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ANALYZING ORGANIZATIONAL MISSION STATEMENT EFFICACY
COMPARING NARRATIVE AND NON-NARRATIVE AUDIO VISUAL AND
TEXTUAL TRANSMISSIONS

KRISTEN PIASECKI

ABSTRACT

This paper is designed to investigate how participants will respond to
organizational mission statement messages when they are given audiovisual narrative
messages, audiovisual non-narrative messages, textual narrative messages, and textual
non-narrative messages.

289 participants were given audiovisual narrative, audiovisual non-narrative,
textual non-narrative, and textual narrative mission statement messages of the Cleveland
State University mission statement message.

Participants were measured on their ability to retain the mission statement
message (immediate recall), the level to which the participants were transported into the
experience of receiving the mission statement message (transportation), participants’
personal involvement with the mission statement message (personal involvement), the
likelihood of participants to speak positively after receiving the mission statement
message (likelihood to speak positively), and participants’ evaluations of the credibility
of the source of the message (source credibility).
No significant findings were discovered that supported the audiovisual and non-narrative expectation, in comparison to the textual and non-narrative expectation. There was a notable result within the source credibility, and the way in which participants responded. The results indicated that source credibility in the audiovisual presentations positively impacted the way in which users responded to the scales. The results indicated that participants in the audiovisual presentations were more likely to report higher personal involvement. It is beneficial to understand that the source from which a mission statement message comes from can heavily impact the way in which a participant views the mission statement message.

This is additionally beneficial to organizations to communicate an effective mission statement message to their stakeholders. There is a significant impact that comes from the source of the mission message, in regards to the way in which the mission message is received.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The importance of understanding the effects that different strategies have on comprehending an organization’s mission statement message is vital to the effectiveness of the mission statement. Considering that an organization’s mission statement shapes the organization’s goals, culture, and values, it is vital to the organization that the mission statement is remembered and understood as intended by all stakeholders. Using a narrative as a method of transmitting a mission statement message to an audience can arguably be an effective method to use when attempting to capture the attention of an audience, in comparison to using a non-narrative format. This is because, as suggested by the narrative transportation theory, when participants lose themselves in a story, both their intentions and their attitudes will change to reflect the story that the participants examined (Green, 2000). In addition to capturing the audience’s attention of the transmitted message through narrative, Daft and Lengel (1984) argue that matching the appropriate channel with the type of task or message has an impact on the message being delivered. A medium’s richness is based on the medium’s capacity for immediate
feedback, the number of cues and senses involved, personalization, and language variety (McDaniel & Rylander, 1993). The theory argues that the richest medium to transmit a message is through face-to-face communication and videos, and the least media rich channels to communicate a message through are flyers or written memos (Carlson & Zmud, 1999). Consistent with Daft and Lengel’s argument, it is likely that an audiovisual will be an appropriate channel to communicate a narrative mission statement message.

This study will investigate the effect of narrative and richness of the medium on the efficacy of the transmission of mission statements. While existing literature has examined the effects and outcomes of organizational mission statements transmitted through audiovisuals, it has not yet examined the effects and outcomes of organizational mission statements transmitted through audiovisuals, while using a narrative delivery. This study builds upon existing research by studying both the channel of textual and audiovisual transmission, and whether the mission message utilizes a narrative delivery. The different effects of narrative and channels with respect to the efficacy of mission statements will be assessed through textual narrative, textual non-narrative, audiovisual narrative, and audiovisual non-narrative. Narrative is defined as transmitting the mission statement in the form of storytelling. The non-narrative will be presented in the original, unedited format of the organization’s original mission statement message. Audiovisuals are conceptualized as media that uses both sight visuals and sound visuals to communicate the message.
The variables used to assess mission statement efficacy are immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, participant’s likelihood to speak positively of the organization, and source credibility. The variable of immediate recall measures the amount of information each participant immediately retains after processing the mission statement message. Transportation measures the extent to which a reader is lost in the type of story. Transportation also measures the intentions and attitudes towards the story, however, these variables were not measured in this study (Green, 2000). Involvement measures if the participants had a favorable response to the mission statement message in that is was consistent with their values (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Likelihood to speak positively means persons reported being more likely to speak positively of the organization. Source credibility measures the extent to which the audience will find the source delivering the message to be trustworthy, honest, and caring. This research study builds off of existing literature, to bridge the gap in the literature that illuminates the lack of research done on the usefulness that narratives can have on the efficacy of organizational mission statements. Relying on the transportation model and the media richness theory, this research study will use both narrative and non-narratives to assess if any relationship exists between narrative and non-narratives, and the roles that the different communication channels (text and audiovisual) have on transmitting the organizational mission statement.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews literature that supports the significance that narratives and audiovisuals can have on participants’ reactions to receiving a mission statement message. This section will review the importance that the transportation imagery model has in relation to narrative transportation. Concordantly, in relation to narrative transportation, theories that identify the importance of narrative development will be explained. The significance of priming and framing in relation to narratives will also be further discussed. In addition, the media richness theory will be applied to analyze the significance that narratives delivered through text versus audiovisuals will have on mission statement messages.

Mission Statement Messages

The father of modern management, Peter Drucker (1974) implemented guidelines in the 1970’s to shape our thoughts on mission statement messages. Drucker implies that asking the question “What is our business?” is identical to proposing the question “What
is our mission?” An organization’s mission statement message serves as an outward declaration of an organization’s “reason for being” and differentiates one organization from other competing organizations (Campbell & Yeung, 1991; Pearce, 1982; Pearce & David, 1987). Noticeably, numerous benefits of having an unambiguous mission statement are offered in the management literature (Analoui & Karami, 2002; Atrill, Omran, & Pointon, 2005; Bart & Baetz, 1998). Organizations pragmatically construct a written mission statement to make sure all stakeholders understand the organization’s “reason for being,” and to offer ways of prioritizing important internal and external factors used to develop practical policies - to provide a basis for the allocation of resources (King & Cleland, 1979). Carefully constructed mission statements are acknowledged by both practitioners and academicians as the initial level of strategic management, because unambiguous mission statements are fundamental for the efficacy of establishing organizational goals and developing policies (Collins & Rukstad, 2008; David, 1989; Powers, 2012). Relying on existing literature, it is evident that an organization’s mission statement may be a vital to the organization’s success. Considering this, it is useful to identify the most effective method through which an organizational mission statement could be transmitted, that would lead to higher levels of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively of the organization, and source credibility. Strategies for implementing the mission statement message through narrative audiovisual, non-narrative audiovisual, narrative textual, and non-narrative textual delivery are considered. This study investigates the strategies for introducing mission statements, using a two-by-two design to operationalize the aspects of strategies.
Green and Brock (2002) argued that narrative stories have the ability to impact the reader’s intentions and attitudes towards the story. This section will review different aspects of message processing from the transportation imagery model, and will investigate how this model can illuminate the modality of narratives between messages received textually, and through audiovisuals.

