

Regulatory motivations in celebrity interest: Self-suppression and self-expansion

John Maltby<sup>a\*</sup> and Liz Day<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> College of Medicine, Biological Sciences, and Psychology, Henry Wellcome Building, Leicester University, Lancaster Road, Leicester, England, LE1 9HN.

<sup>b</sup> Department of Psychology, Sociology and Politics, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, United Kingdom.

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 1162522482. E-mail address: [jm148@le.ac.uk](mailto:jm148@le.ac.uk)

## Abstract

Due to concerns regarding the theoretical and empirical contexts that surround the description of celebrity interest, the current studies examined the development of a measure of two self-regulatory motivations in celebrity interest (RMiCI): self-suppression and self-expansion. Across two samples (total  $n = 527$ ), scores on an adapted version of Stenseng, Rise, and Kraft's (2012) Escapism Scale demonstrated a replicable two-factor structure, concurrent and convergent with other measures of celebrity interest and the biopsychological theory of personality. Scores on the measure also demonstrated discriminant and predictive validity in terms of divergent associations between self-suppression and self-expansion with positive and negative affect respectively. These current findings add to the celebrity interest literature, focussing on regulatory processes in celebrity interest.

**KEY WORDS:** celebrity; regulatory; suppression; expansion

## Regulatory motives for celebrity interest: Self-suppression and self-expansion

Not only do celebrities form a major part of the foundation of popular media and culture, they are potentially seen as valuable to education (e.g. science, Krauss, 2015), social structures and dynamics (e.g. femininity and social class, Tyler & Bennett, 2009) and economics (e.g. sales and stock returns, Elberse & Verleun, 2012). However, despite this dominance across popular culture, our structural understanding of how individuals psychologically relate to celebrities is largely underdeveloped.

The individual difference approach to exploring the structure of interest in celebrities has used the Celebrity Attitude Scale (McCutcheon, Lange, & Houran, 2002) to describe individual differences in attitudinal orientations towards celebrities within a general continuum anchored by low and high celebrity interest. Factor analytic studies of scores obtained on the Celebrity Attitude Scale suggest that celebrity interest (referred to in these studies as celebrity worship or celebrity attitude) typically comprises three orientations: *entertainment-social*, where the attraction to the celebrity results from their perceived ability to entertain and become a social focus; *intense-personal*, reflecting personal intensive and compulsive feelings about the celebrity; and *borderline pathological*, typified by self-reports of uncontrollable behaviours and fantasies regarding the celebrity (Maltby, Houran, Lange, Ashe, & McCutcheon, 2002; Maltby, Day, McCutcheon, Houran, & Ashe, 2006; Swami et al., 2011). Research has demonstrated that there is value in making these distinctions in terms of orientation, albeit this value is largely limited to the distinction between entertainment-social and intense-personal factors. For example, an entertainment-social orientation is related to extraversion and a higher attachment to one's peers in adolescence (Maltby, Houran, & McCutcheon, 2003; Giles & Maltby, 2004). An intense-personal orientation is related to neuroticism, fantasy proneness, lower levels of secure attachments, depression and poor body image, and incidence of cosmetic surgery (Giles & Maltby, 2004; Maltby & Day,

2011; Maltby et al., 2003; Maltby et al., 2006; Maltby, Giles, Barber & McCutcheon, 2005; Swami et al., 2011).

However, some authors have been critical of that work for the lack of theoretical value and difficult terminology used in employing the Celebrity Attitude Scale (e.g. Stever, 2011). For example, the most used context is the absorption-addiction hypothesis (McCutcheon et al., 2002) that describes an increased severity in celebrity interest from entertainment-social, through intense-personal, to borderline pathological, which at its highest level is thought to result in a compromised identity structure and a greater identification with a celebrity. The argument is that the current theoretical suggestions proposed around celebrity interest leave little room for empirical assessment, particularly in terms of non-clinical contexts. Stever (2011) argues there are a number of “serious fans” who do not meet any criteria for pathology related to celebrity worship, and certainly there is an emphasis on exploring celebrity interest within the context of everyday activities, beyond simply viewing fandom as fulfilling entertainment and social needs.

