; people exposed to counter-stereotypic depiction score higher in the labeling individuation score. However, when interpreting in the light of the result of elevation responses, this counter-stereotyping outcome of impression formation will not necessarily lead to higher levels of elevation responses. Thus, counter-stereotypic depiction/stereotype inconsistency in amateur content might be a necessary factor for individuation in impression formation process, but it is not an essential factor to make people see it as meaningful mediated content. In other words, stereotypic depiction and its consequent stereotypic perception are not associated with elevation responses.
This insignificance might result from people’s belief of gender binary. Good, Woodzicka, and Wingfield’s (2010) experiment investigated the effect of stereotypic and counter-stereotypic images in textbooks on male and female high school students' science comprehension and anxiety. Their results revealed that ingroup students had significantly lower levels of comprehension after viewing counter-stereotypic images of outgroup members in the textbook than after viewing stereotypic images of ingroup members in the textbook (Good, Woodzicka, & Wingfield, 2010). This might shed light on why there is no significant difference in our participants’ elevation responses across stereotypic and counter-stereotypic conditions. Most people only react to counter-stereotypic depictions in a comprehensive and meaningful manner when the depicted target falls into the gender binary that they believe in. They feel more challenged when the other side of the long-established binary appears different from the stereotypes; they do not feel as challenged when it comes to new gender preference categories.

Among affective responses, only meaningful affect and mixed affect are significantly different across platforms; people watching the amateur videos through regular platform have significantly higher levels of meaningful affect and mixed affect. However, positive affect and negative affect are not significantly different across platforms. This might indicate that instead of eliciting negative or positive responses, the regular platform evokes mixed and meaningful affects that make them think about transgender people rather than make dichotomous judgments. Individuals are left to reflect without additional information counteracting the effect. This also explains why platform leads to people’s counter-stereotyping relabeling after exposure, but does not result in or guarantee an attitude difference.

Also, the interaction effect of platform stereotype depiction for mixed affect showed that people watched the counter-stereotypic videos on the regular platform experience higher levels
of mixed affect than those who watched the counter-stereotypic videos on the amateur platform. Along with the previous discussion, this finding suggests that the combination of regular platform and counter-stereotypic depiction will optimize the outcomes of mixed affect.

Among physical responses, “rising or open chest,” “chills,” and “warmth in chest” will significantly different across platforms in the same direction, while “laughter” is of significant difference across platforms in an opposite direction. While people experience higher levels of “rising or open chest,” “chills,” and “warmth in chest” on the regular platform, they experience higher levels of “laughter” on the amateur platform. Given that the group of “rising or open chest,” “chills” and “warmth in chest,” and “laughter” are physical responses that reflect two different kinds of emotions, this might indicate that the amateur platform and its consequent over-exposure and information seeking make the videos to be perceived as more of an entertaining material that leads to “laughter.” On the other hand, regular platform and its consequent less information seeking and exposure result in a more poignant experience, “rising or open chest,” “chills,” and “warmth in chest”.

Among motivational responses, “do good thing for other people,” “seek what really matters in life,” “live my life a better way,” “adjust my life to what I really want,” and “work hard to achieve success” are all significantly different across platforms in the same direction. People have such motivations more when they watch the videos on the regular platform. Compared to those motivational statements that are not of significant difference, these statements all reflect a sense of truth seeking; the other insignificant statements are more pragmatic. This, as a result, indicates that the regular platform and its consequent less information seeking and exposure lead to more truth-seeking motivations for people.
As discussed above, while platforms like YouTube prompt individuation process in impression formation through encouraging relevant information seeking, the stereotype inconsistency created by the stereotype depiction in amateur determined relabeling attributes for the target person. More information seeking and its consequent over exposure on the amateur platform might lead to less positive attitudes toward the target person as opposed to less information seeking and exposure on a regular platform. Similarly, high levels of information seeking and its consequent over exposure encouraged by the amateur platform might lead to significantly less elevation responses. However, the stereotype depiction in the amateur content does not play a crucial role in cultivating elevation responses. In general, this study revealed that amateur content and platform are not necessary the promoting factors for the counter-stereotyping of social minority groups; platforms, depictions, and ultimate communication goals need to be tailored and taken into consideration for each other.

