

North, A. C., Sheridan, L., Maltby, J., and Gillett, R. (2007). Attributional style, self esteem, and celebrity worship. *Media Psychology*, 9, 291-308.

Attributional style, self-esteem, and celebrity worship

Adrian C. North, Lorraine Sheridan, John Maltby, and Raphael Gillett

School of Psychology, University of Leicester,
University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)116 252 2175

Fax: +44 (0)116 252 2067

Email: A.NORTH@LE.AC.UK

Key words: Celebrity; attributions; self-esteem

Running head: Attributions, self-esteem, and celebrity worship

Abstract

Two studies were carried out to investigate the relationship between attributional style (Study 1), self-esteem (Study 2), and different forms of celebrity worship.

Entertainment social celebrity worship (the most 'normal' form considered) was unrelated to attributional style or self-esteem; intense personal celebrity worship was related positively to self-esteem but also to a propensity toward stable and global attributions; and borderline pathological celebrity worship (the most negative form considered) was related to external, stable, and global attributions. These results were independent of whether participants were located in Europe or North America, and are discussed in terms of whether celebrity worship should be regarded as positive or negative and as a unitary concept.

Attributional style, self-esteem, and celebrity worship

There is a long history of research on the potentially positive and negative effects of the media on viewers / listeners behaviour (see e.g. Anderson and Bushman, 2002). In particular, recent years have given rise to an increase in the attention paid by social scientists to the correlates of interest in the lives of celebrities and / or their products (e.g. movies, TV series, CDs), and also to the lifestyles of specific groups of media fans. Indeed numerous academic books have been published on these subjects since 1990. For example, McCutcheon, Maltby, Houran, and Ashe (2004) outlined research on the measurement of ‘celebrity worship’ along with their own preliminary research in the area. Wann, Melnick, Russell, and Pease (2001) considered celebrity worship within the specific context of sports fans. Baym (2000) provided a study of an internet-based soap opera fan group. Harris and Alexander (1998) presented a series of articles analysing ‘fandom’ of particular television shows (e.g. *Buffy The Vampire Slayer*) in terms of sub-cultures and identity development. Finally, Jenkins (1992) offered an ethnographic account of the social institutions, cultural practices, and relationship to mass media capitalism endemic to media fans. As these indicate, research concerning celebrities and their outputs has frequently considered perceptions of the self relative to others; and the present paper reports two studies concerning how celebrity worship might relate to attributional style and self-esteem.

Research on celebrity worship was facilitated by the development of the Celebrity Attitude Scale (or CAS; McCutcheon, Lange, and Houran, 2002). The 34 items on this scale measure the extent to which the respondent is interested in and relates to the life of his / her favourite celebrity. Interestingly McCutcheon, Lange, and Houran

(2002) proposed that the CAS contains three sub-scales. These three different types of celebrity worship were termed 'entertainment social', 'intense personal', and 'borderline pathological'. 'Entertainment social' celebrity worship refers to a 'normal' degree of interest in the life of the participant's favourite celebrity. It is manifested by for example an interest in discussing the celebrity with friends, and agreement that learning about the celebrity through magazines or newspapers represents having a good time. 'Intense personal' celebrity worship involves the participant feeling that he / she has a strong personal 'connection' with the celebrity. It is manifested by for example a feeling that the celebrity is a faultless soulmate, about whom the individual has frequent thoughts. As is clear, this form of celebrity worship is arguably less positive than the 'entertainment social' form. Finally, 'borderline pathological' celebrity worship is arguably the form associated most closely with mental disorder. It is manifested through a variety of bizarre beliefs indicating a lack of agency on the part of the fan and a belief in the benevolent omnipotence of the celebrity, such that participants will agree with CAS items concerning a shared secret code through which the individual can communicate with the celebrity, a belief that the celebrity would come to help the individual in times of distress, and feelings that the celebrity would be pleased to meet the individual in intimate settings such as the former's car or home.

Several studies have addressed the correlates of celebrity worship such as a higher incidence among young people (Ashe and McCutcheon, 2001; Larsen, 1995; Giles, 2002); employment of a 'game playing' love style (McCutcheon, 2002); a negative association with some forms of religiosity (Maltby, Houran, Lange, Ashe, and McCutcheon, 2002); and links with different aspects of Eysenck's (e.g. Eysenck and

Eysenck, 1975) personality dimensions (Maltby, Houran and McCutcheon, 2003). Most interestingly in the context of the present research, Maltby, Day, McCutcheon, Gillett, Houran, and Ashe (2004) concluded that intense personal celebrity worship was associated with poorer mental health, and particularly with poorer general health (depression, anxiety, somatic symptoms, social dysfunction) and negative affect (negative affect, stress, and low positive affect and life satisfaction). Similarly, Maltby, McCutcheon, Ashe, and Houran (2001) found that intense personal celebrity worship was associated with depression and anxiety.

