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Abstract
Changes in the Malaysian mass media landscape are on the rise and this has given the audience more choice to watch their favourite channels. Based on the theory of use and satisfaction, audiences are no longer considered passive. Audiences or viewers are now active and selective where the power to choose the media is in the hands of the audience itself. Adopting a uses and gratifications theory (UGT) perspective, the article aims to demonstrate the audience’s or viewer’s sought satisfaction factors through watching the environment and intention portal TV mediated by its usage frequency and types of program. Drawing from viewing patterns and audience literature, relevant uses and gratifications for TV programs chosen were cognitive, emotional, personal, social, and self-expression. Discrete choice modeling (DCM) was adapted for the observed variables of predictors of the Partial Least Squares – Structural Equation Modeling (PLS – SEM) in this study. 500 respondents were participated in this study from Bandar Baru Bangi, Malaysia as the location. Cognitive and emotional needs are the most sought gratifications by the respondents when utilizing the portal TV. These two needs are influenced the discrete choice of elements of the viewers. Thus, this indicates that the Theory of Uses and Gratifications does highlighting the needs sought by the viewers.
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Introduction
Today’s fast-developing technology enriches the format of media platform, also following the digital devices tend to be more portable, compatibility, non-line linked, and non-barrier interconnection between devices extremely, enrich the section of viewers or audiences. Especially growing numbers of channels innovate rich programs to meet the entertaining
madness through a reality-based entertainment show as if they were 'staple food' is not only a place to relieve stress, but also a desire that can never be contained. Thus the traditional TV and portal TV, gaming with each other in the context of multi-choice for devices and TV channels, diverse content based on the instantaneous of viewing pattern. For example, the numerous broadcast viewers now could enjoy the free programs from FTA broadcasting and free portal TV.

Although academic research has explored the audience (Rosya, 2011) and media (Ali, 2011; Shafizan, 2020) in Malaysia, and extensive research of television viewing patterns since 1982 by Rubin, researchers shed on the light in the comparison while the development of media technology (Mazni, 2007; Andrew et al, 2014; Ghazali & Ezhar, 2018; Nizam, 2018) keeps evaluating between traditional TV and portal TV (Ali et al, 2011) in Malaysia. To note, lacking the specific survey conducted based on uses and gratifications theory which applying in the Malaysia media study.

Previously, the uses and gratifications perspective generated varied research, including studies on enjoyment (Nabi et al., 2006), typical gratifications-seeking (Nabi et al., 2006; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2007). Currently, the mass communication scholars put forward as the uses and gratifications (U&G) approach is generally recognized to be a subtraction of media effects research (McQuail, 1994). While, Due to the understandings of how and why viewers use media created in the last century may have little relevance to current television audience practices (Alec&Kim, 2019). As such, the current television consumption experience is drastically differs from what it was 10 years ago (Alec&Kim,2019). Thus, the controversy among scholars argues that uses and gratifications are not a rigorous social science theory (Thomas, 2018).

The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the theoretical understanding of the uses and gratifications on play a greater role in the portal TV, which reflects by audience satisfaction boost by the chosen element when viewing Portal TV. As previous researchers reiterated that by recognizing the potential for audience initiative and activity indeed to explain the outcomes or consequences of mass communication in both uses and effects seek (Rubin, 1994b). Therefore, generating the types of TV use, also exploring the connection between these uses and the individual’s social conditions, viewing attitudes and behaviors (McQuail, Blumler & Brown, 1972). These issues may be particularly significant in the prediction for a stable relationship between gratification and viewing rating. Due to the behavior of viewing determine the rating for every channel, the more audience views the channel, the more income will be produced, no matter from advertisement investing or the voluntary purchase for their favorite channel.

The second significant issue to address is fostering the practical contribution to the broadcast stations, they have to work hard to maintain their popularity in gaining audiences (Pitts, 2003). In this regard, the study seeks to see whether the programs presented by television stations in Malaysia, truly meet the needs and satisfaction of the audience, so that they are committed to seeing the programs presented. To further our understanding, we explored which channels are the audience’s choice and why are some channels so far superior to their audience ratings. The research questions driving this research are as follows:
i. What are the chosen elements by viewers that influencing their needs when watching a Portal TV program?
ii. Does watching frequency and types of program mediate the chosen elements in achieving specific needs for gratification when watching portal TV?