The narrative transportation theory suggests that a person’s intentions and attitudes will be subject to change in order to accordingly reflect the story when that person loses himself or herself in the story (Green & Brock, 2002). An explanation of the persuasive effect that stories can have on the audience is rationalized through the mental state of narrative transportation. As demonstrated in the transportation imagery model, this means that the audience’s probability of experiencing narrative transportation relies on what specific individualistic, circumstantial, and personal preconditions are being met. Additional scholars have expanded the research of Green and Brock’s study on the role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. Green and Brock’s study is further expanded by De Ruyter, Van Laer, Visconti, and Wetzel (2014) by suggesting that narrative transportation is likely to occur whenever the audience receiving the story undergoes an emotion of entering a world evoked by the narrative. This means that because of the audience’s imagination for the storyline, the audience is susceptible to develop a feeling of understanding and compassion for the characters in the narrative, which will allow the audience to feel more connected to the characters. Through
narrative transportation, the transported audience can return transformed by the narrative journey. Van Laer et al lends supporting evidence that a story can captivate the audience in a transformational experience, and the effects produced from this transformational experience are strong and long lasting. Through narrative transportation, it is likely that audience members will experience emotional and cognitive responses, along with attitude and intention changes (De Ruyter, Van Laer, Visconti, & Wetzel 2014).

To better understand the unique significance that the transportation imagery model provides, particularly in regards to illuminating the effects through narrative, it is valuable to comparatively analyze the additional existing models that offer similar elements, yet significantly differ from the transportation imagery model. Examining the alternate models that differ from the transportation imagery model is beneficial to illuminate the areas of strength within the transportation imagery model that the alternate persuasion models often lack. ELM, or the elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) and the heuristic-systematic model (Chaiken, 1987) are two prevalent persuasion models that are used in assessing why audience members either accept the claims of a message, or why audience members discard message claims. Eagly and Chaiken, 1993 explain that the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) and the heuristic-systematic model claim that audience members will agree with the claims presented in the message based on if the audience members cautiously evaluate the message, or if the audience members trust the superficial cues presented in the deliverance of the message such as relying on the credibility of the orator. According to persuasion models, message
examination is primarily dependent on the extent to which the audience members are motivated and able to process the message systematically (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Important variables that the elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) and the heuristic-systematic model (Chaiken, 1987) apply are familiarity, empathy, involvement, and both the number and nature of thoughts the message being delivered evokes. Eagly and Chaiken, 1993 explain that the elaboration likelihood model and the heuristic-systematic model explain that if the audience members perceive these variables as predominantly positive, then the audience members’ attitudes and intentions are more likely to be more positive. Conversely, if the variables are predominately negative, then the audience members’ attitudes and intentions are more likely to be more negative. Correspondingly, these variables also exist in narrative persuasion (Green & Brock, 2000). Unlike the transportation imagery model, the elaboration likelihood model and the heuristic-systematic model do not consider the variable of narrative transportation in relation to persuasion. Considering that the elaboration likelihood model and the heuristic-systematic model do not consider narrative as a form of persuasion, it is valuable to clarify why and how narrative transportation is a valuable factor of effective persuasion. Audience members who have been shown a narrative storyline and have been transported by the narrative are likely to have changed opinions as a result of narrative transportation (Green & Brock 2002). Green and Brock (2002) also explain that the particular effects that audience members will experience as a result of the narrative transportation are often strong and long lasting. Considering this, it is logical to assume that strong and long lasting effects on an audience member’s attitude, viewpoints, and reactions is likely to lead to high memory recall of the message transmitted through the
narrative. Green and Brock, (2002) explain that narrative transportation can transform audience members because narrative storylines can act as a successful form of persuasion for the audience members receiving the narrative story. Similarly, Van Laer et al suggests that through narrative persuasion, audience members experience changes in emotional and mental reactions, viewpoints, and attitude and intention changes as a result of narrative transportation. Through the transportation imagery model (Green & Brock, 2000), narrative transportation as a form of persuasion can provide strong and long lasting changes on audience members’ reactions, viewpoints, and attitudes, which strengthen the argument that narrative transportation can lead to substantial memory recollection of the message that was transmitted through the narrative.

There has been a combination of notable research studies that serve as influencers in the field of narrative research prior to Green and Brock’s study in 2000. Prior narrative research studies have rationalized that narrative storylines extend an invitation to the audience members’ to become directly immersed into the action that narrative storyline is revealing (Deighton, Romer, & McQueen, 1989). Correspondingly, the first researcher to explore the concept of narrative transportation in relation to novels (Gerrig, 1993) suggests that narrative transportation allows audience members’ to be detached from the normal, everyday world that the story receiver experiences. Gerrig (1993) suggests that the detachment from the normal, everyday world, and immersion in the narrative storyline occurs because of the audience members’ engrossment and fixation in the story. Similarly, it is explained by Green and Brock (2000) the reason that audience members’ become detached from the everyday world is because the story receiver
experiences an involvement of being carried away by the story.

Existing research regarding narrative transportation have many commonalities. Narrative transportation requires audience members to receive and interpret the story, and once transported, the audience members will lose track of the physiological sense of reality (Appel & Richter, 2007). Van Laer et al (2014) define narrative transportation as the extent to which audience members will empathize with the characters in the narrative story, and the extent to which the storyline influences the audience members’ imagination. If the narrative storyline influences the audience members’ imagination, it is more likely that suspended reality will occur while reading the story (Van Laer, De Ruyter, Visconti, & Wetzels, 2014). Considering that the storyline can impact the audience members’ imagination, it is possible that a message transmitted through narrative transportation will influence the immediate recall of the message.