The research cited here indicates that different forms of celebrity worship may be associated to differing degrees with particular personality characteristics and mental health problems. Accordingly the goal of the present research was to investigate the relationship between differing forms of celebrity worship and two other factors associated with personality and mental health, namely attributional style and self-esteem. Are these factors also related to propensity toward the different types of celebrity worship?

Attributional style

Research within attribution theory (see Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1973; Weiner, 1986) has demonstrated the utility of classifying people's explanations for events in their life according to three dimensions, namely external-internal, stable-unstable, and global-specific. The external-internal dimension addresses whether the cause of an event is attributable to factors under the control of the person experiencing it, such as intelligence, physical attractiveness, or ability etc. (internal attribution); or instead due

to factors outside the control of the person experiencing the event such as luck, or the effects of other people's behaviour etc. (external attribution). The unstable-stable dimension addresses the extent to which the cause of an event is attributable to factors that will (unstable attribution) or will not (stable attribution) change. The specific-global dimension addresses the extent to which the cause of an event is attributable to factors that are pervasive (global attribution) or isolated to particular localised aspects of the circumstances in question (specific attribution). Several studies have identified relationships between attributional style and depressive symptoms, with one common finding being that depressed patients are more likely to attribute events to stable, global causes (see meta-analytic reviews by Gladstone and Kaslow, 1995; and Joiner and Wagner, 1995; and also Metalsky and Joiner, 1992; Voelz, Haefel, Joiner, and Wagner, 2003). Another group of studies have implicated a negative attributional style in suicide and suicide risk (Barker-Collo, 2001; Joiner and Rudd, 1995; Vollum and Titterington, 2001; Wagner, Rouleau, and Joiner, 2000).

The research reviewed above suggests several possible correlations may exist between different types of celebrity worship and the tendency to make external, stable, and global attributions of events. Most simply, borderline pathological celebrity worship by definition indicates a perceived lack of agency and a belief in the benevolent omnipotence of the favoured celebrity, which in turn suggests it ought to be related to an external attributional style. Similarly, if depressive symptoms are associated with stable, global attributions then Maltby et al's (2001; 2004) findings that intense personal celebrity worship is associated with poorer mental health and negative affect indicates that stable and global attributional styles might be observable among those demonstrating intense personal celebrity worship. We might expect similar findings

concerning stable and global attributions among those demonstrating borderline pathological celebrity worship, since this represents the most psychologically disordered form of celebrity worship. Since entertainment social celebrity worship is more 'normal' than the two other forms it might not be related to a propensity toward any particular type of attributional style.

Self-esteem

We might expect a non-linear relationship between celebrity worship and self-esteem. Numerous studies have identified associations between mental illnesses and low self-esteem. Most notable in this context is of course depression which among other factors is diagnosed on the basis of low feelings of self-worth, although several other mental health disorders have also been associated with the latter (see recent examples in e.g. Awad and Voruganti, 2004; Combs and Penn, 2004; Kontaxakis, Havaki-Kontaxaki, Margariti, Stamouli, Kollias, and Christodoulou, 2004). As such, we might expect that borderline pathological celebrity worship, with its overtones of mental disorder, might be associated negatively with self-esteem.

In contrast, entertainment social and intense personal celebrity worship might be related positively to self-esteem. There are two grounds for such a hypothesis. First several studies indicate a positive relationship between participation in leisure activities and happiness (e.g. Argyle, 1987; Csikszentmihalyi and Hunter, 2003; Gilbert and Abdullah, 2004; and Veenhoven, 2003). The role of leisure in entertainment social celebrity worship is self-explanatory, and intense personal celebrity worship also includes a leisure element through CAS items such as "*I have*

pictures and / or souvenirs of my favourite celebrity which I always keep in exactly the same place”, “If someone gave me several thousand dollars to do with as I please, I would consider *spending it on a personal possession* (like a napkin or paper plate) once used by my favourite celebrity”, and “One of the main reasons I maintain a *special interest* in my favourite celebrity is that doing so gives me a *temporary escape from life’s problems*” (our emphases).

There are also more direct theoretical grounds for suspecting that there may be a positive relationship between self-esteem and specifically entertainment social celebrity worship. This can be based on research concerning the role of self-esteem in social identity theory (SIT, Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986). Although potentially simplistic (see e.g. Abrams and Hogg, 2001; Aharpour and Brown, 2002), it can be argued that SIT states that individuals are motivated to join groups because favourable comparisons of the ingroup with the outgroup provide a source of self-esteem (see recent research by Fuller, Barnett, Hester, and Relyea, 2003; Houston and Andreopolou, 2003; Hunter, 2003; Tarrant, North, and Hargreaves, 2001). Celebrities are, almost by definition, successful people such that e.g. discussing an interest in them with others provides the fan with a source of favourable comparison relative to other people who do not like the same celebrity. Indeed, many of the items on the CAS concerning entertainment social celebrity worship in particular involve placing an interest in the favourite celebrity in an interpersonal / group context which should lead to an increase in self-esteem. This is exemplified by items such as, “I love to *talk with others* who admire my favourite celebrity”, “It is enjoyable just to *be with others* who like my favourite celebrity”, “I like watching and hearing about my favourite celebrity when I am in a *large group of people*” (our emphases).