To address this deficit in the literature, we adopt an approach used in the leisure activity literature that explores regulatory motives when investing interest in a particular activity. The dualistic model of leisure activity engagement (Stenseng, Rise, & Kraft, 2012) is based on Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) that suggests two self-regulatory focuses: *promotion focus* or *self-expansion*, in which the individual seeks self-expansion motivated by personal growth, and *prevention focus* or *self-suppression*, in which the motivation centres on the suppression of negative outcomes in relation to personal goals or negative evaluation by others (Stenseng et al., 2012). Given that an interest in celebrities (be they film, music, or sports celebrities, the most common types reported to be followed [Maltby et al., 2002]) is, in the first instance, designed to fill individuals' time, we suggest that applying the leisure activity engagement model to measure celebrity interest is of value. However, unlike

Stenseng et al. (2012) who focussed on specific favourite leisure time activities, we focus on those activities relating to a particular celebrity.

We consider four key aspects in developing a measure of regulatory motivations in celebrity interest (RMiCI). The first is to examine whether scores obtained from the RMiCI measure assess two replicable factors (self-suppression and self-expansion). The second is to examine the concurrent validity of scores on the RMiCI measure based on statistically significant positive associations with the Celebrity Attitude Scale subscales, which would demonstrate that they could be considered within a wider continuum of low versus high celebrity interest. Third is to consider the convergent validity between scores on the RMiCI measure and a measure reflecting a concordant model of motivation, namely reinforcement sensitivity theory (RST). Gray's (1987) RST suggests three neuropsychological systems: the behavioural approach system (BAS) and two that focus on negative motivations, namely the behavioural inhibition system (BIS) and the fight-flight-freeze system (FFFS) (Gray & McNaughton, 2000). The BAS incorporates an individual's motivations to seek and pursue potential rewards. The BIS comprises anxiety motivations that make the individual sensitive to punishment and avoidant of particular routes in seeking goals. The FFFS is the system mediating fight or flight responses to threat. It is predicted that RMiCI self-expansion is concerned with motivations for personal growth and RMiCI self-suppression is concerned with the suppression of negative outcomes. Thus, we predict that RMiCI self-expansion would be related to the BAS, and RMiCI self-suppression would be related to aspects of the BIS. Given that, generally, there is no implicit threat in activities related to celebrity, we would expect there to be no relationship between celebrity interest and the FFFS. The fourth aspect of our research is to consider the convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity of scores on the RMiCI measure by replicating the differential finding that self-expansion (through activity engagement) and self-suppression (through activity prevention) are

associated with, and also predict over time, higher levels of positive and negative affect respectively (Stenseng et al., 2012).

In the current study we seek to develop and evaluate a scale that measures both self-expansion and self-suppression in celebrity interest, named RMiCI, following the literature detailing the leisure activity engagement model (Stenseng et al., 2012) and RFT (Higgins, 1997, 1998). The aim of Study 1 was to examine whether scores on a measure developed to assess RMiCI demonstrate a replicable two-factor structure comprising self-expansion and self-suppression. The aim of Study 2 was to examine the concurrent, convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity of scores on a RMiCI measure as compared to scores on the Celebrity Attitude Scale, and measures of the biopsychological theory of personality and affect.

### Study 1

The aim of Study 1 was to examine whether scores on a measure developed to assess RMiCI demonstrate a replicable two-factor structure comprising self-expansion and self-suppression.

#### *Method*

*Samples.* Two data samples were collected for this study from two consecutive cohorts of undergraduate students across two years. Sample 1 was used for an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and Sample 2 for a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The first sample comprised 276 undergraduates (38 males and 238 females), aged 18 to 47 years ( $M = 19.88$  years,  $SD = 2.8$ ), with the majority of the respondents being of a white ethnicity ( $n = 169$ ), followed by South Asian ( $n = 29$ ), although 25 respondents did not reveal their ethnicity. The second sample comprised 167 undergraduates (30 males and 133 females), aged from 18 to 35 years ( $M = 19.77$  years,  $SD = 1.4$ ), with the majority of respondents again being of a white ethnicity ( $n = 94$ ), again followed by South Asian ( $n = 25$ ).