*Narrative elements*

Corresponding with transportation, a narrative will be developed in order to measure the participants’ immediate recall, transportation, involvement, and likelihood to speak positively about the organization – the narrative might impact the outcomes, and the outcome will be measured via the scales of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility. The organizational mission statement transformed into narrative will have the following elements, consisting
of introduction, climax, and conclusion. Elements of setting, foreshadowing, characterization will be included to construct an engaging and memorable storyline (Pentland, 1999). Additionally, literary devices of personification and metaphor will be included to strive to establish message comprehension. The growing belief that narrative represents a universal medium of human consciousness, or “meta code” that allows for the transcultural transmission of messages about a shared reality add to the scholarly support that narratives will be effective in message transmission (Lucaites & Condit, 1985). Focusing the elements of narrative listed previously can allow the audience to explore the role of consciousness (Haghjou, 2015). Focusing on narrative elements of setting and characterization, with an incorporation of personification and metaphor, narrative storytelling is likely to have an effect on participants’ comprehension and retention (Wu, 2013).

The media richness theory

Applying a narrative storyline, through the use of an audiovisual, to communicate an organizational mission statement message is a limited area of research that is underexplored. It is advantageous to fully explore why audiovisuals were selected as a successful communication channel for transmitting the message. O’Hair et al (1998) defines media richness as the ability of a communication channel to handle information or to communicate the specific meaning contained in the intended message. It is essential for message receivers to accurately understand the exact meaning contained in an organizational mission statement because the organization’s mission statement shapes the
identity of the organization (Weiss & Piderit, 1999).

Considering that an organization’s mission statement is the core identity and direction of the organization, it is logical to acknowledge that despite strategic ambiguity, unclear messages can be detrimental to an organization. The media richness theory acknowledges that not all communication channels are equivalent in beneficial attributes (Daft & Lengel, 1984). Of the communication channels acknowledged in the media richness theory, face-to-face communication is the richest communication channel, while newspapers are described as the communication channel that is least rich (Daft & Lengel, 1984). The media richness theory both strengthens, and adds substance to the argument that proposes that an audiovisual communication channel will be beneficial in communicating an organizational mission statement message. McDaniel and Rylander, (1993) defines media richness as the extent to which communication channels are able to join different frames of reference, make the message less vague, and provide opportunities for learning in a given time interval. When communicating an organizational mission statement, it is essential to unambiguously communicate the message within a given time interval. Kennedy further develops the concept of media richness by attempting to explain the way in which people select one media channel over another media channel when interacting with people in a social setting (1998). The amount of information a channel is able to transmit helps explain the decision-making process in choosing one form of media over another. For example, television and its visuals are able to convey more information than radio (Kennedy, 1998). When an organization is communicating a complex message that is susceptible to ambiguity, it is
logical for the communicator to desire a communication channel that will convey the most information. The more information a communication channel is able to include in the delivery of the message, the less ambiguous the message will be (O’Keefe, 1988). The media richness theory was originally developed by Daft and Lengel (1984) to describe and evaluate communication mediums within organizations. The media richness theory is an appropriate theory to apply, in regards to organizational mission statements, because it was originally developed to explain and assess communication mediums within organizations. The purpose of the media richness theory was also to manage the communication challenges that organizations were facing, such as messages with high ambiguity and confusion, and contradictory interpretations of communicated messages (Daft & Lengel, 1984). Reflecting on existing research, it is logical to assume that applying a narrative storyline through the use of an audiovisual communication channel will be beneficial in communicating the organizational mission statement message.

Whitbred, Skalski, Bracken, and Lieberman (2010) examined the effectiveness of paper (leader) versus video (richer) channels for introducing a mission statement, and found no significant difference on video effectiveness. It was found that less presence resulted when the statement was transmitted textually. Additionally, text resulted in lower credibility when compared to video. Existing research demonstrates that when organizational mission statements are transmitted through richer video channels, less presence occurs from the audience members (Whitbred, Skalski, Bracken, & Lieberman, 2010). Additionally, Whitbred et al demonstrated that channel richness does not directly impact the transmission of a message. Although past studies do not support that media
rich channels will result in a more effective transmission of the message, existing literature does not examine if narrative transportation, when communicated through a media rich audiovisual channel, will result in a more effective transmission of the message.

Through the transportation imagery model, narrative transportation is successful in emerging audience members in the narrative story (Green & Brock, 2000). Narrative transportation enables audience members to experience emotional and cognitive responses, along with attitude and intention changes (De Ruyter, Van Laer, Visconti, & Wetzel, 2014). The media richness theory supports that face-to-face communication and video communication channels are richer forms of media, and are more effective communication channels (Daft & Lengel, 1984). Relying on the gap in existing literature that illuminates the lack of research done that examines narrative transportation’s impact on message transmission, it is logical to theorize that narrative transportation, when transmitted through audiovisual communication channels can impact the audience’s retention of the message.

**Hypotheses**

Hypotheses were formulated, predicting the effect of how a mission message was presented on five dependent variables. The dependent variables considered were immediate recall of the mission statement message, transportation, personal involvement with the mission statement, likelihood to speak positively of the organization after exposure to the mission statement message, and source credibility. Immediate recall of
the mission message examined how well the participants remembered the true and accurate facts about the mission statement. Transportation examined the extent to which the participants “entered into” the world of the mission statement. Personal involvement examined the extent to which the participants would be emotionally involved with the mission statement, and assesses the extent to which people have a reaction to or feel a “sense of value” to the product. In this study, the product is the mission statement message. Likelihood to speak positively examined the extent to which the participants would speak well of the organization they were just exposed to in the mission statement message. Source credibility is the extent to which the participants found the overall character of the source of the message to be trustworthy. The extent to which the participants found the source of the message (the person) trustworthy indicated the extent to which the participants found the source of the message (the person) credible.

Hypotheses were tested against the exposure to narrative versus non-narrative, with narrative exposure expecting higher results. Hypotheses were also tested against textual versus audiovisual channels, with exposure to the audiovisual channels expecting higher results for each of the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 1 predicts that a narrative delivery will allow participants to remember the mission statement more than a non-narrative exposure. Considering the storyline elements of narratives, it is expected that participants will be more captivated and interested in the narrative format of the mission statement, and will be more likely to remember something that they are interested in, opposed to remembering something that
they have no interest in.

H1: Participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of immediate recall of the mission statement than participants presented with the non-narrative.

Hypothesis 2 predicts that a narrative delivery will allow participants to be transported into the mission statement than a non-narrative exposure. Relying on the storyline elements, it is expected that participants will be more captivated by the storyline elements, and therefore will be more interested in the narrative format of the mission statement. If participants are more interested in the narrative format, it can be expected that they will be more likely to “enter into” a world that they are emotionally interested in.