We should also make two further points concerning the potential relationship between celebrity worship and self-esteem. First, if SIT processes are indeed relevant to celebrity worship then we might expect participants' desire to compare their group favourably with another should mean that they hold positive opinions of a 'celebrity defined' ingroup; and the extent of this favouritism should be related positively to CAS scores. Second, also relevant here are those CAS items concerning intense personal celebrity worship. These involve statements such as "My favourite celebrity is practically perfect in every way", "The successes of my favourite celebrity are my successes also", and "I share with my favourite celebrity a special bond that cannot be described in words". Although perhaps operating outside the specific context of SIT, it would be very surprising if agreement with statements such as these concerning successful people was not associated with elevated self-esteem. In short, we might expect that self-esteem is associated negatively with borderline pathological celebrity worship and associated positively with entertainment social and intense personal celebrity worship.

Two studies were carried out to address the issues outlined above. Study 1 investigated the relationship between celebrity worship and attributional style. Study 2 investigated the relationship between celebrity worship and self-esteem. In Study 1 it was predicted that only borderline pathological celebrity worship scores should be related positively to externality scores, and that borderline pathological and intense personal celebrity worship scores should be related positively to stability and globality scores. In Study 2 it was predicted that borderline pathological celebrity worship scores should be related negatively to self-esteem, whereas entertainment social and

intense personal celebrity worship scores should be related positively to self-esteem. A further prediction following from SIT was that participants who demonstrate higher levels of celebrity worship should be more likely to offer positive evaluations of people with similar celebrity preferences: the more they identify with their favourite celebrity the more motivated that participants should be to favour those who demonstrate similar preferences.

A secondary issue investigated by the present research concerned any potential influence on the above relationships relating to whether participants were living in Europe or North America. Media commentators of course often discuss the supposed fascination of the North American public with celebrities, although the extent to which such arguments are based merely on negative stereotypes is to say the least debatable (Levin, 1987). If the ‘celebrity obsessed’ stereotype of North Americans is true then we might expect to find a more extreme pattern of relationships between the variables among participants from this region than among those from Europe.

Study 1: Attributional style

Method

Participants Data were collected via an internet questionnaire (in English) which was publicised by the host university’s web site and a press release targeted at European and North American newspapers and radio stations. The release contained a list of the ‘top 10’ celebrities nominated in an earlier study, noted that the research was ongoing, and asked people to visit a website in order to help the researchers continue their

work. 611 people responded although data from 58 participants was discarded either because they did not live in North America or Europe, or in a small number of cases due to a clear lack of serious intent or obvious mental health problems on the part of the respondent. This left a sample of 553 participants, comprising 284 males and 269 females with a mean age of 25.91 years ($SD = 10.90$). 309 participants were from Europe (with 255 from the UK – see Appendix 1 for details) and 244 were from North America (with 214 from the USA).

Questionnaire and Procedure Participants were asked to complete The Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, and Seligman, 1982). Measurement of attributional style involved participants rating the likely causes for six ‘good’ and six ‘bad’ events along three separate 7-point scales corresponding to internal versus external, stable versus unstable, and global versus specific attributions. High scores on these scales are indicative of external, stable, and global attributions respectively. The six ‘good’ events were ‘You meet a friend who compliments you on your appearance’, ‘You become very rich’, ‘You do a project that is highly praised’, ‘Your spouse (boyfriend / girlfriend) has been treating you more lovingly’, ‘You apply for a position that you want very badly (e.g. an important job) and you get it’, and ‘You get a pay raise’. The six ‘bad’ events were ‘You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully for some time’, ‘A friend comes to you with a problem and you don’t try to help’, ‘You give an important talk in front of a group and the audience reacts negatively’, ‘You meet a friend who acts hostilely toward you’, ‘You can’t get all the work done that others expect of you’, and ‘You go out on a date and it goes badly’. Participants were also asked to complete the Celebrity Attitude Scale. This 34-item Likert-type scale asked participants to rate a series of

statements concerning their favourite celebrity (defined as “a famous living person (or one who died during your lifetime) that you greatly admire”) on a scale from 1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 = ‘strongly agree’. A full list of CAS items is presented in Table 1.

Results

A principal components analysis was carried out on ratings assigned to the 34 items of the CAS. Varimax rotation of the principal components solution yielded four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Factor loadings greater than .30 are reported in Table 1. On Factor 1 there were particularly high positive loadings for items 3, 11, 14, 15, 16, 33, and 34, such that the Factor might be labelled ‘intense personal’. On Factor 2 there were particularly high positive loadings for items 7, 12, 20, 25, and 26, and a high negative loading for item 27, such that this Factor might be labelled ‘borderline pathological’. On Factor 3 there were particularly high positive loadings for items 5, 17, 19, 23, 29, and 31, such that this Factor might be labelled ‘entertainment social’. On Factor 4 there were positive loadings for items 10 and 22, such that this Factor might be labelled ‘deleterious imitation’. Cronbach’s alpha for the items loading on to these factors was .96, .94, .94, and .74 respectively.

