

5-2015

# An examination of relocation videos and their ability to persuade entrepreneurs

Julia N. Martin

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, [julnimar@gmail.com](mailto:julnimar@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.utc.edu/honors-theses>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Martin, Julia N., "An examination of relocation videos and their ability to persuade entrepreneurs" (2015). *Honors Theses*.

This Theses is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research, Creative Works, and Publications at UTC Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UTC Scholar. For more information, please contact [scholar@utc.edu](mailto:scholar@utc.edu).

**An Examination of Relocation Videos and Their Ability to  
Persuade Entrepreneurs**

Julia Martin

Departmental Thesis

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Major Department: Communications

Project Director: Dr. Michael Friedman

Examination Date: March 23, 2015

Examination Committee:

Dr. Mohammad Ahmadi, Professor Michael Andrews, Dr. Chandler Harriss

Signatures:

Project Director - \_\_\_\_\_

Department Examiner - \_\_\_\_\_

Department Examiner - \_\_\_\_\_

Liaison, Departmental Honors Committee - \_\_\_\_\_

Chair, Departmental Honors Committee - \_\_\_\_\_

Dedicated to: Laurie Moseley Martin

Thank you for always supporting me in all of my endeavors.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge and express my great appreciation for my director, Dr. Michael Friedman, who introduced me to the art of persuasion and has helped me immensely with my research. Without his guidance, I would not have been able to complete this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Chandler Harriss, a member of my committee, for his guidance in video analysis and qualitative research. In addition to Dr. Harriss and Dr. Friedman, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Mohammad Ahmadi and Professor Michael Andrews for their support and guidance as members of my committee.

I would also like to thank my fiancé, Wesley Bursch, for his indirect help and support throughout the writing process. Without his understanding and support, this thesis would not be possible.

Finally, a big thank you to my family and friends for their patience and support throughout the duration of my thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Theoretical Framework	6
Expert Power	6
Mere Exposure	10
Transportation Theory	12
Opinion Change	15
Research Questions	19
Study Method	19
Data Collection	20
Analysis of Results	29
Interpretation of Results	32
References	34

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Information Age is well underway, and we have arrived at a time in which almost everything has gone digital. Knowing the best way to reach audiences using new digital mediums has become fundamental. As markets become more competitive and communication becomes more convoluted it is more important than ever for businesses and cities around the world to be able to recruit employees and convince people to relocate their companies to a specific city in a more effective and efficient way.

Online videos distributed through e-mail or presented on a website are an effective way of attracting and persuading individuals as it gives them the opportunity to see and/or hear about a city in a way that they never have before (Green & Brock, 2002). Using video communication as a recruiting tool saves a lot of time and money. However, the problem at hand is that we do not know what kind of video will work best to draw the attention of entrepreneurs to a specific market.

In this study, I examine two different videos, one with just a “head and shoulders” angle of a person talking that happens to be an expert (Video A) and another one with images and voice-overs (Video B). The purpose of this examination is to see which of these videos would be more likely according to persuasive theories to change the opinions of more entrepreneurs in their willingness to relocate to Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Convincing someone to change their current position is extremely difficult, and, therefore, makes convincing someone to move their family and business challenging. Through this study we will determine which of two combinations of

persuasive theories is the stronger way to convince someone to change their opinion on their willingness to relocate.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

John R. P. French and Bertram Raven's expert power is a strong form of persuasion. In Raven's 1993 analysis of his and French's 1959 study he explains that expert power is the product of a receiver trusting that a communicator has a greater knowledge of a specific topic. If a speaker is able to make it clear that they are knowledgeable on a topic then the receiver will view them as an expert on that topic. In an earlier study French and Raven state that the strength of the expert power is dependent on the knowledge of the expert or the expert's perceived level of knowledge by the receiver and typically the receiver evaluates the expert's "expertness" in relation to his or her own prior knowledge (1959). They further explain that in order for expert power to work the receiver must believe that the speaker is knowledgeable and trust that he or she is being truthful (French & Raven, 1959).

Researchers have found that expert power alone is able to significantly effect trust, relationships, and cooperation (Chinomona & Pretorius, 2011; Beeble & Salem, 2009). If an individual is perceived by their listener to be an expert on a topic then they will begin to gain the trust of that listener. This trust then begins a relationship, which significantly increases the chances of cooperation from the listener to do whatever the expert is asking of them meaning that the expert has the ability to change the opinion of that listener.

In group settings, researchers have found that expert power has the ability to influence the entire group (Beeble & Salem, 2009; Salem, Reischl, Gallacher, & Randall, 2000). As one or a few members of the group begin to be influenced by the expert, the others will follow suit according to crowd theory (Freud 1975). This was proven in several support groups (Beeble & Salem, 2009; Salem, Reischl, Gallacher, & Randall, 2000). If expert power is powerful enough to influence an entire group, it will have the same effect on a single person. This also means that if an expert has the ability to persuade an entire group, he or she also has the ability to persuade that group to change their opinion on a topic.

In addition to being strong, expert power is also considered to be a legitimate source of power, meaning that it is non-coercive (Sahadev, 2005). Researchers have found that expert power's effectiveness has a positive relationship with rational persuasion and consultation influence strategies (Sahadev, 2005; Farrel & Schroder, 1999). The expert speaking does not need to use coercion in order to persuade his or her audience. Experts are able to use their knowledge on a specific topic or situation to persuade an audience to trust and listen to their message using rational persuasion. Research has also shown a correlation between expert power and the cooperation of listeners to the message of the expert (Sahadev, 2005).