The participants were volunteers from an experiment participation scheme whereby students take part in experiments in return for being able to recruit participants to their own research projects. The studies were advertised and the volunteers signed up and completed the studies online via an electronic survey system. If participants wished to withdraw from the study, this was done via the system, with incomplete data not recorded on the system. The survey system was set up so as to prevent individuals from taking part in the study twice.

*Measures.* We administered an amended version of Stenseng et al.'s (2012) Escapism Scale that used administration instructions from the Celebrity Attitude Scale (McCutcheon et al., 2002). Respondents were asked to identify a favourite celebrity, defining the term “celebrity” as a famous living person (or one who had died during the respondent's lifetime) whom the respondent greatly admired. Respondents were then asked to answer 11 items from the Escapism Scale, with a slight amendment to the scale's prefix for the items to: “When I engage in my activity related to my favourite celebrity. . . .”. Responses were recorded on a seven-point scale as used for the Escapism Scale, from “1 = *do not agree at all*” to “7 = *completely agree*”.

*Ethical Consent.* The study procedure for this study, and that described for Study 2, received ethical approval from a University's Psychology Ethics Board and respondents provided consent via the electronic survey, where they had to indicate agreement before proceeding with the survey.

### *Results*

The first step of the analysis was to determine the factor structure of the data using the data from Sample 1 ( $n = 276$ ). Scores for the 11 items were subjected to maximum likelihood analysis (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = .893; Bartlett's test of sphericity = 2214.14,  $df = 55$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The decision as to the number of factors to retain is very important when carrying out EFA. Typically, this is based on the K1 method

(eigenvalues greater than one; Kaiser, 1960), a scree plot (Cattell, 1966), and parallel analysis of Monte Carlo simulations (Horn, 1965), which allows the eigenvalues to be compared to those that might be expected from purely random data with no structure. For this analysis, the K1 method suggested three factors, due to the first two eigenvalues being above 1 (5.96 [54.18% of the variance] and 1.95 [17.72% of the variance]). The scree plot suggested a flattening of the scree at the third plotted eigenvalue, suggesting two factors. In the parallel analysis of the current data, the third eigenvalue (5.96, 1.95, and .67) failed to exceed the third mean eigenvalue (1.33, 1.23 and 1.16) calculated from 1,000 datasets generated with 276 cases and 11 variables, also suggesting a two-factor solution. As a result of these analyses, a two-factor solution was explored using promax rotation (see Table 1). The aim was to find the simplest structure (where svariables load highly onto one and only one factor) and the most parsimonious description (i.e., concurrent with both theory and factor-analytic findings; Carroll, 1953; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Meaningful loadings were assessed using the criteria of .32 (*Poor*), .45 (*Fair*), .55 (*Good*), .63 (*Very good*), and .71 (*Excellent*) (Comrey & Lee, 1992; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Initial findings from the analysis suggested that the items loaded on their expected scales. The items for self-suppression (item 1 through to item 6) and self-expansion (item 7 through to item 11) were all above .55, suggesting that all the item loadings were at least “good”. However, it is worth noting that four self-suppression items and four self-expansion items had loadings of above .71, suggesting that four item versions, with loadings considered “excellent”, might present an opportunity for improved assessment of the self-suppression and self-expansion dimensions when applied to celebrity interest. The development of four item scales also exceeds the recommendation of a minimum of three items for scales (Little, Lindenberger, & Nesselroade, 1999; Spector, 1992; Velicer & Fava, 1998).

- Insert Table 1 about here -

To explore the structural validity of a two-factor interpretation of celebrity interest, a series of comparisons using CFA was performed with AMOS 22 software. A key focus point of CFA is to demonstrate the incremental value of proposed models (Barrett, 2007). Three possible models were tested for goodness-of-fit. The first model was a one-factor model, proposing that all 11 items loaded on one factor reflecting an underlying latent factor structure of celebrity interest. The second model was a two-factor model proposing that the 11 items loaded on two factors: self-suppression (item 1 to item 6) and self-expansion (item 7 to item 11). The third model was a two-factor model, using those items that the EFA reported as loading above .71; this model proposed that the eight items loaded on two factors: self-suppression (item 3 to item 6) and self-expansion (item 7 to item 10). In each of the two-factor models, the latent variables were allowed to co-vary.