- Table 1 about here -

Three multiple regression analyses were carried out to determine the extent to which scores on these four factors (as well as participants’ location, i.e. Europe versus North America) could predict each of externality, stability, and globality scores respectively.

Each of the resulting regression equations was significant (R square = .046, $F(5, 547) = 6.31, p < .001$; R square = .087, $F(5, 547) = 11.54, p < .001$; and R square = .143, $F(5, 547) = 19.41, p < .001$ respectively). The results for each of the predictor variables are shown in Table 2.

- Table 2 about here -

Summary

Consistent with the hypotheses, Table 2 indicates that only borderline pathological celebrity worship was related to externality scores, and borderline pathological and intense personal scores were related to both stability and globality scores. Also, the factor analysis identified a fourth factor, deleterious imitation, and scores on this were related to externality, stability, and globality scores: of these three results, the positive relationship between deleterious imitation and externality scores seems most intuitive, although the latter two relationships are more difficult to explain. All these effects occurred independently of whether participants were located in Europe or North America.

Study 2: Self-esteem

Method

Participants Data were collected via a second internet questionnaire (in English) which was publicised by the host university's web site and supplemented by a second

press release targeted at European and North American newspapers and radio stations. The release again contained a list of the ‘top 10’ celebrities nominated in an earlier study, noted that the research was ongoing, and asked people to visit a website in order to help the researchers continue their work. 680 people responded although data from 56 participants was discarded either because they did not live in North America or Europe, or in a small number of cases due to a clear lack of serious intent or obvious mental health problems on the part of the respondent. This left a sample of 624 participants, comprising 272 males and 352 females with a mean age of 26.62 years ($SD = 11.17$). 355 participants were from Europe (with 271 from the UK – see Appendix 1 for details) and 269 were from North America (with 230 from the USA). The web server used to administer the questionnaires employed the participants’ IP addresses to ensure that those who had completed Study 1 could not also complete Study 2.

Questionnaire and Procedure Participants firstly completed the Celebrity Attitude Scale. At the end of this, participants selected from a list the domain in which their favourite celebrity achieved their fame (e.g. music, movies etc.). Participants were then presented with 10 items concerning statements about other people who liked the same kind of celebrity that they did (e.g. musicians, movie stars etc.), and they were asked to state the extent to which each was true on a scale from 0-10 where 0 = ‘Definitely untrue’ and 10 = ‘Definitely true’. Five of the statements were positive, namely ‘In general, these people might have more friends than most’, ‘It might be fun to spend time with these people’, ‘I might find it quite easy to respect these people’, ‘These type of people would be interesting to talk to’, and ‘If possible, it might be nice if I was more like these people’. The remaining five statements were negative,

namely ‘These people can be rather lazy’, ‘These people can sometimes be cruel to others’, ‘These people can be quite self-centred’, ‘These people can be quite unreasonable’, and ‘These people can be quite dishonest’. These items were based on earlier research concerning intergroup relations (particularly Hewstone and Jaspars, 1982; and Locksley, Ortiz, and Hepburn, 1980). Participants also completed the Rosenberg (1989) self-esteem scale. This contains 10 items (of which five are reverse scored) to which participants respond on a four-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The items are ‘I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others’, ‘I feel that I have a number of good qualities’, ‘All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure’, ‘I am able to do things as well as most other people’, ‘I feel I do not have much to be proud of’, ‘I take a positive attitude toward myself’, ‘On the whole, I am satisfied with myself’, ‘I wish I could have more respect for myself’, ‘I certainly feel useless at times’, and ‘At times I think I am no good at all’.

Results

Self-esteem Responses to all 34 items of the CAS were entered into a principal components analysis. Varimax rotation of the principal components solution yielded four factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Factor loadings greater than .30 are reported in Table 3. On Factor 1 there were particularly high positive loadings for items 3, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 24, such that the Factor might be labelled ‘intense personal’. On Factor 2 there were particularly high positive loadings for items 7, 20, 25, and 26, and a high negative loading for item 27, such that this Factor might be labelled ‘borderline pathological’. On Factor 3 there were particularly high positive

loadings for items 5, 17, 19, 23, 29, and 31, such that this Factor might be labelled ‘entertainment social’. On Factor 4 there were positive loadings for items 10 and 22, such that this Factor might be labelled ‘deleterious imitation’. Cronbach’s alpha for the items loading on to these factors was .96, .95, .93, and .75 respectively.

- Table 3 about here -

A multiple regression analysis was carried out to determine the extent to which scores on these four factors (as well as participants’ location, i.e. Europe versus North America) could predict self-esteem. The resulting regression equation was significant ($R^2 = .08$, $F(5, 618) = 11.87$, $p < .001$). The results for each of the predictor variables are shown in Table 4.