Therefore, expert power alone is able to persuade listeners to trust, listen, and then cooperate with the message of a communicator. For example, a CEO speaking about doing business in a specific city has the ability to persuade another business owner to move his or her business to that city because the CEO has gained the trust of the listener through his or her status as an expert, gotten them to listen, and

based off his or her knowledge and experience may get the listener to cooperate – all of which occurs without any sort of coercion. Even if the communicator is not effective in getting the listener to cooperate after first hearing the message, he or she is able to create a lasting positive attitude towards and memory for the communicator’s message simply due to exposure to the expert and the expert’s message (Klucharev, Smidts & Fernández, 2008). This lasting impression is an effect of a level of persuasion from expert power, and while it may not result in immediate cooperation, it does open up the possibility for further persuasion as the listener now has a positive attitude towards and memory for the topic.

Expert power is based on trust, which is an element of source credibility (O’Keefe, 2002; Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953). The credibility of a speaker is made up of the conclusions made by the receiver concerning several different factors including perceived expertise, trustworthiness, education, occupation, experience, nonfluencies in delivery, citation of evidence sources, position advocated, and liking for the communicator (O’Keefe, 2002). O’Keefe explains that expertise and trustworthiness have the strongest bearing on credibility and, therefore, persuasiveness. These two traits are built up in a number of ways, particularly through the other factors of credibility. Sharing examples of experience allows a speaker to make it very clear that he or she is well versed and truly an expert in a specific area – lending to their credibility and appearance as an expert. Depending on the expert’s experiences and message they may even lend their own credibility to another person or thing. O’Keefe shows that nonfluencies in delivery affect the perceived credibility of a speaker, but these nonfluencies are not always negative.

Receivers are more perceptive to speakers that they have a general liking for, and similarity between the speaker and receiver often results in liking (O’Keefe, 2002; Cialdini, 2007). A small number of nonfluencies in delivery, such as the use of the word “um” once or twice, allows the receiver to see a similarity between themselves and the speaker – the nonfluency humanizes the speaker. The liking from the similarity and humanization then leads to trust and credibility. This credibility when mixed with expert power has been proven to be persuasive enough to get individuals to act a certain way. In 1963, Stanley Milgram performed an experiment in which participants were asked to administer increasing amounts of electric shock to other participants (this participant was actually an actor and the electric shocks were fake). Milgram found that most participants were willing to administer all the way up to the highest shock because they were told to continue with the experiment by an “expert”, someone dressed as a doctor (Milgram, 1963, p. 371). In 2001, researchers found that customers were hesitant to adopt solutions presented by sales representatives unless those sales representatives seemed to have a high level of expertise, as well as a higher ranking in the company, and seemed trustworthy (Liu & Leach, 2001). The findings from both of these studies together show that the receiver is not simply persuaded by a communicator that looks like an expert. This expert must also have credibility and trustworthiness – they must actually be an expert or be exceedingly convincing that they are one. Expert power and source credibility have the strength to persuade a receiver to listen and cooperate.

## **Mere Exposure**

While expert power is powerful, it can be made much stronger when partnered with another persuasive theory, such as mere exposure. In 1968 Robert Zajonc hypothesized that the exposure to a repeated stimulus object would result in a more positive attitude towards that object from the receiver (Zajonc, 1968; Cialdini 2007). The receiver should be exposed to the stimulus object three or more times in a short period of time in order for mere exposure to work. If a speaker in a video were to repeat a specific point or word multiple times, it would draw the receiver to naturally like the specific point or word due to their exposure to it. As the liking for the object increases through mere exposure, the receiver becomes more susceptible to the message.

Many researchers in social psychology have proven Zajonc's theory that increased exposure for a more familiar stimulus causes a greater liking for the stimulus object (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Harmon-Jones & Allen, 2001; Lee, 2001; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; Bornstein, 1989). Bornstein's 1989 meta-analysis on mere exposure explains that mere exposure is effective in many different situations as a form of persuasion. While mere exposure was and still is most commonly used in advertising, he also found that it could be useful in the treatment of phobias and other similar disorders. The repeated exposure to a stimulus causes a general liking for that stimulus and, therefore, decreases the phobia of it. For example, if an individual were to have a bias towards the south, but they received repeated exposure to the south, their bias towards it would decrease as their liking increased.

Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz found that mere exposure explained some of their implicit association test results as participants were revealed to certain stimuli multiple times (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). This increased exposure and familiarity created a liking for the more familiar stimulus – therefore influencing the results of their implicit association tests. Harmon-Jones and Allen found that showing an individual a non-reinforced stimulus multiple times increased their positive attitude and reaction to that stimulus (Harmon-Jones & Allen, 2001). Participants of their study viewed photographs of women’s faces and then viewed them again mixed in with images of new women’s faces. The participants’ facial muscles and brain activity were monitored, and it was discovered that the familiar images were found to be more likeable and induced more muscle reactions in the cheeks of the face. The original photographs of women’s faces were more likeable due to the mere exposure of those images. A similar study using pictures of human faces in the same year found that exposure greatly affected the likability of certain images (Rhodes, Halberstadt, & Brajkovich, 2001). Stimuli that are consistent and familiar are preferred over those that are newly introduced.