Limitations

Using an experimental framework to examine a fairly new area of study can have its setbacks, and this thesis was no exception. There were a number of limitations to this project that stood in the way of stronger results and more concrete overall findings. First of all, the regular platform and amateur platform are fluid to produce definite platform stimuli for the experimental design. Even though the regular platform is designed to resemble opinion blog so as to differentiate it from amateur platform like YouTube, there is still a tension between levels of amateurism and professionalism. However, one could argue that regular platform different from amateur platform is a very broad concept and could include blog, collective citizen journalism. Also, amateur platform could be venues like Reddit and Vimeo. Even though these platforms in these two categories share might similar levels of amateurism and professionalism, the features
and mechanism of these platforms may vary. A study appearing to compare only YouTube and opinion blog might not be sufficient enough to be generalized to analyze the differences in platforms that has different amateur levels. It calls for future studies examining different platforms in these two categories. Because of the fluidity of amateur and professional platforms, a meta-analysis using the data from these studies might be more convincing.

Second, the validity of the IAT (Implicit Association Test) measurement that the study utilizes to measure implicit attitudes towards transgender people is questionable on two levels. One is the construct validity. The IAT was adapted based on the IAT that Graham and Cnaan (2012) created for measuring attitudes towards homosexuals. They placed the paring of homosexuals with good before the paring of homosexuals with bad; this order might shorten the reaction time for the latter paring and weaken the test’s ability to reflect the prejudicial attitudes. The other is the concurrent validity. According to Greenwald et al.’s (2009) estimation, the average predictive validity of the IAT was $r = .29$ against behavioral criterion. On the other hand, the average predictive validity of self-report measures was estimated to be $r = .36$ against behavioral criterion. The explicit measures fared better than the IAT predictive validity but it is important to note that for socially sensitive topics “the predictive validity of IAT measures significantly exceeded the predictive validity of self-report measures” (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009, p. 32)

Third, the nature of the selected social minority group might prevent the IAT from measuring and calculating the reaction time accurately. For homosexuals, its opposition is heterosexuals which is a concept with a group of words/vocabularies that are widely accepted by the general public. However, for transgender people, the opposite is cisgender which is a concept with limited vocabularies that has not been widely used and accepted by the society. Even
though our adaption of IAT avoided those newly developed words, the synonyms of cisgender might lead to slower or same reaction time because of processing and comprehension of such words. As a result, it might influence the scores from this IAT for transgender people.

However, the use of this new IAT should also be seen as a strength of the study. It breaks the new ground in developing an IAT measurements for transgender people. It sets the baseline and starting point for future researchers who are interested in further improving implicit attitudes measures of social minority groups with growing attributes that general audiences are not familiar with.

Fourth, to measure elevation responses, this study applied the items developed by Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley (2012). The instruments for elevation might suffer from the disadvantages of self-reports. Also, the physical responses are measured through a series of statements rather than physiological measurement. All the textual statements have some kinds of emotion indication to some degree. People might interpret them differently. This might influence the validity and reliability of these measurements.

The sample of the study was predominately female, which might not be ideal for the nature of this study. Several studies in different regions and countries revealed that females were more tolerant and more likely to have positive attitudes towards transgender people than males were (Tee & Hegarty, 2006; Nagoshi, Adams, Terrell, Hill, Brzuzy, & Nagoshi, 2008). As a result, females could be more likely to have relatively positive attitudes regardless of the stereotype depictions. Together, these might explain why the present study does not find significant differences across stereotype depictions in amateur content for information seeking, attitudes towards transgender people in general, and elevation responses. Future research should be conducted to address this possibility.
Last but not least, the results of examining social minority groups as targets might not be able to be generalized to answer the online impression formation of other forms of targets, such as brand, places, animals. Also, amateur platform is only one of the many digital platforms available. For example, it would be interesting to investigate people’s impression formation process of a city or village through multidimensional Google Map platform. Moreover, the process of impression formation of transgender people in the digital amateur setting might not be able to be generalized into the impression formation of other social groups.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

If the reverse directions of findings are the result of multiple exposures, future researchers need to include the amount of exposure as a moderator to see how it navigates the impression formation process. Amount of exposure to a certain featured person through a platform is especially important when it comes to digital setting. With the consideration of recommendation system, aggregative newsfeed, the user’s visiting history as input back to the system, and the user’s motivation to check out the content, exposure in the digital setting is transforming into a variable wrestling between controlling and being controlled.