To assess the goodness-of-fit of the data, we looked at the five statistics recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999) and Kline (2005): the chi-square ( $X^2$ ), the comparative fit index (CFI), the non-normed fit index (NNFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Additionally, we obtained the relative chi-square (CMIN/DF) as well as the chi-square, degrees of freedom and NFI because this was reported by Stenseng for the Escapism Scale.

We used the following criteria to assess whether the model fit was adequate (noting that any chi-square test was likely to be significant due to the large sample size [Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993]): (i) that the relative chi-square (CMIN/DF) should be less than 2 or 3, (ii) that the CFI, NFI, NNFI should exceed .90, (iii) that the RMSEA should not exceed .08, and (iv) that the SRMR should have a value less than .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005).

- Insert Table 2 about here -

The goodness-of-fit statistics for the three models are presented in Table 2. For comparison purposes, we have also included in the table the fit statistics provided by Stenseng et al. (2012) for the Escapism Scale. For the one-factor model, the goodness-of-fit statistics did not meet the aforementioned criteria, and therefore the one-factor model did not present a good explanation of the data. The 11-item version of the two-factor model presented relative chi-square, CFI, NFI, NNFI, and SRMR goodness-of-fit statistics that exceeded the aforementioned criteria. Finally, the eight-item version of the two-factor model demonstrated goodness-of-fit statistics that all met the aforementioned criteria and improved on all the goodness-of-fit statistics obtained for the other models. The findings for the eight-item version of the RMiCI scale are presented in Figure 1.

- Insert Figure 1 about here -

The alpha coefficients for scores on both four-item subscales of the RMiCI scale for this paper's sample exceeded the acceptable internal reliability criteria of  $.6 \leq \alpha < .7$  as "acceptable" and  $\alpha > .7$  as "good" (Kline, 1999; Nunnally, 1978): the results for self-expansion scores were  $\alpha = .91$  and  $\alpha = .89$  for Samples 1 and 2 respectively and those for self-suppression scores were  $\alpha = .90$  and  $\alpha = .91$  respectively. The mean (standard deviation) scores for each of the subscales of the RMiCI scale were as follows: self-expansion Sample 1,  $M = 10.56$  ( $SD=5.9$ ), Sample 2,  $M=10.60$  ( $SD=5.7$ ) and self-suppression Sample 1,  $M = 11.01$  ( $SD=6.3$ ), Sample 2,  $M = 10.34$  ( $SD=6.2$ ). The correlation coefficient statistics between scores on the self-expansion and self-suppression subscales were  $r = .42$ ,  $p < .001$  (Sample 1) and  $r = .54$ ,  $p < .001$  (Sample 2).

## Discussion

The reliability and validity estimates for scores on the RMiCI scale from this study support the proposition of a two-factor measure of RMiCI. An EFA demonstrated that a two-factor solution using 8 items was most appropriate for assessing scores reflecting self-expansion and

self-suppression regulatory motivations, which was confirmed by a CFA. This distinction is consistent with theories of regulatory activity from Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) and the dualistic model of leisure activity (Stenseng et al., 2012).

## Study 2

The aim of Study 2 was to examine the concurrent, convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity of scores on a RMiCI measure as compared to scores on the Celebrity Attitude Scale, and measures of the biopsychological theory of personality and affect.

### Method

*Sample.* The sample comprised 251 undergraduates (32 males, 219 females;  $M$  age = 19.90;  $SD = 2.9$ ) who were drawn from the first sample of Study 1. This sample comprised individuals who not only completed a further series of measures at the same time as the RMiCI scale was administered but also completed a further measure that was administered at a second time point. Due to the use of a university participation credit system there was a high retention rate between the original 276 respondents (91%) who completed the RMiCI scale and those who took part at the second time point.