- Table 4 about here -

Agreement with positive and negative statements The second set of analyses concerned participants’ agreement ratings with the five positive and five negative statements concerning people who liked the same type of celebrity as the participant. Two new variables were created on the basis of these ratings. The first represented the sum of ratings given to the five positive statements and the second represented the sum of ratings given to the five negative statements. A mixed ANOVA was calculated to determine whether participants gave higher agreement ratings to the five positive statements than they gave to the five negative statements, and whether these ratings differed between participants from Europe and North America. The only significant effect to arise from this was a difference between agreement ratings assigned to the

positive and negative statements ($F(1, 622) = 148.02, p < .001$). Participants gave higher agreement ratings to the positive statements ($M = 35.41, SD = 9.35$) than to the negative statements ($M = 28.24, SD = 10.19$).

A third variable was then calculated for each individual, namely the sum of ratings of the five positive statements minus the sum of ratings of the five negative statements. This variable in effect represents the *extent* to which participants favoured people who liked the same kind of celebrity as they did. The product-moment correlation coefficient between scores on this variable and total CAS scores was $r(624) = .27, p < .001$. The corresponding coefficients for European and North American participants alone were $r(355) = .27, p < .001$ and $r(269) = .26, p < .001$ respectively.

Summary

Consistent with the hypotheses, self-esteem was related positively to intense personal celebrity worship. Furthermore, although the proposed positive relationship between self-esteem and entertainment social celebrity worship was not identified, the proposed negative relationship between the former and borderline pathological celebrity worship gave rise to a p value of .06. The principal components analysis again identified a fourth factor, deleterious imitation. Scores on this fourth factor were positively related to self-esteem: this seems counter-intuitive in suggesting that participants with higher (rather than lower) self-esteem should be inspired by their favourite celebrity to engage in licentious behaviour. All these effects occurred independently of whether participants were located in Europe or North America.

Furthermore, participants were more likely to agree with the positive statements concerning people who liked the same kind of celebrity than with the negative statements concerning these people. Similarly, the correlation between the extent to which participants favoured people who shared their celebrity preference and factor scores indicates that the more participants liked their favourite celebrity so the more likely they were to favour people who liked the same kind of celebrity. More simply, a shared celebrity preference led to favouritism, which is consistent with SIT.

General Discussion

The results supported the hypotheses concerning the relationships between different types of celebrity worship and different attributional styles. The results concerning the proposed relationships between different types of celebrity worship and self-esteem were less clear but still encouraging: the proposed positive relationship concerning intense personal celebrity worship was identified and the proposed negative relationship involving borderline pathological celebrity worship and self-esteem, although non-significant, might be regarded as a 'near miss' ($p = .06$). The failure to identify a positive relationship between entertainment social celebrity worship and self-esteem was more disappointing, and might be explicable in terms of entertainment social celebrity worship representing an activity that is too 'everyday' and 'normal' to have any noticeable implications for self-esteem. Note also that these relationships existed independently of whether participants were located in Europe or North America.

Implicit to much of the above is the issue of whether celebrity worship is a positive or negative phenomenon. Both studies reported above provided evidence that the answer to this question depends on the type of celebrity worship in question: it is wrong to regard celebrity worship as a unitary concept in this regard. In particular, entertainment social celebrity worship (arguably the most ‘normal’ form) appears to have no implications for attributional style or self-esteem, intense personal celebrity worship was related to positive self-esteem but also to a propensity toward stable and global attributions, and borderline pathological celebrity worship (arguably the most disordered form) was related to external, stable, and global attributional styles and was close to being associated negatively with self-esteem.

We began by noting that several books over recent years have investigated individuals’ attitudes towards celebrities as well as those communities of fans who organise themselves around the outputs of celebrities (e.g. fans of a particular movie). We believe that the CAS rather confuses this apparent distinction between ‘interest in a celebrity’ and ‘membership of a community’ since some of the questions concerning entertainment social celebrity worship for example concern how a given individual’s interest in a celebrity may be the basis for social groups (e.g. “I love to talk with others who admire my favourite celebrity”), whereas other entertainment social items concern more intra-individual processes (e.g. “I enjoy watching, reading, or listening to my favourite celebrity because it means a good time”). Future research on the CAS may investigate this distinction in more detail.

Before concluding we should also note that many of the effect sizes obtained by the present analyses were rather modest, but were also (often highly) statistically

significant and consistent with the magnitude of relationships identified by previous research on celebrity worship. Indeed, following Anderson and Bushman's (2002) reasoning we would point out that effect sizes of the magnitude reported here are "not trivial in magnitude" and are similar to those concerning "the effects of calcium intake on bone mass or of lead exposure on IQ in children" (p.2377). Furthermore, it could be argued that the self-selecting nature of the present participants may have resulted in the research sampling from a restricted range of responses: a truly random sample may have led to stronger effects. Indeed it is a truism that factors other than celebrity worship are related to for example attributional style and self-esteem, and it is interesting that celebrity worship is nevertheless able to explain a statistically significant proportion of the variance in the latter two.