Social cues should also been considered as a moderator in impression formation in the digital amateur setting. According to Carr, Vitak, and McLaughlin’s (2013) finding, people who minimize social cues attached to their identity are significantly more socially identifiable by outgroup members. If so, including social cues as a variable might allow future researchers to know the how many and what kinds of social cues people need to start resisting the depiction and having negative attitudes toward the target. This is a crucial moderator for digital amateur settings because this culture is immersively presented in multimedia forms revolving around social cues, visual cues and audio cues. These cues supplement with each other to reshape
people’s online impression formation. Research with variables that is specified to social cues can also provide practitioners with strategic advice what social cues to avoid when their goals is to reshape impression or attitudes.

Future researchers should try to stabilize the gender numbers in their samples in order to test the gender effect. As previously discussed, the predominant female sample and females’ high tolerance for transgender people could be the reason why this study does not find effect for stereotypic depictions most dependent variables. The low amount of male participants in the present study keeps the researcher from examining whether such gender difference in attitudes also exists when contacting with mediated social minority members.

Moreover, further research should investigate how the information dynamics in the online amateur setting influence minority amateur content creators’ self perception and their content creation. Existing research showed that marginalized members could internalize both stereotypic and counter-stereotypic characteristics that media presented of their social groups (Rivadeneyra, Ward, & Gordon, 2007). It might be also true that the promoting and incentive mechanisms like viewing counting, comments, partnerships with the platform might change the information dynamic, and minority content creators’ self-perception and content creations. Through this, we would know whether amateur culture actually takes advantage of the platforms and provides counter-stereotypic labels or just another venue to populate mainstream stereotypes.

While the present study tapped into three dimensions of transgender stereotypes—Eccentric Qualities, Positive Qualities, and Pseudo Qualities, other elements associated with stereotypes of transgender people that go beyond physical appearance also need to be addressed. Because these three dimensions are extracted from the word associations that exist in qualitative literature about the representation of transgender people in movies, which might limit the our
ability to explore and discover what general audience actually see as the stereotypes of transgender people. Future research should conduct focus groups to enrich the quantitative literature on stereotypes of transgender people from the perspective of general audiences.

I encourage future researchers to investigate other aspects of amateurism. Amateurism is not only about social groups and media productions, it is also a crucial and long existing part of social ecology. It is very important to look at how technology prompts the growth of the amateur culture, and to investigate its outcomes in relations to the rearrangement of various social powers. For example, amateurism and technology interact with each other to rearrange inter-group relationships, online information dynamics, political dynamics, and developments of collective activities. Its living and changing outcomes lead to the rise and the demise of global digital activism like Occupy Wall Street. Amateurism is still an element and subject that is not paid enough attention to with quantitative and media effects approach in academia.
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APPENDIX 1
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE IMPLICIT ASSOCIATION TEST (IAT) OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRANSGENDER PEOPLE

(Instruction page 1)
Hey there,
Lay back and relax.
Press SPACE to start our experiment!

Please review words associated with the categories of heterosexuality, homosexuality, good and bad.

Non-transgender: biological male, non-trans, biological female, non-transgender, real women, real men, gender-normative, mentally and physically matched sex

Transgender: trans, transgenderism, transsexual, tranny, female-to-male, male-to-female, gender reassignment, mentally and physically matched sex

Good: good, honest, respectable, ethical, moral, principled, right-minded, and honorable
Bad: bad, immoral, corrupt, disgraceful, perverse, shameful, dishonest, and unethical

Press the SPACE BAR to begin

(Instruction page 2)

Transgender

Non-transgender

Put your middle or index finger on the E and I keys of your keyboard.
Words representing the categories at the top will appear one-by-one in the middle of the screen.
When the item belongs to a category on the left, press the E key; when the item belongs to a category on the right, press the I key. Items belong to only one category. If you make an error, an X will appear – fix the error by hitting the other key.

This is a timed sorting task. GO AS FAST AS YOU CAN while making as few mistakes as possible, going to slow or making too many errors will result in an un-interpretable score. This task will take about 5 minutes to complete.