*Scales.* In addition to the RMiCI measure described in Study 1, the respondents completed three further scales, one of which was completed on two occasions. The first was the Celebrity Attitude Scale, which is a 34-item scale, from which 27 items can be used to form three measures of celebrity interest: entertainment-social (7 items; e.g. "I love to talk with others who admire my favourite celebrity"), intense-personal (13 items, e.g. "The successes of my favorite celebrity are my successes too"), and borderline pathological (7 items, e.g. "I would gladly die in order to save the life of my favourite celebrity"). Respondents were asked to answer the questions in reference to the same celebrity identified for the RMiCI scale. Responses were scored using a five-point scale with "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" response format. The second scale was the 24-item BIS/BAS scales

(Carver & White, 1994) that assess dimensions of Gray's model of personality. The BAS scale includes 13 items that are subdivided into drive (goal-directed motivations), fun seeking (motivations towards immediate reward) and reward responsiveness (motivations in anticipation of future rewards) subscales (Carver & White, 1994). The BIS scale includes seven items that can be subdivided into BIS-anxiety (inhibition relating to worry about failure) and FFFS-fear (concerns about anticipated punishment) (Heym, Ferguson, & Lawrence, 2008). Four items are used as filler items. Responses are scored on a four-point scale, anchored by 1 ("very true to me") and 4 ("very false for me"). The third was the Positive and Negative Affect Scales (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), which is a 20-item scale comprising two subscales that measure positive and negative mood states via 10 positive (e.g. "active", "strong") and 10 negative (e.g. "upset", "distressed") adjectives. Responses are scored on a five-point scale for the past week, ranging from 1 = "very slightly or not at all" to 5 = "extremely". Respondents additionally completed the Positive and Negative Affect Scales eight weeks after the original administration of the survey.

### *Results*

Table 3 shows the reliability statistics and mean scores for all the measures administered at time 1. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for scores on the scales exceeded both the internal reliability criteria of  $.6 \leq \alpha < .7$  as "acceptable" and  $\alpha > .70$  as "good" (Kline, 1999; Nunnally, 1978).

- Insert Table 3 about here

Table 3 also shows the zero-order correlations between scores for all the measures administered at time 1. In terms of other measures of celebrity interest, scores on both the subscales of the RMiCI share statistically significant positive associations with scores on all the subscales of the Celebrity Attitude Scale ( $r > .28$ ). In terms of the BIS/BAS scales, RMiCI self-expansion subscale scores share statistically significant positive associations with

scores on both the fun-seeking and reward responsiveness subscales of the BAS scale and RMiCI self-suppression subscale scores share a statistically significant positive association with scores on the anxiety subscale of the BIS scale. In terms of affect, RMiCI self-expansion subscale scores share a statistically significant positive association with positive affect scores, and RMiCI self-suppression subscale scores share a statistically significant positive association with negative affect scores. Importantly, RMiCI self-expansion subscale scores do not share a statistically significant association with negative affect scores, and RMiCI self-suppression subscale scores do not share a statistically significant association with positive affect scores.

Given these latter findings regarding affect, we considered whether scores on each of the RMiCI subscales, after an eight-week period, predicted the respective dimension of affect with which they were associated at time 1. For both affect dimensions, no statistically significant differences (positive affect [ $t = 1.86, p = .064$ ]; negative affect [ $t = 1.38, p = .136$ ]) were found in the scores between time 1 (positive affect,  $M = 31.49, SD = 8.1$ ; negative affect,  $M = 20.23, SD = 7.4$ ) and time 2 (positive affect,  $M = 30.55, SD = 7.8$ ; negative affect,  $M = 19.64, SD = 7.2$ ). We ran two two-step multiple regressions, for scores for each affect dimension at time 2 used as a dependent variable, with scores for the corresponding measure of affect at time 1 being found to be a statistically significant predictor variable at step 1 (positive affect:  $F [1,249] = 77.97, r = .50, r^2 = .24, \text{Adj } r^2 = .24, p < .001$ ; negative affect:  $F [1,249] = 161.39, r = .63, r^2 = .39, \text{Adj } r^2 = .39, p < .001$ ). Then, for each dimensions of affect we introduced scores the respective RMiCI subscale as the predictor variable in step 2. For both regression models, introducing RMiCI subscale score in step 2 produced a significant  $R^2$  change (positive affect/self-expansion:  $\Delta R = .01, p = .034$ ; negative affect/self-suppression:  $\Delta R = .02, p = .010$ ), with self-expansion scores ( $B = .16, \beta = .12, t =$