Increased exposure to an object or idea results in an increased preference to that object or idea and viewing someone else with an object, which allows you to visualize yourself with this object, together leads to object valuation and object preference (Tom, Nelson, Srzentic, & King, 2010). These are both incredibly useful in trying to persuade an audience that a certain object or idea is important or worth their time. Not only does the repetition of the stimulus object cause a liking for the

word, but it also causes listeners to assume that there is an importance associated with the term. This assumption involves very low elaboration, but it is still persuasive in nature (O'Keefe, 2008). Researchers have also found that the enhanced liking that comes from repeated exposure can have an effect on other related objects and topics (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Rhodes, Halberstadt, & Brajkovich, 2001). Repeated exposure is sufficient in influencing the ratings of a stimulus object and new, but still related, stimuli (Monahan, Murphy, & Zajonc, 2000). If a receiver listens to a speech concerning a city and they hear the name of the city multiple times, it is understood that they will grow a natural liking for that city, but research shows us that they will also grow a natural liking for other things that become associated with the city, such as business or living in that city.

Research has shown that this same idea works for the repeated exposure of individuals to other individuals or groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). For example, a receiver hearing from the same speaker multiple times causes the receiver to grow a natural liking for that particular speaker. This liking may then be associated with individuals that are associated with that speaker.

If mere exposure in instances from advertisements to words to still images is able to persuade the receiver than a video utilizing the tactic should have the same capability.

### **Transportation Theory**

More often than not transportation theory is used to support a persuasive tactic by adding a compelling storyline using the story itself or visuals. Expert power

and mere exposure are not the only ways to persuade using videos. Transportation theory in certain videos can explain persuasion as well. Researchers propose that when people are able to lose themselves in a story through things such as a great story line, visuals, etc., their attitudes will change to reflect the attitudes of that story (Gerrig, 1994; Green & Brock, 2002; Escalas, 2013). The Transportation-Imagery Model of Narrative Persuasion, often referred to as transportation theory, is responsible for explaining the persuasive effect of good stories on individuals (Green & Brock, 2002). Others have found and confirmed that individuals process information visually using still and moving images (Schlosser, 2003; MacInnis & Price 1987). They have found that good quality narratives have the ability to be incredibly powerful (Schlosser, 2003). A 2014 meta-analysis of narrative transportation has confirmed this fact and also explains that there has almost never been a time in history in which life was not filled by engaging stories (Van Laer, Ruyter, Visconti, & Wetzels, 2014). Videos that use strong and appealing visuals to capture the viewer's attention and keep he or she engaged is a good example of a use of narrative transportation or transportation theory. The compelling images drive the viewer to become a part of the story and have the same attitude as the video.

Schlosser's study suggests that the way people interact with a product virtually has an impact on the individual's purchasing plans of that product (Schlosser, 2003). Schlosser and other researchers found that when people are determining whether or not they will purchase a product they often imagine themselves using the product in the same behavior that is presented to them

virtually (Schlosser, 2003; Escalas, 2013). This mental stimulation and imagery through narrative transportation increases the individual's likelihood to purchase the product. As this is true for purchasing plans, it works the same way for general persuasion on other stimuli.

Schlosser later found that interacting with virtual objects such as videos influenced true and false memories (Schlosser, 2006). Schlosser found that individuals are capable of improving their memory by associating them with certain things. Moving moments, such as in real life or a video, are more helpful in improving memory than static photos and/or text. However, Schlosser found that memories associated with videos often times become influenced by those videos. This leads to the creation of memories out of the videos that stand as what seem to be real memories. This is incredibly useful when trying to persuade someone through a visual narrative by using transportation theory.

Many fields have turned to narrative communication to assist in getting their message across and persuading their audience quickly and efficiently (Hinyard & Kreuter, 2006). The field in which this has been most prominent is health communication. The goal of the videos is to persuade individuals to make behavioral changes that affect their health. This goal is achieved through the use of transportation theory and the utilization of compelling story lines and visuals. If transportation theory is able to influence behavioral change in health it should be able to influence behavioral and opinion change in other areas. However, many health communications videos are successful due to their inclusion of an expert.

Generally, while videos that utilize transportation theory tend to be successful, without a real expert it becomes more difficult to change someone's opinion.

## **Opinion Change**

Opinion change is generally understood as the alteration of an individual's interpretations, expectations, and/or evaluations as they once knew them to be (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953). When trying to understand opinion change it is important that you are aware of the receiver's current opinion, or opinion prior to receiving the persuasive message. A change in opinion may also change an individual's attitude.

Opinions are said to be "verbal", while attitudes are "unconscious" (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953). Opinion change, unlike attitude change, is not subconscious, and is "verbalized" to one's self either aloud or internally. In order for opinion change to take place there must also be a learning experience; for example, a persuasive and informational video. Opinion change has different levels including compliance, identification, and internalization (Kelman, 1961). Opinion change has been reached once the internal or external verbalization has occurred.

Research has shown that verbalization heavily facilitates opinion change (Janis & King, 1954). Individuals role-play frequently in order to express ideas or support ideas that they do not necessarily agree with. This can lead to actual changes in opinion by the individual role-playing. Due to this phenomenon, researchers did a study in which they asked participants to role-play to determine if explicit verbalization caused opinion change. From this study they found that even

pretending to believe in a specific idea influenced that person's real opinion on that idea.

Opinion change is often discussed in regards to the media and advertising. The media is often known for framing certain messages or altering the importance that individuals put on certain issues through an effect known as priming. These methods have been proven to work (Joslyn & Ceccoli, 1996; Lenz, 2009; Leduc, 2002). What individuals see on media or in advertisements or simply in their own day-to-day life has an effect on their thoughts and opinions. Joslyn and Ceccoli found this to be particularly true in the Fall 1992 Presidential Campaign when an increased amount of positive media coverage boosted Clinton's campaign and, later, election.

