

# Study on factors impacting audience's choice while connecting with podcast

**Abhishek Tiwari**, Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies, Range Hills Road, Khadki, Pune. Symbiosis International (Deemed University)

**Abstract-** This research paper looks into what are main reasons behind any listeners selecting or listening to any podcast. This study collects data from actual podcast audience who listen to different podcast daily. Questionnaire was filled up by around 200 frequent podcast listeners across India. Factor analysis was done on data collected to look for factors affecting podcast selection in India. Key findings of analysis suggest that Indian Audience look for a podcast which produce quality content and also comes up with new content frequently. And whether they keep on listening to those podcast depends a lot on their connection with host, connection can be in form of social media interactions or even people's individual comfort with host voice. Audience wants to hear soothing and calm voice again and again and this factor is key for audience retention.

Keywords- Podcasting in India, factor affecting podcast selection, key to a mass podcast, successful podcast factors.

### I. INTRODUCTION

What is a digital broadcast? Basically: a digital broadcast is a sound program, actually like Talk Radio, yet you buy in to it on your cell phone and hear it out at whatever point you like.

The historical backdrop of web recordings unfurls along a course of events set apart by mechanical advancements and moving utilization propensities in the 21st century.

At the beginning of the new thousand years, the term podcasting didn't exist. However, with the appearance of different advances—like the moderateness of home chronicle gear and programming, quicker and more available web access, and an ascent in specialty networks aching for specific on-request content—a pristine, remarkably 21st-century medium was conceived.

Perhaps no one might have really anticipated that a medium most intently taking after bygone era radio would proceed to turn into the following huge thing, however here we are. More than 100 million Americans are tuning into digital broadcasts for data and diversion consistently, and webcast obtaining bargains are being endorsed as much as \$100 million. Almost certainly, you have your own most loved digital broadcast whose week after week scenes you anticipate with intensity. It's unfathomable, as it were, to recall our reality before digital broadcasts, yet we should check it out.

The partiality for digital recordings can be credited to a couple of reasons. To begin with, audience members need to be recounted a testimony and pod-cast is probably the best mechanism for that. Additionally, audience members need to gain some new useful knowledge, and digital broadcasts offer experiences, regardless of whether that implies learning another dialect, or seeing how the innovation works. Truth be told, Spotify's Report 2020 puts forward, 86% of Asian(Indian) guardians that tune in to digital recordings feel that the system now looks like an accommodating instructive device.

Moreover, many of recent college grads and GenZ overviewed expressed that web recordings powered their own-disclosure. This tries to show digital India's/Asias developing acknowledgment of the podcast medium. What's more, maybe the main explanation behind the liking is that audience members need friendship, and sound can break past obstructions of video, available across gadgets and as a backup to the audience members' other essential exercises, say driving or cooking.

This research paper looks into what are main reasons behind any listeners selecting or listening to any podcast. This study collects data from actual podcast audience who listen to different podcast daily. Sample audience is taken from all over India, who follow Indian Crime Story, a true crime podcast available on various podcast platform available in India. Results indicate that audience selection of podcast depends a lot on how audience connects with host, they connect on content quality or frequency or even connect on host voice and how he presents his content. Currently most of podcast are freely available in India due to lack of proper monetization policy on various platform but still audience have this factor also on their mind, they want podcast to be pocket friendly. They are also aware that in future with growth of podcast industry in India, podcast may start to charge money from their audience, when this happens they don't want money to make podcast go out of reach of middle class in India.

#### II. METHODOLOGY

For this research a well drafted questionnaire was shared with listeners of INDIAN CRIME STORY, nearly 200 responses were analyzed for this research.

Factor(facets) Analysis is a procedure that is harnessed to decrease large number of facets into less quantities of components. This method extricates most extreme normal fluctuation from all facets and arrange those into a score. All things considered, we can utilize this score for further more detailed and elaborated analysis.

#### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Vast Schooling and free-spirited Research

Demonstrated on the broad understanding methodology (Susser and Robb, 1990), broad tuning in (EL) is characterized as alluding to an individualized listening movement with a lot of target language contribution of students' inclinations and at their levels. The estimation of EL lies in expanding "automaticity of Research Yeh - Page 136

Acknowledgment of words in their expressed structure, thus prompting improved aural familiarity and consequently improvement in generally speaking cognizance" (Brown, 2007, p. 15). Ridgway (2000, p. 180) additionally viewed automaticity as a critical component in language obtaining and held that training assumes the main part in accomplishing automaticity: "Practice is the main thing. The seriously listening the better, and the subskills will deal with themselves as they become automatized." Renandya and Farrell (2011, p. 56) progressed a comparative conviction: "actually like perusing, listening is best scholarly through tuning in."Another rationale for encouraging EL is the concept of "language learning for life" (Field, 2008, p. 4). Field contended that educators need to give a sort of student preparing that "includes getting ready students so they can exploit the wellsprings of phonetic data that this present reality gives" (p. 5). All in all, this methodology expects to outfit students with the capacity to keep learning after they complete language courses and when the educator isn't there to help them. In this methodology, perusing and listening are two normal methods for broadening students' information through autonomous learning, the last having an additional advantage of improving spoken familiarity (Field, 2008). In this sense, EL can be utilized as a way to cultivate autonomous learning, and for instructors and understudies trying to exploit new innovation, digital recordings can give the rich objective language input required in the EL approach.

#### **Data Analysis & Interpretation**

KMO proportion for inspecting ampleness and the Bartlett's examination for Sphericity for making a decision about the inclination of a factor model. KMO measurement looks at the greatness of the noticed connection coefficient with the extent of halfway relationship coefficient. A higher estimation of this measurement (from 0.5to 1) shows the inclination of the factor examination. Kaiser has introduced the reach as follows

## >.6 is Mediocre

## <.5 Unacceptable

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin gives a Sampling Adequacy of 0.617, it shows the worth is in adequate area of the factor examination model.

Bartlett's examination for Sphericity is trial for speculation whether the populace connection framework is a personality lattice. The presence of the character lattice puts the rightness of the factor examination under doubt. The Chi square measurement is 223.666 with level of opportunity 55. This worth is critical at 0.00

level. Both the outcomes for example KMO measurement and Bartlett's examination for Sphericity, shows a suitable factor examination model.

| character            |         |            |  |  |  |
|----------------------|---------|------------|--|--|--|
|                      | Initial | Extraction |  |  |  |
| often*               | 1.000   | .418       |  |  |  |
| Episode_freq         | 1.000   | .769       |  |  |  |
| Audio_quality        | 1.000   | .492       |  |  |  |
| Story_telling_tech   | 1.000   | .805       |  |  |  |
| Calming_voice_host   | 1.000   | .686       |  |  |  |
| Episode_content      | 1.000   | .685       |  |  |  |
| Familiar_voice       | 1.000   | .651       |  |  |  |
| User_suggestions     | 1.000   | .645       |  |  |  |
| Episode_length       | 1.000   | .673       |  |  |  |
| Price                | 1.000   | .786       |  |  |  |
| Social_media_connect | 1.000   | .744       |  |  |  |

The character depict the measure of change a variable offer with any remaining factors taken into study. It tends to be seen that the absolute commonness esteem is equivalent to 11 (as can be seen, the solidarities are embedded in the slanting of connection framework) for all the factors is taken into the factor examination model. The SPSS, as a matter of course relegates a collection estimation of 1 to all the factors. The separated communalities as demonstrated in the third segment is gauge of the fluctuation in every factor, which can be ascribed to factors in the factor arrangement. Moderately little estimation of mutuality proposes that the concerned variable is a maverick for the factor arrangement and can be exited from the factor investigation.

| Total Varia | nce      |                        |                            |       |                                     |                            |  |
|-------------|----------|------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Element     | Eigen va | Eigen values           |                            |       | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |                            |  |
|             | SUM      | percentage<br>Variance | ofCumulative<br>percentage | SUM   | percentage<br>Variance              | ofCumulative<br>percentage |  |
| 1           | 2.726    | 24.779                 | 24.779                     | 2.726 | 24.779                              | 24.779                     |  |
| 2           | 1.260    | 11.450                 | 36.229                     | 1.260 | 11.450                              | 36.229                     |  |
| 3           | 1.203    | 10.934                 | 47.164                     | 1.203 | 10.934                              | 47.164                     |  |
| 4           | 1.138    | 10.345                 | 57.509                     | 1.138 | 10.345                              | 57.509                     |  |
| 5           | 1.027    | 9.340                  | 66.849                     | 1.027 | 9.340                               | 66.849                     |  |
| 6           | .802     | 7.290                  | 74.139                     |       |                                     |                            |  |
| 7           | .734     | 6.673                  | 80.813                     |       |                                     |                            |  |
| 8           | .708     | 6.435                  | 87.247                     |       |                                     |                            |  |
| 9           | .596     | 5.418                  | 92.665                     |       |                                     |                            |  |
| 10          | .484     | 4.404                  | 97.069                     |       |                                     |                            |  |
| 11          | .322     | 2.931                  | 100.000                    |       |                                     |                            |  |