2.13,  $p = .034$ ) and self-suppression scores ( $B = .15$ ,  $\beta = .13$ ,  $t = 2.60$ ,  $p = .010$ ) predicting unique variance in the respective measure of affect.

### *Discussion*

Concurrent validity for the RMiCI self-expansion and self-suppression subscale scores was established through both sets of scores being found to be statistically significantly associated with all the subscales scores of the Celebrity Attitude Scale, locating them within the general continuum anchored by low and high celebrity interest. Convergent and discriminant validity was found for scores on both the RMiCI subscales through the differing associations with measures of personality and affect. RMiCI self-expansion scores were found to be statistically significantly associated with scores representing two dimensions of the BAS (fun-seeking [willingness to approach new occasions spontaneously and with excitement] and reward responsiveness [positive response to occasions or anticipation of reward]) and positive affect, and RMiCI self-suppression scores were found to be associated with scores representing BIS-anxiety (sensitivity to punishment and avoidance) and negative affect. This is consistent with the view within the literature that these dimensions reflect differing psychological domains (Stenseng et al., 2012), with self-expansion typified by activity engagement aligned to positive outcomes and self-suppression typified by activity prevention aligned to negative outcomes. Predictive validity was found for the scores on both the RMiCI self-expansion and self-suppression subscales since they were found able to predict positive affect and negative affect respectively over an eight-week period.

In terms of considering the reported associations between the measures, it is useful to make the distinction between correlation coefficients that indicate a large effect size ( $r \geq .5$ ), a moderate effect size ( $.3 \leq r < .5$ ), and a small effect size ( $.1 \leq r < .3$ ) (Cohen, 1988, 1992). Additionally, a moderate effect size is considered the minimum at which the findings can be considered to be of practical significance (Cohen, 1992; Ferguson, 2009). The scores on the

RMiCI self-expansion subscale share an association of a moderate effect size with scores on the fun-seeking BAS subscale and an association of a small effect size with scores on the reward responsiveness BAS subscale, while scores on the RMiCI self-suppression subscale share an association of a moderate effect size with scores on the BIS-anxiety subscale.

Therefore, using the minimum moderate effect size criteria, the current findings suggest that scores on the RMiCI self-expansion subscale is related to motivations towards immediate reward, and scores on the RMiCI self-suppression subscale is related to inhibition relating to worry about failure. These findings are consistent with Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) that highlights the context of reward and avoidance motivations in regulatory activity related to self-expansion and self-suppression.

Moreover, scores on the RMiCI self-expansion and self-suppression subscales share associations of a small effect size with scores on measures of positive and negative affect respectively. Therefore, though there are statistically significant associations between scores on the RMiCI self-expansion and self-suppression subscales and affect, and between scores on RMiCI self-expansion and reward responsiveness, the association may not be of practical significance. This finding somewhat echoes the sentiment of Stever (2011) who has argued that fandom is not necessarily accompanied by higher levels of psychopathy.

### General Discussion

The current studies suggest reliability and validity (concurrent, convergent, discriminant and predictive) estimates for scores on a two factor measure of self-expansion and self-suppression regulatory motivations around celebrity interest consistent with theories of regulatory activity from Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) and the dualistic model of leisure activity (Stenseng et al., 2012).