Much like how opinion change was measured during the Fall 1992 Presidential Campaign, opinion change is often measured on an incredibly large scale. Public opinion on climate change was measured over the course of nine years using 74 separate surveys (Brulle, Carmichael, & Jenkins, 2012). In order to properly measure the opinion change the researchers conducted surveys quarterly so that they could see where their participants opinions began, how they changed over time, and where they stood at the conclusion of the study in 2010. The opinions of participants were changed by five different factors that included media coverage and elite cues. These factors did influence the opinions of the participants resulting in opinion change. Opinion change is often influenced by a multitude of things from persuasive theories to an individual's openness to an idea.

Opinion change may also be achieved through opinion leaders (Rogers, 2010). Opinion leaders are able to influence other individuals and their attitudes or behavior due to their own change in opinion. Without recognizing it, individuals have a tendency to follow opinion leaders. As opinion leaders influence more and more individuals the crowd theory begins to take effect as those that are influenced then become opinion leaders as well, creating a domino effect. Crowd theory shows that if more people adopt a specific action or idea then you will likely adopt that same action or idea (Milgram, Bickman, & Berkowitz, 1969). For example, if a receiver were to listen to a communicator talk about his or her decision to change his or her opinion on a topic because of hearing other individual's stories about their experience and opinion change, then the receiver would become likely to adopt that same opinion as they will view the communicator as their own opinion leader due to their honesty in their changed opinion and experience.

As we have established, opinion leaders are important, however, it is also important who these opinion leaders are. Opinion leaders are most effective when they have expert status and credibility (Mischel, 2013). Individuals respect those that change their opinions, but they have a tendency to have a higher regard for experts that report a change in their own opinion. Experts are perceived to have a higher credibility than the everyday individual, so their change in opinion is perceived to come with much higher elaboration. This higher elaboration of the opinion leader/expert leads to a lower elaboration from the receiver, leading to a high level of persuasion (O'Keefe, 2008). Continuing with the previous example, if a receiver were to listen to a communicator that was perceived as an expert talk

about his or her decision change his or her opinion on a topic because of what they had heard from others and their own research and experience, then the receiver would become even more likely to accept the expert as their opinion leader and adopt the expert's opinion.

As the research shows, each of these persuasive theories has their own individual strengths and abilities to persuade receivers. However, these different theories must be able to persuade receivers to reach the point at which opinion change is achieved. Transportation theory is strong on its own and has the ability to create new memories. However, as we have previously established, without an expert transportation theory is substantially less effective as a persuasive tactic, and opinion change becomes incredibly difficult to achieve, as opinion change is easier to achieve with an expert perceived as an opinion leader.

Expert power on its own is very powerful in creating opinion change. Expert power allows for the opportunity of persuasion, while still allowing receivers to find the expert likeable, relatable and human in their actions. When expert power is paired with mere repeated exposure it becomes even more persuasive. Mere exposure allows the receiver to gain a liking for the expert's message or an aspect of that message. As the receiver grows a liking and perceptiveness to the expert and his or her message, they will be more likely to be influenced. Therefore, expert power and mere exposure together will be more persuasive and lead to greater opinion change than transportation theory.

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

**R1:** Does Video A (containing a head and shoulders shot of an expert) or Video B (including quick clips and anonymous voice overs) have more instances of expert power?

**R2:** Does Video A or B have more instances of mere exposure?

**R3:** Does Video A or B immerse the viewer further into transportation theory through the use of narrative or image?

By answering the above questions through the examination of these two videos we will find which one would be more likely to persuade an entrepreneur to relocate based on the uses of expert power, mere exposure, and transportation theory. We will determine which video better utilizes expert power, which video uses more mere exposure, and which video better exploits the power of transportation theory. The theoretical background shows that expert power mixed with mere exposure will be more persuasive and will lead to greater opinion change than transportation theory and mere exposure.

## **STUDY METHOD**

This study was done using a stylistic analysis of two videos. These videos were broken down frame by frame in order to understand what stylistic elements and theories were included. This method allows for an in depth analysis for what could account for a more persuasive video.

We chose two videos that were used as a part of the “Your Dream Lives Downtown” Campaign in Chattanooga, Tennessee, as they were created to persuade

individuals to move to downtown Chattanooga. We specifically chose Videos A and B due to their drastic differences from each other. The “head and shoulders” angle video, or Video A, uses a mixture of expert power and mere exposure. Expert power suggests that the viewer will trust the communicator due to his or her position as a superior professional on the matter (French & Raven, 1959). Mere exposure is the idea that an individual will grow a likeness to an image, phrase, word, or idea after being subjected to it three or more times in a short period of time (Zajonc, 1968). The second video that includes images and voice-overs, or Video B, uses transportation theory. Transportation theory proposes that when people are able to lose themselves in a story through things such as a great story line, visuals, etc., their attitudes will change to reflect the attitudes of that story – transportation theory is responsible for explaining the persuasive effect of good stories on individuals (Green & Brock, 2002).

The design for this study limits the findings on how individuals would actually react to these videos based on their theoretical and stylistic elements. Due to time restrictions and the possibility of too few survey respondents we were unable to survey entrepreneurs to determine which video they would find more persuasive.

## **DATA COLLECTION**

In this study we are analyzing two videos from River City Company’s “Your Dream Lives Downtown” Campaign in Chattanooga, Tennessee. As previously explained, these videos were created to persuade individuals to move into

downtown Chattanooga and live, work, and play downtown. The first video referred to in this study as Video A, shows a head and shoulders shot of Craig Holley, the President and CEO of CapitalMark Bank & Trust. The second video, referred to as Video B, shows several short clips of different areas of downtown Chattanooga that are switched rather quickly. These clips are combined with a series of voice-overs regarding downtown Chattanooga spoken by anonymous individuals.