H2: Participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of transportation than participants presented with the non-narrative.

Hypothesis 3 predicts that a narrative delivery will allow participants to be more personally involved with the mission statement than a non-narrative exposure. It is expected that respondents with higher personal involvement will have a greater level of emotional engagement with the content of the mission statement message, considering the fact that narrative gives greater opportunity to interact with elements of the story. If
the participants feel that the mission statement message is relevant to them, they will feel more emotionally involved with the message.

**H3: Participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than participants presented with the non-narrative.**

Hypothesis 4 predicts that a narrative delivery will allow participants to report higher levels of source credibility. It is expected that the source (the person) that is providing the thematic elements will come across as having a greater understanding of, and involvement with the mission statement message. This will in turn allow participants to view the source (the person) as trustworthy, and the observed trustworthiness of the source (the person) will in turn impact the credibility of the message.

**H4: Participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the non-narrative.**

Hypothesis 5 predicts that participants who are presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement message will be more likely to speak well of the organization, and respond enthusiastically when asked about the organization. It is suggested that because the participants will feel more emotionally involved with the
mission statement message, they will feel more compelled to speak well of the organization.

**H5: Participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to respond positively than participants presented with the non-narrative.**

Hypothesis 6 predicts that an audiovisual delivery of the mission statement message will allow participants to report higher levels of immediate recall. Relying on the media richness theory, it is expected that participants will be more captivated by an audiovisual format of the mission statement, and will be more likely to remember something if they are captivated by it. Considering the original context of the medium (facial expression, verbal and nonverbal gestures, and the Cleveland State University backdrop), it is expected that these elements will draw participants into the mission statement message, and cause participants to pay attention to the message, in turn increasing the likelihood that participants will accurately recall the message.

**H6: Participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of immediate recall of the mission statement than participants presented with the text.**

Hypothesis 7 predicts that an audiovisual delivery of the mission statement
message will allow participants to report higher levels of transportation. Considering the elements in the original context of the audiovisual (facial expression, verbal and nonverbal gestures, and the Cleveland State University backdrop), it is expected that these elements will attract the participants into the world of the mission statement message. Additionally, viewing an actual person (the source) is expected to influence the way in which the participants are transported into world of the mission statement message.

H7: Participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of transportation than participants presented with the text.

Hypothesis 8 predicts that an audiovisual delivery of the mission statement message will allow participants to report higher levels of personal involvement with the mission statement. Considering the original context of the medium (facial expression, verbal and nonverbal gestures, and the Cleveland State University backdrop), it is expected that participants will be more emotionally involved with an audiovisual format of the mission statement. It is expected that respondents who are more emotionally involved will have a greater level of engagement with the content of the mission statement message, considering the fact that the source (the person) gives a greater opportunity to interact with the elements of the story. Considering that the participants can see the source, it is expected that participants will feel more emotionally involved with the message.
H8: Participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than participants presented with the text.

Hypothesis 9 predicts that an audiovisual delivery of the mission statement message will allow participants to report higher levels source credibility. In addition to considering the elements in the original context of the audiovisual (facial expression, verbal and nonverbal gestures, and the Cleveland State University backdrop), it is expected that these factors will strengthen the credibility of the source. In addition to the overall trustworthiness of the source, it is expected that physically viewing the source’s facial expressions and verbal cues will strengthen the credibility of the message.

H9: Participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to present greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the text.

Hypothesis 10 predicts that an audiovisual delivery of the mission statement message will allow participants to talk positively about the organization. Considering the factors involved with the audiovisual (facial expression, verbal and nonverbal cues, and the Cleveland State University backdrop), it is expected that viewing the source (the person) will cause participants to feel more connected with the mission statement.
message, therefore, making the participants more likely to speak well of the organization.

**H10:** Participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement will be more likely to talk positively about the organization than participants presented with the text.

*Research questions*

Research questions are proposed to question if narrative audiovisual deliveries of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility will be higher than those participants who received the other three conditions of audio visual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative. Research questions were proposed because prior research has not yet looked at these specific questions. Relying on the media richness theory, audiovisual delivery, when combined with narrative, is expected to report higher levels on the dependent variables because participants will be more engaged, captivated by, and interested in a narrative audiovisual. Considering the audiovisual factors like appearance, facial expressions, verbal and nonverbal cues, and the Cleveland State University banner in the background, it is assumed that these factors, together with the storyline elements in narrative transmission, will influence the outcomes of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility.

**RQ1a:** Will participants who received the audiovisual narrative
delivery of the mission statement be more likely to report greater levels of immediate recall than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative)?

RQ1b: Will participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement be more likely to report greater levels of transportation than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative)?

RQ1c: Will participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement be more likely to report greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative)?

RQ1d: Will participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement be more likely to report greater levels of source credibility than those participants who received the
other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative)?
Participants

Participants were college students enrolled at Cleveland State University. All participants were given the opportunity to participate in this study by receiving extra credit in their classes. All participants agreed to an IRB approved consent form in order to participate in the experiment. This study included a total of 289 participants. There was a comparable distribution of males and females, and their status in college was listed as either freshmen, sophomore, junior, or senior status.

These efforts yielded a total of 289 participants with usable data for the study. The study examined participants using narrative audiovisual, non-narrative audiovisual, narrative text, and non-narrative text on the scales of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility. Of those 289 participants in the study ($n = 149$) were male and ($n = 137$) were female (however, 3 participants failed to report their biological sex). The majority of participants used either a desktop or laptop computer to complete this survey ($n=188, 65\%$) followed by ($n=94,$
32%) using a phone. The majority of participants were Caucasian \((n = 163, 57\%)\), followed by African American \((n = 56, 20\%)\), followed by Arabic \((n=40, 14\%)\) and Hispanic \((n=11, 3\%)\). Of the participants, the distribution by class rank was Freshmen \((n=61, 21\%)\), Sophomore \((n=62, 21\%)\), Junior \((n=85, 29\%)\), or Senior \((n = 70, 24\%)\), and \((n=21, 5\%)\) other. Finally, 26.6% of the participants in this study received the audiovisual narrative channel, 28.4% of the participants in this study received the audiovisual non-narrative channel, 22.7% of the participants in this study received the textual narrative, and 22.2% of the participants in this study received the textual non-narrative. Appendix J provides a summary table of the demographics of the sample, listed in Table 1.