The rest of the article is structured as follows: 1) research background for the development of television in Malaysia. 2) literature review for keywords. 3) research methodology to investigate these questions, we set the angle of cognitive needs, emotional needs, personal needs, social needs, and the stress-releasing need, with quantitative measures of the demography, viewing satisfaction and TV channel viewing frequency. 4) conclusion of our research that contribute to the aspect of academic and practical meaning.

In 1990, the U.K. government passed a Broadcasting Act, which introduced direct competition between channels (ITV and Channel 4), this evolution resulted in new and existing service providers to refocus their attention to the viewing pattern. The challenge of business success and survival of channels face the direct service payment from customers-TV viewers. Therefore, another challenge reflects on the viewer’s behavior. For example, TV audiences generally unable to decide on choosing a particular program, watching it from beginning to the end, and then immediately shut down their site as soon as the program ends. Instead, they search for and wandering programs and channels (Peter, 1993).

Influencing by the UK, Malaysian Television Systems Berhad (STMB) in 1983 and other stations emerged gradually. There are three types of television organizations in Malaysia; government (TV1, TV2 & TVi), private (Astro, Netflix & TM Streamyx), and semi-government (TV Al-Hijrah, TV 3, BERNAMA TV, Ntv7, 8TV & TV9). To note, RTM is a free television station for the community via channels (TV1, TV2 & TVi); Partial Government Television is Malaysian National News Agency (BERNAMA) offers television channels; TV and Department of Islamic Development Malaysia (JAKIM) offers television channels AlHijrah TV; free private television (i.e. Media Prima Berhad, which offers television channels TV3, Ntv7, 8TV & TV9). The evolution continues when Astro has emerged as a paid satellite channel offering a variety of networks to cater to their consumers. IPTV broadcasts for TM UniFi and TM Streamyx subscribers offer paid channels HyppTV.

Although Malaysian media development since January 1987, a negative phenomenon exposed that the substance of up-to-date Malaysian TV stations remains almost unchanged, no matter to the 'liberalization' or 'privatization', the policies of the current administration, which came to power in 1981, the increase in channel choosing and broadcast time duration, its function as a "purported tool for nation-building" (Karthigesu, 1991) still has many questions. Regrettably, the credibility of Malaysian television as an origin of the information is questioned and those who democratize television in the fast-developing economy to make it more representative have fallen on deaf ears (Zaharom, 2014).

Previously, the bold idea and a path-breaker of a new experiment conducted in countries by Britain, such as former colonies, initiating the competition between the government networks and an autonomous private network in Malaysia (Karthigesu, 2016). Thus, the widening gap between unlimited media and limited attention poses a challenge to anything that attracts an audience. While following more and more choices about “what, when, and where” to decide from rich media in the “post-network” era of television, puzzling
audiences (Lotz, 2014). This triggers off the deep exploration of the question of our study 1) which channels are the audience's choice and 2) why some channels are so far superior to their audience ratings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Theory of Uses and Gratifications with Media

The uses and gratifications as the milestone for the development of communication studies, mainly contributing to break the tradition of focusing on communicators-oriented and media-oriented. Audience-oriented was shed light on the field of communication studies. As uses and gratifications theory believes that the audience has the initiative to choose media, and the usage of media is composed of a series of key elements, including "people's communication needs and motivations, psychological and social environment, mass media, functional substitution of media, communication behavior, and the consequences of this behavior."