In Video A the President & CEO of CapitalMark Bank & Trust, Craig Holley, is shown seated in what appears to be the lobby/seating area of a building. There is a large painting positioned behind him, as well as a couch, a lamp, and a couple of chairs. He is shown wearing a suit and tie. The video has been edited so we hear Holley talking about downtown Chattanooga, but he is not looking directly at the camera. This makes it clear that the video was put together using responses from an interview that was recorded.

Video A breaks down as follows:

<b>Time</b>	<b>Visual</b>	<b>Audio</b>	<b>Cinematography</b>
0:00 – 0:01	Text is shown on the screen stating, “Let me tell you about DOWNTOWN Chattanooga.”	Some instrumental music that continues softly through the entire video	None
0:02 – 0:03	Text is shown on the screen reading: R. Craig Holley CapitalMark Bank & Trust President, CEO & Chairman of the Board	Music	None

0:04 – 0:08	Holley is seated on the left third of the screen and continues to remain seated on the left third throughout the entire video.	The music is still present. Holley introduces himself.	This is a close up shot.
0:09 – 0:45	Same	Holley discusses opening a business and deciding where to do it. He also discusses opening CapitalMark and their success.	This shot is rather lengthy. The camera leans out slightly revealing some of Holley’s shoulders taking us to a medium close up shot.
0:46 – 1:13	Same	Holley talks about how CapitalMark achieved its success and the fact that they attribute their success to their downtown location. He also talks about how more and more of their employees are choosing to move downtown.	The camera leans out again to create a medium shot.
1:14 – 1:23	Same	Holley talks about the activities, restaurants and entertainment in downtown.	The camera leans in to a close up medium shot.
1:24 – 1:34	Same	Holley states that the heart and soul of any city is its downtown. He also says that Chattanooga’s downtown is a great source of pride and only going to improve.	The camera leans out to a medium shot.
1:35 – 1:46	Same	Holley is now talking about he and his wife, Terry, wanting to live downtown. He says that they love downtown.	The camera leans back in to a close up medium shot. As Holley talks the camera leans in just slightly more until the closing of the shot.

1:47 – 1:48	Text appears on the screen that says River City Company. (They were the creators of this video.)	Continued soft music that has played throughout the entire video.	None
1:49 – 1:51	A sentence appears on the screen that reads, “DOWNTOWN Chattanooga’s economic development company.”	Continued soft music.	None
1:52 – 2:00	Holley is seen still sitting on the left third of the screen. He is drinking water from a water bottle that he screws open and closed.	Someone is speaking very muffled in the background out of the shot. Then, Holley almost laughingly inquires, “You mean you’re not going to use everything I say?” Then you hear a giggle from the individual that is out of the shot.	While the muffled speaker is speaking the camera loses focus for just a moment.

In Video B there are several different short clips shown from different areas of downtown Chattanooga including a few different unknown individuals. The video also includes voice-overs done by several anonymous individuals. While the voice-overs seem fluid and tie the shots together, the shots in this video change at a rather fast pace.

Video B breaks down as follows:

<b>Time</b>	<b>Visual</b>	<b>Audio</b>	<b>Cinematography</b>
0:00 – 0:02	A waitress is shown carrying a pizza out of a kitchen through the doors.	Music plays in the background. Anonymous voices explain in a poetic way that dreams come true downtown. They make it seem like a performance using metaphors relating downtown to a stage.	The camera is still and shows a medium shot of the waitress from the back.

0:02 – 0:04	A city street in Chattanooga and the buildings on either side of it can be seen.		The camera shoots down a street out of focus and then everything comes in to focus.
0:04 – 0:06	A woman is shown exiting her home with a bike helmet in hand.		This is a full shot.
0:06 – 0:08	This shot shows a building sign that says pizza on it being hung outside of a building.		This shot also uses a full shot.
0:08 – 0:10	In this shot it looks as if you are looking up at the trees while walking. A flowering tree branch is seen in this shot.		This shot uses low angle tracking for a close up of a tree branch.
0:10 – 0:12	The trunk of a tree is seen out of focus at the start of this shot and tracks out of frame until all that is seen is the same woman with the bike helmet walking forward down the sidewalk of a street.		The tracking from the last shot transitions smoothly to the trunk of a tree that is out of focus on the left 2/3 of the screen. The camera tracks until the tree is out of view.
0:12 – 0:14	This shot shows the back of a man inside of a building that is very clearly under construction. He uses large gestures with his hands as if he may be talking about his vision for the space. (This conversation is not heard.)		The camera is still for this shot and uses a medium shot.
0:14 – 0:16	In this shot you see the same pizza sign from earlier, but it is now nighttime. The sign is now hanging and lit.		The camera is still and uses a slight low angle, so you feel as though you are looking up at the sign from the sidewalk.