References

Abrams, D. and Hogg, M. A. (2001). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. In M. A. Hogg and D. Abrams (eds.). *Intergroup relations: essential readings*. New York: Psychology Press. pp. 232-244.

Aharpour, S. and Brown, R. (2002). Functions of group identification: an exploratory analysis. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, 15, 157-186.

Anderson, C. A. and Bushman, B. J. (2002). The effects of media violence on society. *Science*, 295, 2377-2378.

Argyle, M. (1987). *The psychology of happiness*. New York: Methuen.

Ashe, D. D. and McCutcheon, L. E. (2001). Shyness, loneliness, and attitude toward celebrities. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 6, 124-133.

Awad, A. G. and Voruganti, L. N. P. (2004). Body weight, image, and self-esteem evaluation questionnaire: development and validation of a new scale. *Schizophrenia Research*, 70, 63-67.

Barker-Collo, S. L. (2001). Adult reports of child and adult attributions of blame for childhood sexual abuse: predicting adult adjustment and suicidal behaviors in females. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 25, 1329-1341.

Baym, N. K. (2000). *Tune in, log on: soaps, fandom and on-line community*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Combs, D. R. and Penn, D. L. (2004). The role of subclinical paranoia on social perception and behavior. *Schizophrenia Research*, 69, 93-104.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. and Hunter, J. (2003). Happiness in everyday life: the uses of experience sampling. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 4, 185-199.

Eysenck H. J. and Eysenck S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Fuller, J. B., Barnett, T., Hester, K., and Relyea, C. (2003). A social identity perspective on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143, 789-791.

Gilbert, D. and Abdullah, J. (2004). Holidaytaking and the sense of well-being. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31, 103-121.

Giles, D. C. (2002). Parasocial interaction: a review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychology*, 4, 279-305.

Gladstone, T. R. G. and Kaslow, N. J. (1995). Depression and attributions in children and adolescents: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 23, 597-606.

Harris, C. and Alexander, A. (1998). *Theorizing fandom: fans, subculture and identity*. Cresskill: Hampton.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Wiley.

Hewstone, M. and Jaspars, J. (1982). Explanations for racial discrimination: the effect of group discussion on intergroup attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 12, 1-16.

Houston, D. M. and Andreopoulou, A. (2003). Tests of both corollaries of social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis in real group settings. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 357-370.

Hunter, J. A. (2003). State, category specific collective self-esteem and intergroup discrimination. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 8, 139-148.

Jenkins, H. (1992). *Textual poachers: television fans and participatory culture*. New York: Routledge.

Joiner, T. E. and Rudd, M. D. (1995). Negative attributional style for interpersonal events and the occurrence of severe interpersonal disruptions as predictors of self-reported suicidal ideation. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 25, 297-304.

Joiner, T. E. and Wagner, K. D. (1995). Attribution style and depression in children and adolescents: a meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 15, 777-798.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, 28, 107-128.

Kontaxakis, V., Havaki-Kontaxaki, B., Margariti, M., Stamouli, S., Kollias, C. and Christodoulou, G. (2004). Suicidal ideation in patients with acute schizophrenia. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 49.

Larson, R.W. (1995). Secrets in the bedroom: adolescents' private use of media. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 24, 535-550.

Levin, J. (1987). *Gossip: the inside scoop*. New York: Plenum.

Locksley, A., Ortiz, V., and Hepburn, C. (1980). Social categorization and discriminatory behavior: extinguishing the minimal intergroup discrimination effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 773-783.

Maltby, J., Day, L., McCutcheon, L. E., Gillett, R., Houran, J., and Ashe, D. D. (2004). Personality and coping: a context for examining celebrity worship and mental health. *British Journal of Psychology*, 95, 411-428.

Maltby, J., Houran, J., Lange, R., Ashe, D., and McCutcheon, L. E. (2002). Thou shalt worship no other gods - unless they are celebrities: the relationship between celebrity worship and religious orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1157-1172.

Maltby, J., Houran, J., and McCutcheon, L. E. (2003). Locating celebrity worship within Eysenck's personality dimensions. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 191, 25-29.

Maltby, J., McCutcheon, L. E., Ashe, D. D., and Houran, J. (2001). The self-reported psychological well-being of celebrity worshippers. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 3, 441-452.

McCutcheon, L. (2002). Are parasocial relationship styles reflected in love styles? *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 7, 82-93.

McCutcheon, L. E., Lange, R., and Houran, J. (2002). Conceptualization and measurement of celebrity worship. *British Journal of Psychology*, 93, 67-87.

McCutcheon, L., Maltby, J., Houran, J. P. and Ashe, D. (2004). *Celebrity worshippers: inside the minds of stargazers*. Frederick, MD: Publish America

Metalsky, G. I. and Joiner, T. E. (1992). Vulnerability to depressive symptomatology: a prospective test of the diathesis-stress and causal mediation components of the hopelessness theory of depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 667-675.

Peterson, C., Semmel, A., von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. I., and Seligman, M. E. P. (1982). The Attributional Style Questionnaire. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 6, 287-299.

Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the adolescent self-image (revised edition)*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worschel and W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tarrant, M. North, A. C., and Hargreaves, D. J. (2001). Social categorization, self-esteem, and the estimated musical preferences of male adolescents. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 565-581.

Veenhoven, R. (2003). Hedonism and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 4, 437-457.

Voelz, Z R., Haeffel, G. J., Joiner, T. E. Jr., Wagner, K. D. (2003). Reducing hopelessness: the interaction of enhancing and depressogenic attributional styles for positive and negative life events among youth psychiatric inpatients. *Behaviour Research & Therapy*, 41, 1183-1198.

Vollum, S. and Titterington, V. B. (2001). Gender, attributional styles, and direction of lethal violence: a partial test of an integrated model of suicide and homicide. *Homicide Studies*, 5, 227-252.

Wagner, K. D., Rouleau, M., and Joiner, T. (2000). Cognitive factors related to suicidal ideation and resolution in psychiatrically hospitalized children and adolescents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 2017-2021.

Wann, D. L., Melnick, M. J., Russell, G. W., and Pease, D. G. (2001). *Sport fans: the psychology and social impact of spectators*. New York: Routledge.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Appendix 1 – Participants' location

Study 1			Study 2		
Country	Frequency	%	Country	Frequency	%
Albania	2	.4	Austria	2	.3
Andorra	1	.2	Belgium	5	.8
Austria	2	.4	Bulgaria	1	.2
Azerbaijan	1	.2	Canada	39	6.3
Belgium	6	1.1	Denmark	1	.2
Canada	30	5.4	Finland	4	.6
Denmark	1	.2	France	3	.5
France	1	.2	Germany	33	5.3
Germany	8	1.4	Greece	2	.3
Greece	3	.5	Lithuania	1	.2
Ireland	1	.2	Netherlands	8	1.3
Italy	3	.5	Norway	2	.3
Malta	1	.2	Poland	4	.6
Netherlands	11	2.0	Romania	2	.3
Norway	2	.4	Slovakia	1	.2
Romania	1	.2	Spain	5	.8
Spain	4	.7	Sweden	3	.5
Sweden	3	.5	Switzerland	2	.3
Switzerland	2	.4	Turkey	2	.3
Turkey	1	.2	United Kingdom	271	43.4
United Kingdom	255	46.1	United States	230	36.9
United States	214	38.7	Vatican City	2	.3

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
1. If I were to meet my favourite celebrity in person, he/she would already somehow know that I am his/her biggest fan	.486	.502		
2. I share with my favourite celebrity a special bond that cannot be described in words	.565	.490	.318	
3. I am obsessed by details of my favourite celebrity's life	.630		.422	
4. I would gladly die in order to save the life of my favourite celebrity	.450	.421		
5. My friends and I like to discuss what my favourite celebrity has done			.673	
6. When something good happens to my favourite celebrity I feel like it happened to me	.553	.453	.410	
7. My favourite celebrity and I have our own code so we can communicate with each other secretly (such as over the TV or special words on the radio)	.344	.671		
8. One of the main reasons I maintain an interest in my favourite celebrity is that doing so gives me a temporary escape from life's problems	.337		.527	
9. I have pictures and/or souvenirs of my favourite celebrity which I always keep in exactly the same place	.594		.394	
10. If my favourite celebrity endorsed a legal but possibly unsafe drug designed to make someone feel good, I would try it				.793
11. My favourite celebrity is practically perfect in every way	.658			
12. The successes of my favourite celebrity are my successes also	.418	.613		
13. I enjoy watching, reading, or listening to my favourite celebrity because it means a good time			.541	
14. I consider my favourite celebrity to be my soulmate	.647	.470		
15. I have frequent thoughts about my favourite celebrity, even when I don't want to	.680	.314	.306	
16. When my favourite celebrity dies (or died) I will feel (or I felt) like dying too	.624	.419		
17. I love to talk with others who admire my favourite celebrity			.805	
18. When something bad happens to my favourite celebrity I feel like it happened to me	.589	.521	.347	

19. Learning the life story of my favourite celebrity is a lot of fun	.341		.650	
20. My favourite celebrity would immediately come to my rescue if I needed help		.724		
21. I often feel compelled to learn the personal habits of my favourite celebrity	.572	.319	.452	
22. If I were lucky enough to meet my favourite celebrity, and he/she asked me to do something illegal as a favour, I would probably do it	.327			.755
23. It is enjoyable just to be with others who like my favourite celebrity			.762	
24. When my favourite celebrity fails or loses at something I feel like a failure myself	.498	.585		
25. If I walked through the door of my favourite celebrity's home without an invitation she or he would be happy to see me		.800		
26. If my favourite celebrity saw me in a restaurant he/she would ask me to sit down and talk		.767		
27. If my favourite celebrity found me sitting in his/her car he or she would be upset		-.608		
28. If someone gave me several thousand pounds to do with as I please, I would consider spending it on a personal possession (like a napkin or paper plate) once used by my favourite celebrity	.529	.443		
29. I like watching and hearing about my favourite celebrity when I am in a large group of people			.773	
30. If my favourite celebrity was accused of committing a crime that accusation would have to be false	.512	.401		
31. Keeping up with news about my favourite celebrity is an entertaining pastime	.446		.671	
32. News about my favourite celebrity is a pleasant break from a harsh world	.463		.581	
33. To know my favourite celebrity is to love him/her	.621		.324	
34. It would be great if my favourite celebrity and I were locked in a room for a few days	.652			
Eigenvalue	7.12	6.02	5.82	1.74
% of variance	20.94	17.69	17.12	5.11