Based on early research of uses and gratifications by Lazarsfeld-Stanton collections (1942); Herzog (1942); Suchman (1942); Berelson (1949), the theory developed from the research of soap operas, serious music or radio and functions of newspaper reading. Most scholars believe that the early research lacks coherence in theory, and its methodology tends to be behaviorism and individualism (McQuail, 1994). Then around 1973, more empirical research was conducted in the US, Britain, Sweden, Finland, Japan, and Israel. several differing starting points followed it be press toward a greater systematization (Elihu et al., 1973). The perspective of the "uses and gratifications approach", clearly indicates that a certain way in which individuals use communications and other resources in their surroundings to gratify their needs and achieve their goals and can do this by simply asking them. The theory of uses and gratifications experienced the time from the traditional to modern, until Elihu Kartz (1973) who was the first scholar to propose it officially, deepen and widen the study into the level of "how the audience uses the medium to meet their own social and psychological needs" and "how the medium satisfies the audience's needs". In his Personal Influence (1955) takes a stand against the mass communication research of the day, which, Katz and Lazarsfeld debate, the media influence as a direct impact of media content on socially isolated individuals by short-sightedly understands. As a result, Elihu, Gurevitch, et al. Classified the audience’s 35 needs of media into 5 categories: the need for awareness; the need for emotion; the need for personal integration; the need for social integration; the need for stress relief.

From the perspective of traditional media, Mendelsohn (1964) put forwarded functions of radio listening, it played the role of companionship, bracketing the day, altering mood, counteracting loneliness or boredom, also providing useful news and information, allowing vicarious participation in activities, and enhancing social interaction. In another perspective from Berelson (1970), he identified that utilize of the newspaper, mainly for collecting information and explanation of public affairs, as a tool for daily life, social prestige, and social contact (Rubin, 1983). As proved by a model of “media-person interactions” which was proposed by McQuail, Blumer, and brown (1972), classifying four important media gratifications: diversion, personal relationships, personal identity, and surveillance. Especially, this decade the world is colored by various television channels. Name everything,
from songs, dramas, movies, news, even sports and games to today's madness through a reality-based entertainment show that grows mushrooms after rain. We may assume that traditional TV and portal TV also can take the place of the function of radio and newspaper, with an emotional need for companionship, changing mood, loneliness-killing, enrich daily life, information-offering, public affairs discussion, social interaction, etc. Proved by Rubin (1983), identified the nine clusters of the television watching which with five likely motivation factors: 1) Pass Time or Habit, 2) Information Seeking, 3) Entertainment, 4) Companionship, and 5) Escape.

Besides, in the digital media view, one of the original purposes of uses and gratifications was to identify types of gratifications provided by the media, which include television (Greenberg, 1974; Rubin, 1981, 1983), cinema (Austin, 1986; Palmgreen, Cook, Harvill, & Helm, 1988), the Internet (Ko, Cho, & Roberts, 2005; LaRose & Eastin, 2004; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004), and social media (Ancu & Cozma, 2009; Cheng, Liang, & Leung, 2015; Quinn, 2016). Thus, such as the streaming providers, Netflix, Hulu, Amazon Prime, and YouTube post content through web-enabled smart televisions or portal TV, tablet computers, and smartphones (Alec & Kim, 2019), generally releasing new series of programming, the weekly distribution model supported by advertisements related to traditional broadcast and cable television has undergone a major shift. Thus, the theory of uses and gratifications may be expanded into a larger field and results in financial significance for broadcasters who run the private TV station serving for fees.

The Theory of Uses and Gratifications with Satisfaction

Customer’s satisfaction can be defined as a satisfaction to the overall satisfaction obtained by experiencing a specific service (Koteswara et al., 2015). Notably, consumers with gratification display a higher tendency to buy the same product or service and even resist offers from competitors (Chiou, 2004). Such consumers also result in positive word of mouth. A high level of gratification, maintained continuously over a long time, generating a prolonged relationship with the customer (Gu, 2016). Moreover, perceived service quality and customer satisfaction are considered to be two different structures (Keshvari et al., 2015); Satisfaction refers to the customer’s emotional response to product performance, and service quality refers to the overall evaluation of a particular service by customers (Moreira and Silva, 2015).