Procedure

Participants were given versions of the mission statement message in the following forms: (1) a textual, non-narrative presentation of the Cleveland State University mission statement message; (2) a textual presentation of the Cleveland State University mission statement message in a narrative format; (3) an audiovisual, non-narrative presentation of the Cleveland State University mission statement message; (4) an audiovisual presentation of the Cleveland State University mission statement message in a narrative format. Participants reported on immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility. The survey was conducted through Survey Monkey. The textual mission statement was delivered as a narrative and a non-narrative. Appendix A provides the textual narrative missions
statement, while Appendix B provides the textual non-narrative mission statement. The video conditions were delivered as a narrative audiovisual, and a non-narrative audiovisual. The narrative audiovisual condition portrayed an actor reading the narrative script, behind a Cleveland State University banner. The non-narrative audiovisual condition portrayed an actor reading the non-narrative script, behind a Cleveland State University banner. See Appendix C and D. Participants’ responses were measured with the following scales:

*Narrative vs Non-Narrative (audiovisual and text)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative, Audiovisual Channel</th>
<th>Narrative, Text Channel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Narrative, Audiovisual Channel</td>
<td>Non-Narrative, Text Channel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were given stimuli that consisted of narrative audiovisual, non-narrative audiovisual, narrative text, and non-narrative text. The four channels were evenly distributed throughout the survey.

*Primbing and framing*

Reflecting on the psychological and deeper cognitive effects that can be applied with narrative storytelling, framing and priming are also considered. Priming and framing research has extensively been studied under a comprehensive grouping of
cognitive media effects. The downfall to this research field is that often times, appropriate attention is not applied to each conceptual difference of framing, when compared to priming (Scheufele, 2009). While both framing and priming can be included under the broad term of agenda setting, it is important to have a careful clarification of the concepts, and of their theoretical foundations in social and political psychology (Scheufele, 2009). Agenda setting does not tell an audience what to think but rather, it is a direct implication that tells the audience what they should be thinking about (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Agenda setting is a strategic method in manipulation that can have an influence on shaping the opinions and attitudes of the audience. Priming and framing are two concepts that can be categorized under the term agenda setting, and additionally contribute to what an audience thinks about (Scheufele, 2009). When considering the concept of priming, it is likely that an individual who is presented with a point of reference will be more likely to think in a direction that points towards that point of reference (Mark Peters & Donald Kinder, 1982). The point of reference allows the brain to think of associated topics. For example, relying on priming, exposing participants to the word “engaged learning” will make participants more likely to think of “Cleveland State University” instead of “The University of Akron” if asked to name a college. In essence, the words “engaged learning” is priming the words “Cleveland State University” in the participants’ brains. Regarding the concept of framing, a focus and environment for reporting a story, as well as influencing how audiences will understand or evaluate it are provided by the media (Goffman, 1974). Framing deals with social construction in regards to discernment of a social phenomenon by the journalists delivering the news, and by the interpretation of the phenomenon by the audience members receiving the news.
(Scheufele and Tewksbury, 2007). Scheufele & Tewksbury (2007) argue that in order to identify perception and interpretation, framing offers a rhetorical analysis of text that involves the narrative elements such as the use of metaphor, storytelling, jargon, and choice of words. For example, through framing, the narrative mission statement of Cleveland State University will be developed in a way that the audience will be given a particular point of view or frame of reference and interpretation that will be aimed to allow audience members to view Cleveland State University in a positive attitude.

This study suggests that a narrative treatment on audiovisual and textual conditions will predict significant outcomes on the variables of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility. The above information regarding priming, framing, narrative elements, and transportation strongly suggests that a condition that receives a narrative treatment is likely to have a significant impact on the way in which the audience will respond. Priming, framing, narrative elements, and transportation strongly support the suggestion that narrative treatment on both audiovisual and textual conditions will predict significant outcomes on the variables of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility. Although not every element of priming and framing were applied to this study, it is important to understand the differentiators. This study implemented storytelling, and narrative elements to the narrative audiovisual and text stimuli. Metaphors and jargon were not used, while storytelling and choice of words were. The audience will be given a particular point of
view or frame of reference and interpretation that will be aimed to allow audience members to view Cleveland State University in a positive attitude.

This study implemented storytelling, and narrative elements to the narrative audiovisual and text stimuli. Metaphors and jargon were not used, while storytelling and choice of words were. The audience will be given a particular point of view or frame of reference and interpretation that will be aimed to allow audience members to view Cleveland State University in a positive attitude.

Immediate Recall Scale

To measure participants’ immediate recall of the mission statement message, a scale was developed that measured participants’ immediate recall of the message. A 5 question true or false scale was created to measure the correctness of participants’ immediate recall with the mission statement message where 1 represents true and 2 represents false. The immediate recall rate was calculated by observing the accuracy in responses to the “true” and “false” questions. Sample questions include “The mission does not offer education in the field of humanities” and “The mission is to encourage excellence, diversity, and engaged learning.” See Appendix E for the instrument.

Narrative Transportation Scale

To measure participants’ transportation with the mission statement message, the
Narrative Transportation Scale was implemented (Cronbach’s alpha of .76). The Narrative Transportation Scale is a unidimensional scale that is composed of 12 items scored on a 7-point scale. Sample questions include “While I was reading the narrative, I could easily picture the events in it taking place” and “I found myself thinking of ways the narrative could have turned out differently.” Scores on the items were averaged. See Appendix F for the scale.

The Personal Involvement Scale

To measure participants’ personal involvement with the mission statement message, the Personal Involvement Inventory Scale was implemented (Cronbach’s alpha of .94). The Personal Involvement Inventory Scale is a unidimensional scale that is composed of 20 semantic differential items scored on a 7-point scale. Sample items include “Boring/interesting” and “Appealing/unappealing.” Scores on the items are averaged to form an overall measure of involvement. See Appendix G for the scale.

Likelihood to Speak Positively Scale

To measure participants’ likelihood to speak positively with the mission statement message, a Likelihood to Speak Positively Scale was developed and implemented (Cronbach’s alpha of .79). The Likelihood to Speak Positively Scale is a unidimensional scale that is composed of 5 items scored on a 7-point scale where 1 represents not at all
likely, and 7 represents very much likely. Sample questions include “After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to speak positively about Cleveland State University to friends?” and “After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to recommend Cleveland State University to prospective students?”