Press the SPACE BAR to begin

(Instruction page 3)
The first task has the word homosexual in the right upper hand corner and the work heterosexual in the left upper hand corner.
The terms representing the words of homosexual and heterosexual are alternated one at a time in the middle of the screen in the color white and the subject must press the E or I key that corresponds to the words of homosexual or heterosexual.

(Instruction page 4)

Good

Bad

See above, the categories have changed. The items for sorting have changed as well. The rules, however, are the same. When the item belongs to a category on the left, press the E key; when the item belongs to a category on the right, press the I key. Items belong to only one category. An X appears after an error—fix the error by hitting the other key. Go As FAST AS YOU CAN.

Press the SPACE BAR to begin

(Instruction page 5)

The first task has the word good (in a bright green color with a black background) in the right upper hand corner and the word bad in the left upper hand corner. The terms representing the words of good and bad are alternated one at a time and the subject must press the E or I key that corresponds to the words of good and bad.

(Instruction page 6)

Transgender

Or

Good

Non-transgender

Or

Bad

See above, the four categories you saw separately now appear together. Remember, each item belongs to only one group. For example, if the word GAY appear, press E—it only belongs to category Homosexual, not the category Good. Use the E and I keys to categorize items into four groups left and right, and correct errors by hitting the other key.

Press the SPACE BAR to begin

(Instruction page 7)

Non-transgender

Homosexual
Notice above, there are only two categories and they have switched positions. The concept that was on the right is now on the left. Practice this new configuration. Use the E and I keys to categorize items left and right, and correct errors by hitting the other key.

Press the SPACE BAR to begin

(Instruction page 8)

Non-transgender  Transgender
    Or            Or
   Good          Bad

See above, the four categories now appear together in a new configuration. Remember, each item belongs to only one group. Use the E and I keys to categorize items into the four groups left and right, and correct errors by hitting the other key.

Press the SPACE BAR to begin

(Conclusion page)

Thank you for participating=}
APPENDIX 2
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please type in your condition number. If you forget your condition number, please raise your hand to ask the researcher.

Information Seeking Individuation

Did you click or watch any of the recommended videos on the right of the assigned YouTube page?

- Yes
- No

Please type the number of the videos that you clicked in the box below: (How many videos did you watch?)

Did you check out any content other than the assigned page and its linked contents?

- Yes
- No

Please recall among the external contents that you checked out, how many of them are relevant to LGBT? Type the number that you estimate in the box below.
**Labeling Individuation**

Which of the words and phrases listed below best describe the person featured in the video(s) that you just watched? If the word reflects how you think of the featured person, type in -1; If not, keep 0 the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freakish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamboyant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of the words and phrases listed below best describe the person featured in the video(s) that you just watched? If the word reflects how you think of the featured person, type in 1; If not, keep 0 the box.

Pure
Normal
Honest
Ingenuous
moral
Fortunate
Ordinary
Unflashy
Plain
Natural
Explicit Attitudes towards Transgender People

Using a scale from zero to 100, please tell us your personal feelings toward each of the following groups. As you do this task, think of an imaginary thermometer. The warmer or more favorable you feel toward the group, the higher the number you should give it. The colder or less favorable you feel, the lower the number. If you feel neither warm nor cold toward the group, rate it 50.

(*TYPE IN ONLY NUMBERS RANGING FROM 0 TO 100).

Republicans

Democrats

Transgender People

Homosexuals

Attitudes towards the Featured Transgender Person

I'd like to get your feelings toward the person featured in the first video you just watched. I'd like you to rate this person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorable toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. Type in your rating of the person in the video in below box. (*TYPE IN ONLY NUMBERS RANGING FROM 0 TO 100).
## Elevation Responses

### Affective Responses

How much do you experience each affect listed below while viewing this person's video(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Touch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbeat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melancholy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Physical Responses**

How much do you experience each physical response listed below while viewing this person's video(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump in Throat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tears Crying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscles Tensed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising or Open Chest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth in Chest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Heart Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bouncy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscles Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Motivational Responses**

How much do you think the video may have you to behave in the ways in below while viewing this person's video(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheerful</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a better person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De good things for other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek what really matters in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live my life a better way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust my life to what I really want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make people laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hard to achieve success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet new friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a lot of money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

How many hours do you spend on below media in a regular week (including weekends)? Please type in the numbers that you estimate in below boxes:

You Tube

Facebook/Twitter/Instagram

Blog

TV

Newspaper (Paper and digital versions; News Websites)

Magazine

According to Gallup national survey in 2012, 9 million adults in the United States self-identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender.