The theory of use and gratifications appeared in the middle of the twentieth century in response to the huge influence of media effects and the hypodermic needle viewpoint. This approach suggests that people actively consume media and make specific choices in their media consumption to meet certain needs. Although necessarily study the multi-channel phenomenon, as its ability to alter the nature of the viewer watching process and the audience's behavior (Caronlyn, 1993), the frequency with which an audience chooses a broadcasting channel is due to the quality of the content displayed, loyalty to a broadcasting station, visual satisfaction and so on. Currently, most of the money is spent on content and special features that are broadcast to attract as many viewers as possible (Anderson 2011). For example, in the Malaysia KRU production film is modernized in terms of special effects, costumes, and animations in the Ribbit story. Traditionally, media quality has been analyzed from two factors: the first linked with professional points of view and benchmarks based on technical, aesthetic, ethical, and narrative criteria; the second settles the audience’s
perspective (Alberto, 2015). More specifically, the uses and gratification approach suggest that individuals are aware of their needs (Zhanna Bagdasarov et al., 2010), evaluating the rich channels and content, assessing functional selections from the media with an interpersonal channel, or other activities that they seek to provide the gratification, all in the form of selection, attention, and use (Katz et al., 1974).

Methodology

Data Collection and Sampling

A non-probability purposive sampling method was used to collect the data via self-administered survey (Su et al., 2016). The questionnaire was constructed in Bahasa Malaysia since the location of the data collection comprises of Malay as the majority group with Chinese and Indian as the minority group that well-versed in Bahasa Malaysia. The goal of this study was to identify the discrete choice of viewing intention elements of viewers when watching portal TV. This categorical type of data is the independent variable in this study and DCM is used to analyse categorical data as the IV in the structural model. DCM used Boolean block algorithm in determining the factor loading of the observed variables (Hair et al., 2019).

Section A and B of the instrument were constructed with categorical indicators and for section B is it the discrete choice items. Using a categorical item for demographic and independent variable and five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for the dependent variable. The process began with examining of past literature for the operationalization of variables included in this study.

The instrument consisted of four sections. The first section is the demographic of the respondents, such as level of education, ethnicity, income, occupation and so on. The second section recorded the discrete choices of respondent on preferred watching place and preferred media platform. The third section is the mediating variables of the study, which are the primary reason of usage and the types of programs frequently watched. The fourth and last section is the dependent variable of the study, which is the five dimensions of needs in uses and gratifications theory. Pilot study was conducted prior to the full-scale data collection, the instrument was distributed to 50 respondents and reviewed by topic-matter experts in order to confirm the content validity. Minor modifications were made afterwards in the structure of the instrument based on the review and pilot study result.

Analysis Methods

There are two methods of analysis in structural equation modelling which are the covariance-based (CB-SEM) and partial least squares (PLS-SEM). In this study, PLS-SEM was chosen in order to suit the nature of this study. Since this study was exploratory in nature, the mediation testing in PLS-SEM is more appropriate since the method was able to reduce bias, as the bootstrapping procedure exclude assumptions about the parametric nature of the construct’s distribution or the sampling distribution of the statistics, plus this method inclusiveness in bridging all mediated examined interactions rather than single construct (Hair et al., 2014). Furthermore, multiple testing for mediations simultaneously allows for better inclusiveness of the complete effect rather than comparing it with single individual testing of each mediator through a regression model, of which the indirect effects may be flattened due to the association of correlation of each mediator. The mediation testing via PLS-SEM is able to
process more complex model and with smaller sample sizes while at the same time still maintaining higher levels of statistical power (Hair, Hult, Ringle, Sarstedt and Thiele, 2017). Statistical power refers to the robustness of the technique in determine significance among relationships with low, medium and high effect sizes. Given that this study is prediction exploration in nature, PLS-SEM was deemed to be the most suitable data analysis method. PLS-SEM has the ability to yield small parameter estimation bias when the nature of the sample population is obscure (Sarstedt et al., 2016), which is the nature of most social science study in general.

Finally, the main research goal was to explain and predict sought gratification needs by viewer a via multiple discrete choice variables. Because of the stated reasons, PLS-SEM was selected in order to suit the nature of this study, which focussing on prediction (Shiau and Chau, 2016).