Source Credibility Scale

To measure the source credibility of the Cleveland State University mission statement message, McCroskey’s 1999 Source Credibility scale used (Cronbach’s alpha of .93). The Source Credibility Scale is a unidimensional scale that is composed of 18 items scored on a 7-point scale where 1 represents not at all likely, and 7 represents very much likely. Sample items included “Intelligent/unintelligent” and “Honest/dishonest.” Scores on the items are averaged to form an overall measure of source credibility. See Appendix I for the scale.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Hypothesis 1 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of immediate recall of the mission statement than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s immediate recall of the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would experience greater levels of transportation than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s transportation levels among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-
test was conducted to compare participant’s level of personal involvement with the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare how participant’s responded to source credibility in regards to the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would be more likely to respond positively about the organization than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s likelihood to speak positively to the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of immediate recall of the mission statement than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s immediate recall of the mission statement among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the
Hypothesis 7 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would experience greater levels of transportation than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s transportation among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition.

Hypothesis 8 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s personal involvement with the mission statement message among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the way in which participants respond to source credibility levels among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition.

Hypothesis 10 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would more likely to respond positively about the organization
An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s likelihood to speak positively among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition.

Research Question 1a-e (RQ1a, RQ1b, RQ1c, RQ1d, RQ1e) predicted that participants who received the mission statement message through the audiovisual narrative medium would report greater responses on the five dependent variables compared to the other three channels; specifically: a) have levels of immediate recall, b) experience greater transportation, c) have more personal involvement, d) report higher source credibility, and e) report being more likely to respond positively about the organization. To test these hypotheses, 5 independent samples t-tests were conducted, one for each dependent variable. For each test the grouping factor were those in the audiovisual narrative versus those in the other three conditions combined.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics for the dependent variables, while Table 3 provides the correlations between these variables. Of the five variables (immediate recall, transportation, level of personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility), each variable was correlated, with the highest ranking between level of personal involvement and source credibility \((r=.61)\). The next highest ranking in correlation was between likelihood to speak positively and source credibility \((r=.60)\).

The first set of hypotheses tested the effect of the narrative versus non-narrative treatments; the results of hypothesis 1-5 are summarized in Table 4. Hypothesis 1 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of immediate recall of the mission statement than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participants’ immediate recall of the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition. Results in Table 4 show no significant difference for the narrative, \((M=5.00,\)
SD= 1.10) and non-narrative (M = 4.94, SD = 1.15) conditions t(285) = .402, p = .688. These results suggest that the narrative condition does not have an effect on the immediate recall of the mission statement message.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would experience greater levels of transportation than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participants’ transportation levels among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition. Results in Table 4 show no significant difference in the scores for the narrative, (M=3.70, SD=.868) and non-narrative (M = 3.74, SD = .816) conditions t(285) = .354, p = .723. These results suggest that the narrative condition does not have an effect on the transportation levels of the mission statement message.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s level of involvement with the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition. Results in Table 4 show no significant difference in the scores for the narrative, (M=4.52, SD=.956) and non-narrative (M = 4.44, SD = .914) conditions t(285) = .701, p = .484. These results suggest that the narrative condition does not have an effect on the participant’s personal involvement with the mission statement.
Hypothesis 4 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare how participant’s responded to source credibility in regards to the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition. Results in Table 4 show no significant difference in the scores for the narrative, (M=4.94, SD=.982) and non-narrative (M = 4.96, SD = .938) conditions t(285) = .181, p = .857. These results suggest that the narrative condition does not have an effect on source credibility, in regards to the mission statement.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would be more likely to respond positively about the organization than participants presented with the non-narrative. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s likelihood to speak positively to the mission statement among participants who received the narrative condition, and participants who received the non-narrative condition. Results in Table 4 show no significant difference in the scores for the narrative, (M=4.60, SD=1.20) and non-narrative (M = 4.75, SD = 1.11) conditions t(285) = 1.03, p = .304. These results suggest that the narrative condition does not have an effect on the likelihood to speak positively.

The second set of hypotheses tested the effect of the audiovisual versus text
channel; the results of hypotheses 6-10 are summarized in Table 5. Hypothesis 6 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of immediate recall of the mission statement than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s immediate recall of the mission statement among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition. Results in Table 5 show no significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual, (M=5.06, SD=1.01) and text (M = 4.85, SD = 1.20) conditions t(285) = 1.64, p = .101. These results suggest that the audiovisual condition does not have an effect on the participants’ immediate recall of the mission statement message.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would experience greater levels of transportation than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s transportation among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition. Results in Table 5 show no significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual, (M=3.76, SD=.869) and text (M = 3.68, SD = .806) conditions t(285) = .856, p = .393. These results suggest that the audiovisual condition does not have an effect on the participant’s levels of transportation.

Hypothesis 8 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was
conducted to compare participant’s personal involvement with the mission statement message among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition. Results in Table 5 shows that the results are approaching significance in the scores for the audiovisual, (M=4.57, SD= .957) and text (M = 4.37, SD = .897) conditions t(285) = 1.85, p = .065. Table 5 shows a difference that is approaching significance.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the way in which participants respond to source credibility levels among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition. Results in Table 5 show a significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual, (M=5.08, SD= .977) and text (M = 4.80, SD = .914) conditions t(285) = 2.57, p = .011. These results suggest that the audiovisual condition does have a significant effect on the way in which the participants respond to source credibility. The participants who received the audiovisual condition reported greater levels of source credibility.

Hypothesis 10 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would be more likely to respond/speak positively about the organization than participants presented with the text. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s likelihood to speak positively among participants who received the audiovisual condition, and participants who received the text condition.
Results in Table 5 show there is an approaching significance difference in the scores for the audiovisual, (M=4.80, SD= 1.16) and text (M = 4.55, SD = 1.14) conditions t(285) = 1.80, p = .075. These results suggest that the audiovisual condition was approaching significance in having an effect on the participant’s likelihood to speak positively.