0:16 – 0:17	This shot shows a man and a woman dressed as employees standing in the same pizza shop from the opening shot. The individuals are smiling at the camera with their arms around one and other as if posing for a photo.		The camera uses a still medium shot.
0:17 – 0:18	A smiling woman standing in her garden holding a bowl of vegetables and a handful of onion roots is seen in this shot. She too looks as though she is posing for a photo.		This shot uses a $\frac{3}{4}$ shot.
0:18 – 0:19	The same man from the building under construction is shown sitting at a table outside working on sketches. He is looking off into the distance as if he is thinking.		The camera uses a medium shot.
0:19 – 0:20	The sketches that the man is working on can now be seen. They look like sketches for what could be building plans.		The camera now uses a close up shot.
0:21 – 0:22	This shot shows a hand putting what looks like the top of a tin can on some sort of industrial machine.		The camera uses a close up shot for this as well.
0:22 – 0:23	Now, as the camera leans out, a woman is seen working at the machine. The woman and the machine are seen in their entirety.		The camera leans out to a full shot.

0:24 – 0:25	We now see the woman with the bike helmet getting a bike off of the Chattanooga bike share system's rack.		The camera utilizes a $\frac{3}{4}$ shot.
0:26 – 0:28	This shot shows the same woman smiling and riding her bike down the road.		The camera uses a $\frac{3}{4}$ tracking shot from the side of the woman.
0:29 – 0:30	The same woman is shown in this shot riding her bike on the walking bridge.		The camera continues to use a $\frac{3}{4}$ tracking shot from the side of the woman.
0:30 – 0:32	This shot shows someone's hand out the window of a car in the air.		The camera uses an extreme close up tracking shot from the interior of the car.
0:33 – 0:34	In this shot it is as if you are looking over the shoulder of the man from the construction shot as he is driving a car. You are unable to see out his window due to the focus, but you feel like you are riding with him.		The camera uses a close up tracking shot from the backseat of the car. This is an over the shoulder shot.
0:35 – 0:36	This shot follows the same man from behind as he walks down a hallway under construction with a hard hat on.		This is a full tracking shot.

0:36 – 0:37	This shot looks as if you are looking through the bar at a restaurant from one side to the other. The glasses hanging immediately in front of the camera are out of focus and the individuals on the other side of the bar are in focus.		This is a long shot.
0:38 – 0:39	Two sets of hands are seen preparing a salad in the kitchen of a restaurant.		The camera uses an extreme close up for this shot.
0:39 – 0:40	We now see the food being placed up ready for order on a shelf in the kitchen of a restaurant. Through the shelf we can see the faces of the two men preparing the food. One of the men is from the earlier shot inside of the pizza shop.		The camera uses a close up shot.
0:40 – 0:41	This shot shows the screen of a man's laptop. His shoulder, which you are looking over, is out of focus.		The camera uses an over the shoulder close up for this shot. The man's shoulder is out of focus.
0:41 – 0:42	We now see this same man standing in talking in a meeting. You can see a woman on his left and the back of the head of a man that is sitting in front of the camera.		This shot uses a medium shot. The two other individuals that are not speaking are out of focus. The standing and speaking man is on the right hand third of the shot.

<p>0:43 – 0:44</p>	<p>This shot shows the man and woman that work at the restaurant again. They are now seated at the restaurant. They are both smiling and laughing.</p>		<p>The camera uses a medium shot. The man is out of focus on the right edge of the shot, while the woman is on the right third and in focus.</p>
<p>0:44 – 0:46</p>	<p>We return now to the outside of the pizza shop. We are now seeing the pizza sign from the other side. We see the corner of the restaurant at night. It looks as if you are outside on the sidewalk. This shot uses a time-lapse, as seen by the people through the restaurant windows and walking down the street.</p>		<p>This shot is a long shot that uses tracking and also leans out during the time-lapse.</p>
<p>0:46 – 0:49</p>	<p>This shot allows you to see over the shoulder of the woman on the bike. She is looking off of one of the bridges to another bridge and some buildings.</p>		<p>This is an over the shoulder long shot. At first, the woman is in focus and what she is looking at is out of focus. Then the focus switches from her to what she is looking at.</p>

0:49 – 0:53	In this shot we see a still image of the skyline of Chattanooga as seen from the north side of the river with Lookout Mountain in the background at sunset. In the sky of the image it says “Your Dream Lives Downtown” using the campaign logo, which is a script font with an underline and a dot with a sunburst at both ends of the phrase.		This shot is a still image.
0:53 – 0:54	The still image remains the same, but the logo disappears.		This shot is a still image.
0:54 – 0:56	The still image is still present, but now the River City Company logo appears in the sky. Under the logo it says “downtownchattanooga.org”. Then everything fades out to black.		This shot is a still image that fades out to black to conclude the video.

## ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Throughout the entirety of Video A Craig Holley is made out to be an expert. He is set up as an expert from the beginning with the showing of his title and the repetition of that title when said again in his introduction. This also begins to utilize mere exposure. Holley is placed strategically in the shot to be on a third so that the attention is always on him as our eyes are naturally attracted to things that rest on a

third rather than dead center. The fact that the shot begins with a close up of Holley further shows his prominence and importance as an expert.

Holley continues to position himself as an expert as he talks about opening a business and deciding where to do it. He lends his expert power to the city of Chattanooga when he says that they chose to start their business in Chattanooga due to the success they saw other businesses having in Downtown Chattanooga. He continues to lend this expert power by saying that CapitalMark attributes their success to their downtown location. Holley shows that he is an expert on business in Chattanooga through all of this, as well as by talking more specifically about CapitalMark's success and growth after starting in Downtown Chattanooga. Holley demonstrates his expertise on life in Chattanooga while talking about how more and more of his employees are choosing to move downtown. He discusses the activities, restaurants and entertainment that downtown has to offer. He says that he and his wife love and want to move into downtown. Through Holley's narrative it is seen that he has been in Chattanooga long enough to see it grow, just as his business was growing, and he declares that Chattanooga's downtown is only going to continue to improve. The video concludes with a shot that feels as though it is "behind the scenes" while Holley is drinking from a water bottle. Holley is still positioned on a third, so he is still seen as a prominent figure, but this shot allows for him to be humanized and more likeable, thus increasing his power as an expert.