Model Estimation and Results Evaluation.
SmartPLS 3 software (Ringle et al., 2015) was used in this study and the reported results were drawn based on guidelines provided by Hair, Hult, Ringle and Sarstedt (2017), Hair, Hult, Ringle, Sarstedt and Thiele (2017) and Ramayah et al. (2018). The two-stage analytical procedure is conducted when analysing the data. The measurement model was tested in the first stage in order to assess the construct reliability, construct validity, and discriminant validity. In the second stage, the structural model was analysed in order to examine the hypothesised relationships (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

Results
Table 1 summarises the profiles of the respondents showing that 42.2 per cent of the respondents were male, 57.8 percent female and the majority ethnic group are Malay with 67.4 per cent.

Measurement Model
The assessment of CDM starts with the transformation of attribute level of categorical items into the binary coding of Boolean block by transforming the categorical items into binary code of 1 and 0 by using SPSS version 26 (Hair et al., 2019). The indicators of IV in the binary form will be analysed by using a PLS algorithm by using factor as the weighting scheme as suggested by Hair et al., 2019. Thus, although the discrete choice items are having only one observed variable respectively, the reflective items for independent variables were considered satisfactory in terms of its convergent validity. In addition, the reflective measurement model achieves a CR score of 0.865 and higher, determining the internal consistency of the measurements in measuring each construct is accepted. All the values of AVE are greater than the critical threshold of 0.5, which a proved evidence of the convergent validity of the measures (Table 1).

Two approaches were used in determining the discriminant reliability. The first approach is the cross-loadings of the items were examined by comparing the value of the items with the opposing constructs value and no cross loading with higher values was found. The second approach is determining the value of formal-Lacker and Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) value (Henseler et al., 2015). In this study, the value of HTMT was fixed by applying
HTMT-based inference test (Franke and Sarstedt, n.d.). The first procedure is to ascertain whether the HTMT value of a construct approaches 1.0. The nearer it is to 1.0 (or the more it exceeds 1.0) would be interpreted as a violation of discriminant validity. Henseler et al. (2015) recommended HTMT cutoff values of 0.90. Table 3 and table 4 below showing the value of formal-Lacker and Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) value respectively.

**Table 1.** Convergent Validity

| Types of programs frequently watched | Cronbach’s Alpha | Rho-A | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Primary reason of usage             | 0.766            | 0.789 | 0.865                 | 0.681                           |
| Cognitive Need                      | 0.964            | 0.968 | 0.972                 | 0.873                           |
| Self-Expression Need                | 0.956            | 0.966 | 0.963                 | 0.79                            |
| Emotion Need                        | 0.954            | 0.956 | 0.962                 | 0.785                           |
| Personal Need                       | 0.972            | 0.974 | 0.976                 | 0.855                           |
| Social Need                         | 0.943            | 0.946 | 0.953                 | 0.744                           |
| Primary reason of usage (Info seeking) | 1                | 1     | 1                     | 1                               |
| Preferred watching place (Office)   | 1                | 1     | 1                     | 1                               |
Table 2. Cross-Loading

| Types of programs frequently watched | Primary reason of usage (Info seeking) | Cognitive Need | Self-Expression Need | Emotion Need | Personal Need | Social Need | Preferred media platform (Info seeking) | Preferred watching place (Office) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 0.778                               |                                        |                |                     |              |               |            |                                       |                                   |
| 0.521                               | 0.825                                  | -0.298         | -0.304              | 0.934        |               |            |                                       |                                   |
| Cognitive Need                      |                                        | -0.319         | -0.351              | 0.59         | 0.889         |            |                                       |                                   |
| Self-Expression Need                |                                        | -0.327         | -0.338              | 0.792        | 0.716         | 0.886      |                                       |                                   |
| Emotion Need                        |                                        | -0.27          | -0.303              | 0.73         | 0.678         | 0.805      | 0.925                                |                                   |
| Personal Need                       |                                        | -0.245         | -0.271              | 0.672        | 0.689         | 0.762      | 0.75       | 0.863                                |                                   |
| Social Need                         |                                        | -0.106         | -0.165              | 0.015        | 0.047         | 0.005      | 0.037      | 0.075      | 1                                  |                                   |
| Preferred media platform (Info seeking) |                                        | 0.269          | 0.38                | -0.423       | -0.377        | 0.435      | 0.399      | 0.383      | 0.037      | 1                                  |                                   |