This work presents the first psychological structural model of celebrity interest that begins to address a criticism that the psychometric assessment of an interest in celebrities

heretofore was limited to descriptions that emphasised a non-reciprocal relationship fulfilling a range of personal, emotional and psychopathy needs (Rojek, 2001; Stever 2011). From the current studies, the suggested formulation of celebrity interest assesses intentional mindsets comprising attitudes and behaviours that reflect everyday growth, engagement, avoidance, and escape. The size of the reported associations (i.e. small) between scores obtained on measures of these domains and scores on measures of affect suggest the domains are not necessarily related with high levels of psychopathy. This focus on self-expansion and self-suppression regulatory motivations, as described within the academic leisure literature (Stenseng et al., 2012), compares considerably with the clinical concepts used to describe celebrity interest within the absorption-addiction hypothesis (McCutcheon et al., 2002). Therefore, researchers can apply the RMiCI framework to situations where celebrity interest has been found to be important (e.g. educational, social and economic situations; Elberse & Verleun, 2012; Krauss, 2015; Tyler & Bennett, 2009) without necessarily representing high levels of celebrity interest as worrisome or pathological. This framework would also sit more readily within interpretations of fandom (Stever, 2011) and the view that celebrity interest is related to positive behavioural outcomes (Elberse & Verleun, 2012).

The previous consideration highlights the need for scores on the RMiCI scales to be validated within different populations. The current sample provides an adequate baseline to which future findings might be compared, but the scale needs further validation amongst other populations, most importantly fans (both adolescent and adult), for whom celebrity interest may represent parts of the primary and secondary roles in the developmental stages of childhood and adulthood, transitions between these developmental stages, and elements of the growth of emotional autonomy and social attachments (Giles & Maltby, 2004; Stever, 2011).

In summary, the current study provides an initial consideration of the reliability and validity for scores on a measure of regulatory motivation in celebrity interest. The current findings address a current deficit in the theoretical and empirical celebrity interest literature, by presenting celebrity interest in terms of two everyday motivations: self-expansion and self-suppression. As the findings suggest that the scores on the RMiCI self-expansion and self-suppression subscales demonstrate adequate validity through their relationships with other measures of celebrity interest and personality, and that they are predictors of affect, it is anticipated that the introduction of this scale will lead to the measurement of regulatory motivations when studying antecedents and outcomes of celebrity interest.

## References

- Barrett, P. (2007). Structural equation modelling: Adjudging model fit. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 815–824. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.018>.
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*, 588–606. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.88.3.588>.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136–162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Carroll, J. B. (1953). An analytical solution for approximating simple structure in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 18*, 23–38.
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 319–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.319>.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245–276.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>.
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Elberse, A., & Verluen, J. (2012). The Economic Value of Celebrity Endorsements. *Journal of Advertising Research, 52*(2), 149-165. doi: 10.2501/JAR-52-2-149-165.

- Ferguson, C. J. (2009). An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*, 532–538.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015808>.
- Giles, D. C., & Maltby, J. (2004). The role of media in adolescent development: Relations between autonomy, attachment, and interest in celebrities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 813–822. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00154-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00154-5).
- Gray, J. A. (1987). The neuropsychology of emotion and personality. In S. M. Stahl, S. D. Iverson, & E. C. Goodman (Eds), *Cognitive neurochemistry* (pp. 171–190). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Gray, J. A., & McNaughton, N. (2000). *The neuropsychology of anxiety* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Heym, N., Ferguson, E., & Lawrence, C. (2008). An evaluation of the relationship between Gray's revised RST and Eysenck's PEN: Distinguishing BIS and FFFS in Carver and White's BIS/BAS scales. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 709–715.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.07.013>.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52*, 1280–1300.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280>.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 1–46.
- Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 30*, 179–185.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1–55.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>.

- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International Inc.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurements, 20*, 141–151.
- Kline, P. (1999). *The handbook of psychological testing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Krauss, L. M. (2015). Scientists as celebrities: Bad for science or good for society? *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 71*(1), 26-32. doi: 10.1177/0096340214563676.
- Little, T. D., Lindenberger, U., & Nesselroade, J. R. (1999). On selecting indicators for multivariate measurement and modeling with latent variables: When “good” indicators are bad and “bad” indicators are good. *Psychological Methods, 4*, 192–211.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.2.192>.
- Maltby, J. & Day, L. (2011). Celebrity worship and incidence of elective cosmetic surgery: Evidence of a link among young adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 49*, 483–489.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.12.014>.
- Maltby, J., Day, L., McCutcheon, L. E., Houran, J., & Ashe, D. (2006). Extreme celebrity worship, fantasy proneness and dissociation: Developing the measurement and understanding of celebrity worship within a clinical personality context. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 273–283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.004>.
- Maltby, J., Giles, D., Barber, L., & McCutcheon, L. E. (2005). Intense-personal celebrity worship and body image: Evidence of a link among female adolescents. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 10*, 17–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/135910704X15257>.