While Video A's use of expert power is very apparent, expert power is completely omitted from Video B. The identities of the individuals shown in the short clips in Video B are entirely unknown. Judgments could be made based off of

their chosen apparel, but there is not enough information provided in the video for them to be considered experts of any kind. The voices that speak over the entirety of the video are those of anonymous individuals. Therefore, again, we are unable to determine if they are actually experts. There is not enough information provided for the voices to even be considered to be those of experts. Therefore, Video B inherently has less instances of expert power than Video A.

Mere exposure is seen in both Videos A and B. It is seen immediately at the opening of Video A when Craig Holley introduces himself, repeating what has already been shown in text in the first shot of the video. This mere exposure continues throughout the video through the repetition of the words downtown, Chattanooga, and the combined, Downtown Chattanooga. Downtown is repeated nine times throughout the two-minute video, Chattanooga three times, and the combined three times. As the theoretical framework has shown, the mere repeated exposure causes a natural liking from the receiver. Therefore, the listener, without even necessarily noticing it, will grow a natural liking for downtown, Chattanooga, and the combined. Video B also utilizes mere exposure by repeating the word downtown four times in 58 seconds. As previously explained for Video A, this causes a natural liking for the term. However, since the term is only downtown rather than Downtown Chattanooga the liking becomes less useful than the liking in Video A as the receiver's liking could be drawn to any downtown. Therefore, Video A not only has more instances of mere exposure, it also uses mere exposure more effectively.

Both Videos A and B utilize transportation theory in some way. Video A makes an effort to utilize transportation theory through narrative and the music

paired with it. The music draws the receiver into the story and Craig Holley's explanation of opening CaptialMark Bank in Downtown Chattanooga and the relationship between their business, their employees, and his own family and Downtown Chattanooga provides a form of narrative. As this video was edited from what was likely to have originally been an interview, the narrative is not incredibly compelling, making the use of transportation theory in Video A extremely weak. However, the transportation theory in Video B is exceptionally strong. The quick changes between shots grab the attention of the viewer, while the music and voice-overs drive the narrative forward. The receiver hears abstract descriptions and metaphors of downtown. The narrative utilizes a poetic way of saying that dreams can come true downtown. The language is colorful and engaging, much like the shots that are shown. Video B very clearly immerses the viewer further into transportation theory through the use of both narrative and images.

## **INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS**

This qualitative study has examined these two videos to determine which one possesses more persuasive qualities. Since this is a qualitative study, we are unable to say for certain that the video containing more persuasive qualities will be more effective in changing the opinions of entrepreneurs and their opinions on moving their businesses to Chattanooga.

This analysis has set the stage for future research to quantitatively study how external factors influence the effectiveness of persuasive theories. As the literature has shown, transportation theory is not as strong as expert power in persuasion, but

when external factors are taken into consideration the persuasive outcome could be much different than expected. Would an entrepreneur with no knowledge of an area be willing to move to that area after seeing a video with an expert talking about that area, or would they be more likely to move after seeing a video that has a powerful narrative and strong imagery? Conversely, would an entrepreneur with knowledge of an area be more likely to relocate after seeing a video with an expert talking about the area, or would they be more willing after seeing a narrative driven video? How does this prior knowledge or lack thereof effect the entrepreneur's ability to be persuaded? Answering these questions will allow us to determine exactly how external factors influence the effectiveness of persuasion.

## REFERENCES

- Beeble, Marisa L., and Deborah A. Salem. "Understanding the phases of recovery from serious mental illness: the roles of referent and expert power in a mutual-help setting." *Journal of Community Psychology* 37.2 (2009): 249-267. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Bornstein, Robert F. "Exposure And Affect: Overview And Meta-Analysis Of Research, 1968–1987." *Psychological Bulletin* 106.2 (1989): 265-289. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Brulle, Robert J., Jason Carmichael, and J. Craig Jenkins. "Shifting public opinion on climate change: an empirical assessment of factors influencing concern over climate change in the U.S., 2002–2010." *Climatic Change* 114.2 (2012): 169-188. *Google Scholar*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Busch, Paul, and David T. Wilson. "An Experimental Analysis of a Salesman's Expert and Referent Bases of Social Power in the Buyer-Seller Dyad." *Journal of Marketing Research* 13.1 (1976): 3-11. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Chinomona, Richard, and Marius Pretorius. "Major dealers' expert power in distribution channels." *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences* 14.2 (2011): 170-187. *Google Scholar*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Cialdini, Robert B. *Influence*. New York, NY: Harper Business, 2007. Print.
- Escalas, Jennifer Edson. "Imagine Yourself in the Product: Mental Simulation, Narrative Transportation, and Persuasion." *Journal of Advertising* 33.2 (2004): 37-48. *Taylor & Francis Online*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