Table 3. Fornell-Lacker Value
Table 4. Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT)

| Types of programs frequently watched | Primary reason of usage (Info seeking) | Cognitive Need | Self-Expression Need | Emotion Need | Personal Need | Social Need | Preferred media platform (Info seeking) | Preferred watching place (Office) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0.778                               |                                       | 0.521          | 0.825              |              |               |            |                                        |                               |
|                                      |                                       | -              | -                  |              |               | -          |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | 0.298          | 0.304              | 0.934        |               |            |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | -              | -                  | 0.59         | 0.889         | -          |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | 0.319          | 0.351              | 0.792        | 0.716         | 0.886      |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | -              | -                  | 0.327        | 0.338         | 0.792      |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | -              | -                  | -            | 0.672         | 0.762      |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | -              | -                  | 0.245        | 0.271         | 0.672      |                                        |                               |
| -                                   |                                       | -              | -                  | 0.106        | 0.165         | 0.015      |                                        |                               |
| 0.269                               |                                       | 0.38           | -0.423             | -0.377       | 0.43          | 0.38       | -0.03                                  | 0.03                          |
|                                      |                                       | -              | -                  | 0.269        | 0.38          | 0.43       |                                        | 0.3                           |
| -                                   |                                       | -              | -                  | 0.38         | 0.38          | 0.38       |                                        |                               |
Common Method Variance
Common method variance (CMV) is an issue that primarily happened when the data were collected using one single instrument (Podsakoff et al., 2012). Thus, this study adapted Harman’s Single Factor Test (Tehseen et al., 2017, p. 155) approach to determine the CMV is processing the data through unrotated factor analysis (using SPSS software). The factor scores were computed on the first unrotated factor. The VIF value is well below the threshold value of 3.3 which indicating there is no CMV issue in the data itself.

Structural Model
In order to ensure the yielded results on the mediating relationships (Figure 1) is reliable, the transmittal approach was adapted and the result was determined by the guidelines from past literature ((Ramayah et al., 2018; Rungtusanatham et al., 2014). This study only focuses only on indirect effects in order to determine the strength of the mediation effect in bridging the

| Types of programs frequently watched | Primary reason of usage (Info seeking) | Cognitive Need | Self-Expression Need | Emotion Need | Personal Need | Social Need | Preferred media platform (Info seeking) | Preferred watching place (Office) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 0.624                               |                                       | 0.308          | 0.343                |              |              |           |                                        | 0.123                            |
|                                      |                                       | 0.331          | 0.397                | 0.605        |              |           |                                        | 0.278                            |
|                                      |                                       | 0.339          | 0.384                | 0.822        | 0.74         |           |                                        | 0.278                            |
|                                      |                                       | 0.339          | 0.384                | 0.822        | 0.74         |           |                                        | 0.278                            |
|                                      |                                       | 0.276          | 0.341                | 0.753        | 0.694        | 0.835     |                                        | 0.278                            |
|                                      |                                       | 0.276          | 0.341                | 0.753        | 0.694        | 0.835     |                                        | 0.278                            |
|                                      |                                       | 0.255          | 0.305                | 0.702        | 0.716        | 0.799     | 0.78                                   |                                   |
|                                      |                                       | 0.255          | 0.305                | 0.702        | 0.716        | 0.799     | 0.78                                   |                                   |
|                                      |                                       | 0.255          | 0.305                | 0.702        | 0.716        | 0.799     | 0.78                                   |                                   |
|                                      |                                       | 0.255          | 0.305                | 0.702        | 0.716        | 0.799     | 0.78                                   |                                   |
|                                      |                                       | 0.255          | 0.305                | 0.702        | 0.716        | 0.799     | 0.78                                   |                                   |

**Types of programs frequently watched**

- Cognitive Need
- Self-Expression Need
- Emotion Need
- Personal Need
- Social Need
- Preferred media platform (Info seeking)
- Preferred watching place (Office)
The relationship between IV and DV. The mediation analysis in PLS-SEM is this study also followed the general recommendations by past literature in determining the mediating effects (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2017; Klarner et al., 2013; Nitzl et al., 2016; Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Zhao et al., 2010). The figure 1 below, display the structural model of this study.