- Maltby, J., Houran, J., Lange, R., Ashe, D., & McCutcheon, L. E. (2002). Thou shalt worship no other gods - unless they are celebrities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 1157–1172. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(01\)00059-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00059-9).
- Maltby, J., Houran, M. A., & McCutcheon, L. E. (2003). A clinical interpretation of attitudes and behaviors associated with celebrity worship. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 191*, 25–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00005053-200301000-00005>.
- McCutcheon, L. E., Lange, R., & Houran, J. (2002). Conceptualization and measurement of celebrity worship. *British Journal of Psychology, 93*(1), 67–87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000712602162454>.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rojek, C. (2001). *Celebrity*. London: Reaktion.
- Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stenseng, F., Rise, J., & Kraft, P. (2012). Activity engagement as escape from self: The role of self-suppression and self-expansion. *Leisure Sciences, 34*(1), 19–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2012.633849>.
- Steuer, G. S. (2011). Celebrity worship: Critiquing a construct. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(6), 1356–1370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00765.x>.
- Swami, V., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Mastor, K., Siran, F. H., Said, M. M. M., Jaafar, J., Sinniah, D., & Pillai, S. K. (2011). Celebrity worship among university students in Malaysia: A methodological contribution to the Celebrity Attitude Scale. *European Psychologist, 16*(4), 334–342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000029>.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Tyler, I. & Bennett, B. (2010). 'Celebrity chav': Fame, femininity and social class. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(3), 375-393. doi: 10.1177/1367549410363203.
- Velicer, W. F., & Fava, J. L. (1998). Effects of variable and subject sampling on factor pattern recovery. *Psychological Methods*, 3(2), 231–251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//1082-989X.3.2.231>.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1063–1070. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>.

## Tables

Table 1

*Maximum Likelihood Extraction with Promax Rotation of the Regulatory Motivations in Celebrity Interest scale.*

	1	2
When I engage in my activity related to my favourite celebrity. . . .		
1. . . . . suppress my problems	.576	.192
2. . . . . prevent negative thoughts	.635	.156
3. . . . . shut out the difficult things	.865	-.019
4. . . . . escape from reality	.829	-.047
5. . . . . forget the difficult things	.900	-.012
6. . . . . escape from myself	.821	-.092
7. . . . . learn new things	-.059	.942
8. . . . . know myself better	-.043	.951
9. . . . . surprise in a positive way	-.013	.805
10. . . . . open up for experiences	.023	.747
11. . . . . filled with a positive energy	.221	.583

Due to copyright reasons each item's wording has been abbreviated. The full wording of the items is available in Stenseng et al. (2012).

Tables

Table 1

*Maximum Likelihood Extraction with Promax Rotation of the Regulatory Motivations in Celebrity Interest scale.*

	1	2
When I engage in my activity related to my favourite celebrity. . . .		
12. . . . . suppress my problems	.576	.192
13. . . . . prevent negative thoughts	.635	.156
14. . . . . shut out the difficult things	.865	-.019
15. . . . . escape from reality	.829	-.047
16. . . . . forget the difficult things	.900	-.012
17. . . . . escape from myself	.821	-.092
18. . . . . learn new things	-.059	.942
19. . . . . know myself better	-.043	.951
20. . . . . surprise in a positive way	-.013	.805
21. . . . . open up for experiences	.023	.747
22. . . . . filled with a positive energy	.221	.583

Due to copyright reasons each item’s wording has been abbreviated. The full wording of the items is available in Stenseng et al. (2012).

Figures

Figure 1

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Eight-item Version of the Regulatory Motivations in Celebrity Interest Scale.*