Research questions 1 a-e tested the effect of the interaction of the narrative audiovisual condition versus the other three conditions combined; the results of research questions a-e are summarized in Table 6. Research question (RQ1a) questioned if participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of immediate recall than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s immediate recall of the mission statement among participants who received the audiovisual narrative condition of the mission statement message, compared to participant’s who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative). Results in Table 6 show a significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual narrative condition, (M=5.20, SD=.962) and the other three conditions of audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative (M = 1.40, SD = .159) conditions t(285) = 2.08, p =.04. These results suggest that the audiovisual narrative condition does have an effect on the participants’ immediate recall of the mission statement message, and is approaching significance. Participants who were in the audiovisual narrative condition had significantly higher immediate recall rates compared to those in the other conditions.
Research questions (RQ1b) questioned if participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would experience greater levels of transportation than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s transportation levels among participants who received the audiovisual narrative condition of the mission statement message, compared to participant’s who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative). Results in Table 6 show no significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual narrative condition, (M=3.71 SD=.899) and the other three conditions of audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative (M = 3.73, SD = .822) conditions t(285) = .158, p = .875. These results suggest that the audiovisual narrative condition does not have an effect on the participant’s transportation levels compared to the other conditions.

Research question (RQ1c) questioned if participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would have greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s personal involvement with the mission statement among participants who received the audiovisual narrative condition of the mission statement message, compared to participant’s who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative). Results in Table 6 show no significant difference in the scores for the
audiovisual narrative condition, (M=4.64, SD=1.02) and the other three conditions of audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative (M = 4.43, SD = .898) conditions t(285) = 1.62, p = .011. These results suggest that the audiovisual narrative condition does not have an effect on the participant’s personal involvement levels compared to the other conditions.

Research question (RQ1d) questioned if participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would predict greater levels of source credibility than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare how the participant’s responded to source credibility among participants who received the audiovisual narrative condition of the mission statement message, compared to participant’s who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative). Results in Table 6 show a significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual narrative condition, (M=5.14, SD=.957) and the other three conditions of audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative (M = 4.88, SD = .952) conditions t(285) = 2.00, p = .05. These results suggest that the audiovisual narrative condition does have a significant effect on source credibility, when compared to the other conditions.

Research question (RQ1e) questioned if participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would be more likely to respond positively about the organization than those participants who received the other three conditions
(audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare participant’s likelihood to speak positively among participants who received the audiovisual narrative condition of the mission statement message, compared to participant’s who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative). Results in Table 6 show no significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual narrative condition, (M=4.80, SD=1.18) and the other three conditions of audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative (M = 4.64, SD = 1.15) conditions t(285) = 1.02, p = .31. These results suggest that the audiovisual narrative condition does not have an effect on the participant’s likelihood to speak positively, when compared to the other conditions.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of narrative, along with the richness of the medium when applied to the efficacy of the transmission of mission statement messages. This study has built upon existing literature because while existing literature has examined the effects and outcomes of organizational mission statements transmitted through audiovisuals, it has not yet examined the effects and outcomes of organizational mission statements transmitted through audiovisuals, while using a narrative delivery.

This study further elaborated on existing research by studying the channel of textual and audiovisual transmission, in consideration with whether the mission message utilized a narrative delivery. The different effects of narrative and channels, with respect to the efficacy of mission statements messages were assessed through textual narrative, textual non-narrative, audiovisual narrative, and audiovisual non-narrative.
Narrative Stimulus

When assessing the narrative condition in relation to hypotheses 1-5, there was no significance found in the hypotheses with dependent variables of immediate recall, transportation, level of personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility when presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement message. It is possible that storyline elements and characterization can make the message more complex, in turn having a negative effect on the dependent variables.

Channel Stimulus

Hypothesis 6-10 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement message would report greater levels of immediate recall, transportation, level of personal involvement, likelihood to speak positively, and source credibility. While the findings on hypotheses 6 and 7 were not significant, hypothesis 8 and hypothesis 10 did approach significance, with the dependent variables of personal involvement, and likelihood to speak positively. Results for hypothesis 9, with the dependent variable of source credibility were significant (see Table 3 for correlations).

Narrative and Channel Combined Stimulus

The findings in Research question (RQ1a) were significance in predicting that
participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement will predict greater levels of immediate recall than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). Research question (RQ1b) predicted that participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement will predict greater levels of transportation than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative), but there were no significant findings. The findings in research question (RQ1c) were not significant in predicting that participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement will predict greater levels of personal involvement with the mission statement than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). Research question (RQ1d) reported significance and predicted that participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement will predict greater levels of source credibility than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative). Research question (RQ1e) predicted that participants who received the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would be more likely to respond positively about the organization than those participants who received the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, text narrative, text non-narrative), but there were no significant findings. It appears that when considering the audiovisual narrative only immediate recall and personal involvement reported approaching significance and only source credibility reported significant results (see Table 3 for correlations).
Considering the audiovisual/narrative delivery of the mission statement message, and the effect in which it had on source credibility, it would be beneficial to conduct future research to examine source credibility more in detail. It is possible that the choice of “actor” chosen to deliver the message can impact the results of source credibility. It is also possible that the choice of “actor” chosen to deliver the message can have no significant impact. It would be beneficial expand on existing research to analyze the ways in which different channel elements influence an audience member’s evaluation of source credibility.

There are significant findings worth further investigating in regards to source credibility. Considering the hypotheses involving source credibility, the way in which the source was viewed is significantly supported. Hypothesis 4 predicted that participants presented with the narrative delivery of the mission statement would predict greater levels of source credibility than participants presented with the non-narrative. This was the only hypothesis with source credibility where there was no significant difference in the scores for the narrative, (M=4.94, SD= .982) and non-narrative (M = 4.96, SD = .938) conditions t(285) = .181, p = .857. Hypothesis 9 predicted that participants presented with the audiovisual delivery of the mission statement would have higher source credibility levels than participants presented with the text. There was a significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual, (M=5.08, SD= .977) and text (M = 4.80, SD = .914) conditions t(285) = 2.57, p = .011. These results suggest that the audiovisual condition does have an effect on the way in which the participants respond to source credibility (see Table 3 for correlations). Research question (RQ1d) suggested that
participants presented with the audiovisual narrative delivery of the mission statement would predict greater levels of source credibility with the mission statement than participants presented with the other three conditions (audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative). There was a significant difference in the scores for the audiovisual narrative condition, (M=5.14, SD=.957) and the other three conditions of audiovisual non-narrative, textual narrative, and textual non-narrative (M = 4.88, SD = .952) conditions t(285) = 2.00, p = .046. These results suggest that the audiovisual narrative condition does have an effect on source credibility. Source credibility emerged as a dependent variable of interest in this study.