What do you identify your sex orientation?

- [ ] Heterosexual/straight
- [ ] Bisexual
- [ ] Homosexual/Gay/Lesbian
- [ ] Unsure/Questioning
What’s your biological gender?

- Male
- Female

What is your ethnicity? (Please choose any or all that apply)

- American Indian
- Asian-American/Oriental/Pacific Islander
- Asian East Indian
- Black/African-American
- Mexican-American/Chicano
- Puerto-Rican
- Other Hispanic
- White/Caucasian
- Other

What’s your age? (Enter only digits of your age below)

[ ]
What is the income of your household growing up?

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000 to $19,999
- $20,000 to $29,999
- $30,000 to $39,999
- $40,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $59,999
- $60,000 to $69,999
- $70,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $89,999
- $90,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 or more

If you are currently enrolled as an undergraduate, which classification are you?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Not Enrolled
What is your mother’s highest level of education?

- High School or GED
- Technical school
- Some college
- Bachelor’s degree
- Graduate degree
- Post graduate or professional (Ph.D., M.D., J.P. etc.)

What is your father’s highest level of education?

- High School or GED
- Technical school
- Some college
- Bachelor’s degree
- Graduate degree
- Post graduate or professional (Ph.D., M.D., J.P. etc.)
Please indicate the political party with which you are most closely aligned:

- Republican
- Democratic
- Libertarian
- Independent
- Green
- Other (please specify)

What is your political ideology?

- Strongly conservative
- Conservative, not strongly
- More conservative than liberal
- Moderate
- More liberal than conservative
- Liberal, not strongly
- Strongly liberal
How often you attend religious activities in the past six months? (religious attendance)

- Never
- Once, few times
- 1 – 3 times per month
- Weekly or more often

Please indicate the religion with which you are most closely aligned

- Baptist
- Protestant
- Catholic
- Unitarian Universalist
- Nondenominational
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Buddhism
- Agnostic
- Atheist
- Other (please specify)
Please indicate whether your church's teachings are:

- [ ] Strongly conservative
- [ ] Conservative, not strongly
- [ ] More conservative than liberal
- [ ] Moderate
- [ ] More liberal than conservative
- [ ] Liberal, not strongly
- [ ] Strongly liberal
APPENDIX 3
STIMULI SCREENSHOTS

Condition 1: Stereotypic Depiction on Amateur Platform

Condition 2: Stereotypic Depiction on Regular Platform
Condition 3: Counter-stereotypic Depiction on Amateur Platform

Condition 4: Counter-stereotypic Depiction on Regular Platform

Thousands of people like me have posted personal testimonies to YouTube in an online campaign titled “It Gets Better.” The campaign is intended to help LGBT teenagers who feel isolated and suicidal.
APPENDIX 4
IRB APPROVAL AND CONSENT FORM

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/projects using living humans as subjects, or samples, or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

Applicant, please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-F, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at http://sites01.lsu.edu/wp/ored/human-subjects-screening-committee-members/

A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:
(A) A copy of this completed form and a copy of parts B thru F.
(B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to parts 1 & 2)
(C) Copies of all instruments to be used.
   *If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
(D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)
(E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (http://phrpp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php)
(F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: https://sites01.lsu.edu/wp/ored/files/2013/07/Security-of-Data-Agreement.pdf

1) Principal Investigator: Minjie Li
   Dept: Mansfield School of Mass Comm
   Ph: (225)-773-8015
   E-mail: ml16@tigers.lsu.edu

2) Co Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each
   Meghan Sanders
   Mansfield School of Mass Communication
   Associate Dean for Sponsored Research and Programs
   Phone: (225) 578-7380
   Email: msanders@lsu.edu

3) Project Title: Impression formation on YouTube: The power of aggregation and amateurs.