It is crucial when analysing the mediating effects that, collinearity between constructs is not an issue prior to proceed with the analysis (Hair et al., 2017; Hair, Hult, Ringle, Sarstedt & Thiele, 2017). The same process as determining CMV can be applied in determining collinearity between constructs. As shown in Table 5, all values were well below the threshold value for VIF of 3.3 (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2006; Kock & Lynn, 2012; Picon et al., 2014). Thus, it is confirmed that there is no issue in collinearity between constructs.

Figure 1. Structural Model of the Study
Hypotheses testing

For mediation testing, 5000 iterations of the bootstrapping procedure were adapted based on the suggestion from the past literature in order to estimate 95% bias-corrected confidence interval for the total indirect effect and the indirect effects (Hair et al., 2017; Preacher and Hayes, 2008); Rungtusanatham et al., 2014; Ramayah et al., 2018). The results of the hypothesis testing are presented in table 6. Preferred watching place (Office), Primary reason of usage (Info seeking), and Preferred Types of Programs → U & G T needs. Based on the literature on U&G theory, it has been proposed that five different U&G needs – cognitive, emotional, personal, social, and self-expression was influenced by discrete choice elements of viewer’s intentional mediated by the primary reason of usage and types of the preferred program. These two mediators mediate the gratification needs as discussed below.
| Hypotheses Testing | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Stats. (|O/STDEV|) | Decision | $R^2$ | $f^2$ | $Q^2$ | CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (CI) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------|------|------|------|--------------------------|
| Preferred watching place -> Primary reason of usage -> Types of programs frequently watched -> Emotion Need | -0.092 | 0.017 | 5.303 | Accepted | 0.214 | 0.206 | -0.101 | -0.03 |
| Preferred watching place -> Primary reason of usage -> Types of programs frequently watched -> Cognitive Need | -0.084 | 0.017 | 4.858 | Accepted | 0.175 | 0.199 | -0.098 | -0.026 |
| Preferred watching place -> Primary reason of usage -> Types of programs frequently watched -> Self-Expression Need | -0.084 | 0.017 | 4.991 | Accepted | 0.363 | 0.174 | 0.154 | -0.132 | -0.04 |
| Preferred watching place -> Primary reason of usage -> Types of programs frequently watched -> Personal Need | -0.076 | 0.016 | 4.866 | Accepted | 0.138 | 0.169 | -0.088 | -0.02 |
| Preferred watching place -> Primary reason of usage -> Types of programs frequently watched -> Social Need | -0.07 | 0.015 | 4.659 | Accepted | 0.114 | 0.129 | -0.143 | -0.044 |
Discussion

Theoretical contributions

In this study, DCM is applied in analysing the categorical data form of the observed variables for the IV. The attribute levels of the indicators were transformed into binary coding form of Boolean block in order the outer loading of indicators were able to be analysed in SmartPLS 3. DCM was adopted since the aim of this study is to pin-point the discrete choice of elements by viewers in their intention of watching portal TV. On the other hand, most of the studies measuring the importance weight of the IV in influencing the relationship in the proposed model. By using this method, this study was able to identify a single element that influencing the gratification needs that sought by viewers through their primary reason of usage and the types of programs frequently watched in portal TV as the mediating effect in this study.

The results indicated that the mediating role of both usage frequency and types of preferred programs mediate the influence discrete choice of office as the preferred watching place to all five gratification needs sought by viewers through both of their watching frequency (surfing online news portal) and preferred types of programs (interview program and arts/ cultural program). These viewing patterns were to fulfill the information seeking, getting up-to-date with the local political leaders and simply just to kill boredom that caused by the absence of the company to talk with them. This indicates that viewers when using portal TV aware of the needs that they want to gratify based on their surrounding environment (Zhanna Bagdasarov et al, 2010).