Table 1 – Factor analysis of Study 1 CAS scores

		Intense personal	Borderline pathological	Entertainment social	Deleterious imitation	Location
Externality	B	.03	.21	.01	.09	.07
	<i>t</i>	.74	4.92	.17	2.05	1.62
	<i>p</i>	.46	< .001	.87	.04	.11
Stability	B	.15	.17	.04	.20	.07
	<i>t</i>	3.57	4.11	.97	4.98	1.64
	<i>p</i>	< .001	< .001	.34	< .001	.10
Globality	B	.15	.26	.00	.23	.08
	<i>t</i>	3.75	6.70	.04	5.89	2.10
	<i>p</i>	< .001	< .001	.97	< .001	.04

Table 2 – Study 1 multiple regression analyses

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
1. If I were to meet my favourite celebrity in person, he/she would already somehow know that I am his/her biggest fan	.398	.562		
2. I share with my favourite celebrity a special bond that cannot be described in words	.478	.587		
3. I am obsessed by details of my favourite celebrity's life	.618	.340	.418	
4. I would gladly die in order to save the life of my favourite celebrity	.440	.475		
5. My friends and I like to discuss what my favourite celebrity has done			.695	
6. When something good happens to my favourite celebrity I feel like it happened to me	.647	.434		
7. My favourite celebrity and I have our own code so we can communicate with each other secretly (such as over the TV or special words on the radio)	.332	.657		
8. One of the main reasons I maintain an interest in my favourite celebrity is that doing so gives me a temporary escape from life's problems	.550		.408	
9. I have pictures and/or souvenirs of my favourite celebrity which I always keep in exactly the same place	.630	.321	.350	
10. If my favourite celebrity endorsed a legal but possibly unsafe drug designed to make someone feel good, I would try it				.795
11. My favourite celebrity is practically perfect in every way	.658			
12. The successes of my favourite celebrity are my successes also	.616	.505		
13. I enjoy watching, reading, or listening to my favourite celebrity because it means a good time	.336		.567	
14. I consider my favourite celebrity to be my soulmate	.618	.432		
15. I have frequent thoughts about my favourite celebrity, even when I don't want to	.670	.376		
16. When my favourite celebrity dies (or died) I will feel (or I felt) like dying too	.642	.388		
17. I love to talk with others who admire my favourite celebrity			.803	

18. When something bad happens to my favourite celebrity I feel like it happened to me	.709	.418		
19. Learning the life story of my favourite celebrity is a lot of fun	.372		.606	
20. My favourite celebrity would immediately come to my rescue if I needed help		.670		
21. I often feel compelled to learn the personal habits of my favourite celebrity	.550	.320	.426	
22. If I were lucky enough to meet my favourite celebrity, and he/she asked me to do something illegal as a favour, I would probably do it				.800
23. It is enjoyable just to be with others who like my favourite celebrity			.771	
24. When my favourite celebrity fails or loses at something I feel like a failure myself	.658	.448		
25. If I walked through the door of my favourite celebrity's home without an invitation she or he would be happy to see me		.768		
26. If my favourite celebrity saw me in a restaurant he/she would ask me to sit down and talk		.746		
27. If my favourite celebrity found me sitting in his/her car he or she would be upset		-.666		
28. If someone gave me several thousand pounds to do with as I please, I would consider spending it on a personal possession (like a napkin or paper plate) once used by my favourite celebrity	.528	.369		
29. I like watching and hearing about my favourite celebrity when I am in a large group of people			.787	
30. If my favourite celebrity was accused of committing a crime that accusation would have to be false	.436	.321	.308	
31. Keeping up with news about my favourite celebrity is an entertaining pastime	.459		.653	
32. News about my favourite celebrity is a pleasant break from a harsh world	.554		.512	
33. To know my favourite celebrity is to love him/her	.564	.314	.345	
34. It would be great if my favourite celebrity and I were locked in a room for a few days	.549			
Eigenvalue	7.74	5.62	5.34	2.01
% of variance	22.76	16.52	15.70	5.91

Table 3 – Factor analysis of Study 2 CAS scores

		Intense personal	Borderline pathological	Entertainment social	Deleterious imitation	Location
Self-esteem	B	.23	-.07	.02	.13	-.10
	<i>t</i>	6.03	1.91	.54	3.43	2.66
	<i>p</i>	< .001	.06	.59	.001	.008

Table 4 – Study 2 multiple regression analyses