**Total Variance** 

| Element | Rotation total | Rotation total of Squared Loadings |                       |  |  |  |
|---------|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|         | SUM            | Percentage of Variance             | Cumulative Percentage |  |  |  |
| 1       | 2.087          | 18.969                             | 18.969                |  |  |  |
| 2       | 1.475          | 13.412                             | 32.381                |  |  |  |
| 3       | 1.362          | 12.385                             | 44.766                |  |  |  |
| 4       | 1.221          | 11.101                             | 55.867                |  |  |  |
| 5       | 1.208          | 10.982                             | 66.849                |  |  |  |
| 6       |                |                                    |                       |  |  |  |
| 7       |                |                                    |                       |  |  |  |
| 8       |                |                                    |                       |  |  |  |

| 9  |  | I |
|----|--|---|
| 10 |  |   |
| 11 |  |   |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

-----

. . . . .

Presents the underlying eigenvalues (absolute, % of change, and total %), extraction amounts of squared loadings (complete, % of difference, and aggregate %) and the turn amounts of squared loadings (all out, % of fluctuation, and total %). The "All out" section gives the measure of change in the variable credited to the concerned segment or factor. The "% of fluctuation" section demonstrates the level of change represented by every particular factor or segment. Note that the complete change represented by all the five factor is equivalent to 66.849. The change credited to channel comfort, content quality, content amount, crowd and host interface and Pocket Friendly. Additionally, the complete difference ascribed to all the variables can be processed. The second piece of the figure is the extraction amounts of squared loadings that gives data identified with the extricated elements or segments. The third piece of the figure, revolution amounts of the squared loadings, the fluctuation represented by the turned variables or parts is not the same as those demonstrated in the second section of extraction totals o squared loadings, it is critical to take note of that for pivot amounts of squared stacking, the total rate for the arrangement of segments will consistently stay same.

| Element Matrix       |         |         |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------|---------|---------|------|------|------|--|
|                      | Element | Element |      |      |      |  |
|                      | 1       | 2       | 3    | 4    | 5    |  |
| often*               | .583    | .061    | 127  | 060  | 235  |  |
| Episode_freq         | .356    | 224     | .425 | .154 | .622 |  |
| Audio_quality        | .639    | .064    | 075  | 202  | 180  |  |
| Story_telling_tech   | .516    | .221    | 605  | .267 | .230 |  |
| Calming_voice_host   | .582    | 173     | .181 | .152 | 511  |  |
| Episode_content      | .509    | 069     | 396  | .492 | .147 |  |
| Familiar_voice       | .682    | 197     | .331 | 166  | 101  |  |
| User_suggestions     | .344    | .655    | .274 | .063 | 134  |  |
| Episode_length       | .620    | 228     | .130 | 311  | .352 |  |
| Price                | .134    | .603    | 118  | 575  | .245 |  |
| Social_media_connect | 013     | .485    | .478 | .524 | .075 |  |

Element matrix: It addresses the factor stacking for every factor on unrotated factors. Each incentive under the heading part addresses the connection b/w the concerned variable and the unrotated factors. The worth given under Factors addresses the connection between's the concerned variable and Factors. The figure shows ideal degree of relationship.

| Rotated Element Matrix |  |
|------------------------|--|
|                        |  |

|                      | Element |      |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------|---------|------|------|------|------|--|
|                      | 1       | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |  |
| often*               | .581    | .261 | 010  | 003  | .111 |  |
| Episode_freq         | 028     | .082 | .851 | .161 | 103  |  |
| Audio_quality        | .629    | .195 | .082 | 043  | .223 |  |
| Story_telling_tech   | .127    | .866 | .016 | .001 | .197 |  |
| Calming_voice_host   | .756    | .048 | 006  | .119 | 314  |  |
| Episode_content      | .175    | .771 | .130 | .033 | 203  |  |
| Familiar_voice       | .685    | 059  | .422 | .014 | 013  |  |
| User_suggestions     | .321    | .040 | 053  | .650 | .340 |  |
| Episode_length       | .383    | .101 | .653 | 206  | .219 |  |
| Price                | .015    | .001 | .011 | .053 | .885 |  |
| Social_media_connect | 127     | .004 | .079 | .843 | 105  |  |

Rotated Element matrix: the segment shows the factor stacking for every factor for concerned factor after pivot. It shows that the factors have high stacking on factors.