Second, portal TV was used in the office by viewers largely for information seeking for any development or announcement made by the political leaders and as a stress reliever at the workplace when they got a time to access it. This gratifies their satisfaction that refers to the emotional response to the environment of their currently facing in a workplace (Moreira and Silva, 2015). Thus, portal TV was preferably accessed at the office as a stress reliever in fulfilling emotion gratifications need in respond to the volatile events that they experience in a workplace. The utilization of portal TV media platform in this sense is to satisfy the three most basic psychographic categories which are personal, social and tension release gratifications (Zolkepli et al., 2018). Finally, the Results showed information seeking is one of the crucial needs to be gratified by viewers when accessing portal TV at the workplace. This is due to their need to acquire latest updates by the country’s leaders that could give a direct impact on their work routine. Young generation of employees tends to rely on the portal TV news for a more reliable source of information compared to the social media (Mumtaz et al., 2019). Thus, the factor contributes more on discrete choice of viewers that preferred to access portal TV at their workplace.

Practical Contributions

There are few practical contributions of this study, especially to the media content providers in Malaysia. This study is succeeded to help them understand the importance of elements in portal television for improving audience satisfaction. The first contribution is through the result of this study, the media content providers able to identify the appropriate media content to be included in their airing schedule particularly during office hour on weekdays. Our study indicates that cognitive and emotional needs are the most sought gratifications by the respondents when utilizing the portal TV. These two needs are influenced the discrete choice of elements of the viewers. Our study suggests that organisation strategies can be built around these two needs. Strengthen about this factor, will virtually help TV stations to improve
their media content. It is very important to know to what extent the TV portal satisfies audiences and organisations, due the organizations constantly competing with each other.

This study is focusing on the working adults, and the results show that most of them are preferred to use the portal TV at the office for information seeking through the types of programs that they preferred which are interview program, arts and cultural program. Most of the media content providers are focusing on the prime time in their airing schedule, particularly in the evening and weekends for the insertions of advertisement and did not focus on during working hours on weekdays. From the findings, the media content providers able to maximize the utilization of their airing schedule by identifying appropriate contents and insertions during office hours.

The second contribution of this study is, through the types of programs watched by viewers the media content providers able to come out with the fact-driven ideas for their portal TV programs during office-hour on weekdays. The results show that the programs that oriented in information seeking is the most sought by viewers when they are working. This result is able to be a catalyst for media content providers to come out with creative programs that are driven by the data and fact which will increase the accuracy on reaching out the target audience.

During this Covid-19 pandemic, the pandemic is massively affected the working culture in Malaysia. Most of working adults were found to seek information from mainstream sources of mass media, print media, and online sources such as official websites and websites of newspapers and forums (Liu, 2020; Soroya et al., 2021). This needs to be seriously considered by media content providers if they want to fully utilize the effectiveness of their program airing strategy and stay on track with the current scenario.

Future research implications
Despite the contributions of this study, it had some limitations. Due to the sole focus of this study is to the uses of portal TV in gratifying needs, the same findings could not be implied to the other forms of media platform. This is the opportunity for future research to the same methodology to the other forms of media platforms in adopting a CDM approach with PLS-SEM. This method is specifically useful in pinpointing a single element that chose by viewers and directly influencing their needs. This research was specifically conducted in a Malaysian context, and there is a need to see if the results can be replicated in other countries to further examine the effect of cross-cultural differences on the discrete choice on usage intention. There may also be other categorical constructs that can be tested the overall model prediction that should be explored, such as preferred using time, and preferred companion that influence viewers’ discrete choice intentions.

Conclusions
The categorical choices made by viewers are crucial indicators on their preferred selection of elements that drive their intentions on media usage. Categorical indicators are capable of identifying their gratification needs with clinical precision on their concrete selection. This approach is able to benefit market researchers that want to identify the preferred choice of attributes that the consumers seek whether on a product, service and in this case the consumption of media.
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