4) Proposal? (yes or no) No
   If Yes, LSU Proposal Number
   Also, if YES, either
   ○ This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant
   OR
   ○ More IRB Applications will be filed later

5) Subject pool (e.g., Psychology Students) Undergraduate Students
   *Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children, the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

6) PI Signature [Signature]
   Date 01/30/2014
   (No per signatures)
   **I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changed, I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for two years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Screening Committee Action: Exempted [ ] Not Exempted [ ] Category/Paragraph [ ]
Signed Consent Waived? [ ] Yes / [ ] No
Reviewer [ ] Mathews [ ] Signature [ ] Mathews [ ] Date 2/7/14
INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH STUDY
Louisiana State University

Title of project: Impression Formation on YouTube: The Power of Aggregation and Amateurs.

Person in Charge: Minjie Li
Manship School of Mass Communication
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803 (225) 773-8015 mli16@lsu.edu
Hours available by phone: M-F 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Co-Investigator: Meghan S. Sanders, 211 Journalism Building
Manship School of Mass Communication
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
(225) 578-7380 msand@lsu.edu
Hours available by phone: M-W 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

1. Purpose of Study: The purpose of this research is to examine how YouTube videos created by social minority members influence outgroup people’s perception of social minority groups. Individuals participating in the research will be asked to complete a questionnaire before and after exposure to YouTube videos created by YouTubers from various social minority groups. By conducting this study, we hope to extend our understanding of individuals’ psychological response to such viewing experiences.

2. Procedures to be followed: If you agree to take part in this research, you will be asked to:

   • You will attend a study session at the Media Effects Lab, during which you will watch a series of videos clips from selected from YouTube. Following the viewing of the clips, you will complete an online computer-based questionnaire designed to assess your perceptions of the people featured.
   • The questionnaire will also ask you to report your general media habits and preferences, and demographic information.

3. Discomforts and Risks: This study involves minimal risk; that is, no risks to your physical or mental health beyond those encountered in the normal course of everyday life.
4. **Benefits:**
   
a. The benefits to participants include learning about you as a media consumer. You will have a better understanding of how media content influences attitudes and perceptions of yourself as a user.

   b. The benefits of this study to society include a better understanding of the mechanisms through which media content influences attitudes and perceptions, which could help plan programs, improve content on the Web, make media consumers part of a more critical audience/user group.

5. **Duration:** It will take no longer than 1 hour to complete participation in this study.

6. **Statement of Privacy:** All of your responses in this study are confidential and anonymous. No identifying information will be included on any of the answers that you provide. If this research is presented or published, no information that would identify you will be included since your name is in no way linked to your responses. Your anonymity will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Specifically, no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by third parties.

7. **Right to ask questions:** You have the right to ask questions at any point in time about the research. The person in charge will answer your questions. Contact Dr. Meghan Sanders (msand@lsu.edu) at 225-578-7380 or Minjie Li (ml16@lsu.edu) at 225-773-8015 with questions. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225)578-8692.

8. **Voluntary:** Your participation is also voluntary. You are free to stop participating in the research at any time, or to decline to answer any specific questions without penalty.

9. **Compensation:** Participation is purely voluntary and no compensation will be provided for participation beyond that which is already established for members of the Manship School Subject Pool. Subject pool participants will receive participation credit for a class from which they were recruited as allowed by their instructor. There is another option to participating to receive the extra credit. This option is to complete a response paper to a reading, assigned by the researcher-in-charge. The person in charge will provide an instruction sheet containing information on how to write the alternate assignment.

Completion and return of questionnaires or verbal agreement to answer questions, implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to participate in the research.

Please keep this page for a personal copy of this informed consent form.

**STUDY EXEMPTED BY:**
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
130 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 / www.lsu.edu/jrb
Exemption Expires: 2/6/2017
VITA

Minjie Li was born in Hainan, a tropical island in China. He moved to Beijing and earned his bachelor’s degree in journalism from China Institute of Industrial Relations in July 2011. He worked as a journalist and digital editor for the 2008 Beijing Olympics Official Website. After that, Minjie started working towards his master’s in mass communication from the Manship School of Mass Communication at Louisiana State University. During his graduate education, Minjie served as a graduate assistant to the Media Effects Lab, Dr. Meghan Sanders, and Dr. Amy Reynolds. He expects to graduate in May 2014. Following graduation, Minjie will begin his doctoral studies and pursue a career in academia.