IV. FINDINGS

The Factors extracted can be grouped as: Audio\_quality + Calming\_voice\_host + Familiar\_voice = Channel Comfort Story\_telling\_tech + Episode\_content = Content quality Episode\_freq + Episode\_length = Content quantity User\_suggestions + Social\_media\_connect = Audience and host connect Price = Pocket Friendly

> **Element Transformation** Component 3 4 5 402 .079 .787 .444 .128 2 .077 .125 .327 .674 .646 3 133 .688 450 .526 .173 .192 490 -.051.511 -.677 .566 272 725 .031 .280

Element transformation: it is utilized to build the turned factor framework from unrotated factor grid by utilizing a straightforward equation (unrotated factor stacking \* factor change lattice = pivoted factor stacking). A worth near 0 shows a generally more modest turn and worth more than in addition to short 5 demonstrates huge pivot.

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on our research be would suggest new and upcoming or any other who is planning to come up with their podcast channel in future should focus on as many of 5 different components (Channel Comfort, Content quality, Content quantity, Audience and host connect and Pocket Friendly) explored in this research. Channel comfort depends a lot on voice quality, to improve on this component, creator can use voice modulation or any kind of robotic voice creation software. For other component creator needs to find a perfect balance, which can be found with experience and time. Social media is a huge actor in almost every industry existing in current world, same way social media will play great role in creating audience and creator connect.

#### References

- 1. Abdous, M., Camarena, M. M., & Facer, B. R. (2009). MALL technology: Use of academic podcasting in the foreign language classroom. ReCALL, 21(1), 76-95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S095834400900020
- 2. Benson, P. (2001). Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning. Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- 3. Brown, R. (2007). Extensive listening in English as a foreign language. The Language Teacher, 31(12), 15-19.
- 4. Chan, W. M., Chi, S. W., Chin, K. N., & Lin, C. Y. (2011). Students' perceptions of and attitudes towards podcast-based learning—A comparison of two language podcast projects. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 8, 312-335. Retrieved from http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/archive/v8s12011.htm
- 5. Chinnery, G. M. (2006). Going to the MALL: Mobile assisted language learning. Language Learning & Technology, 10(1), 9-16.
- 6. Copley, J. (2007). Audio and video podcasts of lectures for campus-based students: Production and evaluation of student use. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44(4), 387-399. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703290701602805
- 7. Cross, J. (2011). Metacognitive instruction for helping less-skilled listeners. ELT Journal, 65(4), 408-416. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq073

- 8. Ducate, L., & Lomicka, L. (2009). Podcasting: An effective tool for honing language students' pronunciation? Language Learning & Technology, 13(3), 66-86.
- 9. Field, J. (2008). Listening in the language classroom. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511575945
- 10. Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. RELC Journal, 39(2), 188-213. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092184
- 11. Hew, K. (2009). Use of audio podcast in K-12 and higher education: A review of research topics and methodologies. Educational Technology Research and Development, 57(3), 333-357. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-008-9108-3
- 12. Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. TESOL Quarterly, 40(1), 109-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40264513
- 13. Judge, P. B. (2011). Driven to read: Enthusiastic readers in a Japanese high school's extensive reading program. Reading in a Foreign Language, 23(2), 161-186.
- 14. Kemp, J. (2010). The listening log: Motivating autonomous learning. ELT Journal, 64(4), 385-395. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp099
- 15. Lee, M. J. W., & Chan, A. (2007). Pervasive, lifestyle-integrated mobile learning for distance learners: An analysis and unexpected results from a podcasting study. Open Learning, 22(3), 201-218. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680510701619810
- 16. McQuillan, J. (2006). Language on the go: Tuning in to podcasting. International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 2(1), 16-18.
- 17. O'Bryan, A., & Hegelheimer, V. (2007). Integrating CALL into the classroom: The role of podcasting in an ESL listening strategies course. ReCALL, 19(2), 162-180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0958344007000523
- 18.Pemberton, R., Toogood, S., & Barfield, A. (Eds.). (2009). Maintaining control: Autonomy and language<br/>learning.HongKong:HongKongUniversityPress.http://dx.doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789622099234.001.0001</td
- 19. Renandya, W. A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2011). 'Teacher, the tape is too fast!' Extensive listening in ELT. ELT Journal, 65(1), 52-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq015
- 20. Ridgway, T. (2000). Listening strategies—I beg your pardon? ELT Journal, 54(2), 179-185. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.179