- Farrell, Mark, and Bill Schroder. "Power and influence in the buying centre."  
*European Journal of Marketing* 33.11/12 (1999): 1161-1170. *Emerald Insight*.  
Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- French, John R. P., and Bertram H. Raven. *The Bases of Social Power*. (1959).
- Freud, Sigmund. *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. New York, NY: W. W.  
Norton & Company, Inc., 1959. Print.
- Gerrig, Richard J. "Narrative Thought?" *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*  
20.6 (1994): 712-715. *Sage Journals*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Green, Melanie C. and Timothy C. Brock. "In the mind's eye: Transportation-imager  
model of narrative persuasion." (2002): 315-341. *PsycNET*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Greenwald, Anthony G., Debbie E. McGhee, and Jordan L. K. Schwartz. "Measuring  
Individual Differences In Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association  
Test." *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 74.6 (1998): 1464-  
1480. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Harmon-Jones, Eddie, and John J. B. Allen. "The Role of Affect in the Mere Exposure  
Effect: Evidence from Psychophysiological and Individual Differences  
Approaches." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27.7 (2001): 889-  
898. *Sage Journals*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Hinyard, Leslie J. and Matthew W. Kreuter. "Using Narrative Communication as a  
Tool for Health Behavior Change: A Conceptual, Theoretical, and Empirical  
Overview." *Health Education & Behavior* 34.5 (2007): 777-792. *Sage Journals*.  
Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

- Hovland, Carl, Irving Janis, and Harold Kelley. *Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953. Print.
- Janis, Irving L., and Bert T. King. "The Influence Of Role Playing On Opinion Change." *The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology* 49.2 (1954): 211-218. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Joslyn, Mark R., and Steve Ceccoli. "Attentiveness to Television News and Opinion Change in the Fall 1992 Presidential Campaign." *Political Behavior* 18.2 (1996): 141-170. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Kelman, Herbert C. "Processes of Opinion Change." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 25.1 (1961): 57-78. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Klucharev, Vasily, Ale Smidts, and Guillén Fernández. "Brain mechanisms of persuasion: how 'expert power' modulates memory and attitudes." *Social Cognitive & Affective Neuroscience* 3.4 (2008): 353-366. *Oxford Journals*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Leduc, Lawrence. "Opinion change and voting behaviour in referendums." *European Journal of Political Research* 41.6 (2002): 711-732. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Lee, Angela Y. "The mere exposure effect: An uncertainty reduction explanation revisited." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27.10 (2001): 1255-1266. *Sage Journals*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

- Lenz, Gabriel S. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53:4 (2009): 821-837. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Liu, Annie H. and Mark P. Leach. "Developing Loyal Customers with a Value-adding Sales Force: Examining Customer Satisfaction and the Perceived Credibility of Consultative Salespeople." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 21.2 (2001): 147-156. *Taylor & Francis Online*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. and Linda L. Price. "The Role of Imagery in Information Processing: Review and Extensions." *Journal of Consumer Research* 13.4 (1987): 473-491. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Milgram, Stanley. "Behavioral Study Of Obedience." *The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology* 67.4 (1963): 371-378. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Milgram, Stanley, Leonard Bickman, and Lawrence Berkowitz. "Note On The Drawing Power Of Crowds Of Different Size." *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 13.2 (1969): 79-82. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Mischel, Walter. *Personality and Assessment*. Psychology Press, 2013. Print.
- Monahan, Jennifer L., Sheila T. Murphy, and Robert B. Zajonc. "Subliminal Mere Exposure: Specific, General, and Diffuse Effects." *Psychological Science* 11.6 (2000): 462-466. *Sage Journals*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- O'Keefe, Daniel J. "Elaboration<sup>2</sup> likelihood model." *International<sup>2</sup> Encyclopedia of Communication*. Vol. 4. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2008. 1475-1480. Print.
- O'Keefe, Daniel J. "Source Factors." *Persuasion: Theory and Research*. London: SAGE, 2002. 181-213. Print.

- Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Linda R. Tropp. "A Meta-Analytic Test Of Intergroup Contact Theory." *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 90.5 (2006): 751-783. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Raven, Bertram. (1993) The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49(4). 227-251.
- Rhodes, Gillian, Jamin Halberstadt, and Gemma Brajkovich. "Generalization of Mere Exposure Effects to Averaged Composite Faces.(statistical Data Included)." *Social Cognition*. 19.1 (2001). Print.
- Rogers, Everett M. *Diffusion of Innovations*. Simon and Schuster, 2010. Print.
- Salem, Deborah A., Thomas M. Reischl, Fiona Gallacher, and Katie Weaver Randall. "The Role of Referent and Expert Power in Mutual Help." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 28.3 (2000): 303-324. *Google Scholar*. Web. 6 Mar 2015.
- Schlosser, Ann E. "Experiencing Products in the Virtual World: The Role of Goal and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Purchase Intentions." *Journal of Consumer Research* 30.2 (2003): 184-198. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Schlosser, Ann E. "Learning through Virtual Product Experience: The Role of Imagery on True versus False Memories." *Journal of Consumer Research* 33.3 (2006): 377-383. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Sahadev, Sunil. "Exploring the role of expert power in channel management: An empirical study." *Industrial Marketing Management* 34.5 (2005): 487-494. *ScienceDirect*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

Tom, Gail, Carolyn Nelson, Tamara Srzentic, and Ryan King. "Mere Exposure and the Endowment Effect on Consumer Decision Making." *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied* 141.2 (2007): 117-125. *Taylor & Francis Online*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

Van Laer, Tom, Ko De Ruyter, Luca M. Visconti, and Martin Wetzels. "The Extended Transportation-Imagery Model: A Meta-Analysis Of The Antecedents And Consequences Of Consumers' Narrative Transportation." *Journal Of Consumer Research* 40.5 (2014): 797-817. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

Zajonc, Robert B. "Attitudinal Effects Of Mere Exposure." *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 9.2, Pt.2 (1968): 1-27. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.