Contrary to existing literature, this study found that audiovisual has a significant impact on mission statement messages, whereas Whitbred et. al (2008) found that text had a significant impact on mission statement messages. It will be beneficial to future studies to implement hypotheses in which source credibility as the independent variable, and consider the extent to which source credibility can influence the way in which participants respond to other dependent variables. It would be interesting, for future research, to examine the channel, along with the framing, in addition to source credibility, and observe it’s impact on the dependent variables of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, and likelihood to speak positively.

Implications for Practice

This research study was a great way to build experience and understanding on
how professional research studies should be conducted. I viewed this research study as a wonderful way to practice – and trial and error. In retrospect, there are many alterations I would have made throughout this research study process – some of which include surveying both Cleveland State University students, as well as individuals who are not Cleveland State University students. Throughout this research study I made many errors, had a fair amount of successes, and learned many ways to improve on research students I might participate in on the future.

Implications for Theory

It would be interesting to revive this study and conduct future research. There were many factors that influenced the outcome of the results of this study, however, one of the most prominent influencers was the pool of participants. It is unfortunate that my participant pool was limited to only Cleveland State students, because the results are significantly influenced by this restriction. The student’s prior knowledge and experience with Cleveland State University is likely to have impacted the way in which the participants responded to the research questions. Students are likely to have presuppositions about the university, and this is likely to impact their attitude and responses to the survey questions. In future research, it would be interesting to conduct a test that expands on this study by conducting a correlation test between tenure and the outcome variables, and examine if there is any significance. In addition, it would also be interesting to conduct an analysis that examines the hypotheses, and uses only freshman, only sophomores, only juniors, and only seniors to determine if there is any difference in
isolating the college status. It would be interesting to expand on this research for future studies.

Limitations

The major limitation throughout this research study to be considered is that Cleveland State University students might have affected the results. Due to the fact that every student surveyed was a Cleveland State University student, these students can carry bias in their answers. The current CSU students might have possibly had prior knowledge and experience in the organization. For future research, it would be interesting to run a correlation between tenure and outcome, to determine if there is any finding of significance to consider. In addition to the correlation, it would be useful to conduct future research to isolate only freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, to see if there is any significance between these groups. These specific tests were not analyzed in this research study, because it was not the intention. However, these tests are interesting for future research to elaborate on this research study. In addition, future research should use non-CSU students, as well as CSU students, and compare how the results might differ, as well.

As in any study, this study experienced certain limitations that can serve as potential setbacks for the research results. The scope of students, as well as the number of students can serve as a potential limitation for this study. It is possible that the results
would vary among other groups of people, other environments, and other areas of community. For example, it is possible that students attending a smaller, private university might have a different reaction to the materials being tested, in comparison to the larger community of students polled at Cleveland State University. It is possible that other factors, such as location, university size, as well as individualistic characteristics could impact the results of this study.

Money and funding was another limitation of this study. The created materials (the audiovisual materials) were filmed with an iPhone, and the setting consisted of an average Cleveland State University banner. While this could potentially be advantageous to the findings of the study, it can also be a deterrent to the study’s results. The camera quality, as well as the on-camera source could have been helpful in quality to present the participants with a familiar, and not necessarily prestigious presentation. The source could have also played a positive role in reliability. In comparison, these factors could also be limitations, because supposing the quality of the video had been more clear, professional, and obviously well-constructed, the participants might have returned different results would differently influence the audiovisual section responses.

Trusting the integrity and honesty of the student’s answers is another possible limitation of this study. This is not to imply that students are dishonest or acting with a lack of integrity in answering the study’s questions, however, this consideration is taking into account that some students might have not been eager or interested in taking this survey. If the participants completed the study’s survey as an obligation, or as a vessel to
receive extra-credit, the participants might have contributed insincere answers, simply as a means to complete the survey as quickly as possible. While this is not a concrete limitation, it is certainly a limitation that is a logical assumption in the possible misconstruing of results, or the limitations of the study as a whole.

The types of variables and questions that were selected for this study could also be a factor in the limitations of this study. For example, suppose asking the questions in a different manner, or framing the questions in a different way might have altered the way in which the participants responded to the questions being asked. Even though the questions asked in this study were precisely the exact questions that I intended to ask in this survey, it is still possible that they ways in which these questions were phrased might serve as a possible limitation. It is logical to assume that the way in which a question is phrased might positively influence the way in which the participants respond, or might negatively influence the way in which the participants respond.

The age of the participants in the study is also a possible limitation of this study. It is possible that the age and progression of an individual’s life can impact the way in which the individual responds to, and reacts to certain questions. The age of an individual can potentially influence the individual’s feelings towards the question being asked. For example, an individual who is 20 years old might respond differently to the exact same material and questions they were asked when that same individual is 40 years old. An individual’s age allows for more life experience, as well as additional influences and opinions to be formed. Considering this, it is logical to assume that the outcome of the survey might have been different if the age of the participants was broader in range.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the projected hypotheses were not significantly supported in the areas of immediate recall, transportation, personal involvement, and likelihood to speak positively. There were, however, significant findings worth further investigating in regards to source credibility. Despite certain limitations, such as participant’s age, funding, and location, this study was successful in finding out new information on an existing topic. This particular study on organization mission statement efficacy would be beneficial to do at a multitude of different organizations to identify how the participants respond to the organizational mission statement message. This particular study focused on students from Cleveland State University, in regards to the Cleveland State University mission statement. If this study’s implications, however, were to be extended to alternate organizations and companies, it would be necessary to consider additional limitations. It is important to attempt to fully exhaust the entirety of the potential limitations for each study in order to ensure that the most accurate and pure information is being accumulated in the final results. This study was intended to support that immediate recall,
transportation, personal involvement, and likelihood to speak positively would be heavily influenced by the audiovisual presentation of the mission statement message.

There were no significant findings in the projected areas of prediction. While the findings of this study did not significantly support any of the projected hypotheses, there was a significant finding in regards to source credibility that stood out. This study was successful in discovering new information on an existing topic, and was also successful in furthering existing research in a new way that has not been investigated before.
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Appendix A

Textual Narrative Script

Hi, my name is Jaimie, and I’m a prospective student looking for a college to attend. As an 18 year old fresh out of high school, I’m constantly seeing my friends receive college acceptance letters. For me, I want a university that’s in the heart of the city. I want the city to be up and coming and lively, and I want the city to be Cleveland. I want the university that I attend to encourage excellence, to encourage diversity, and to encourage engaged learning. These attributes of a university are so important to me.

When I think of studying, I want excellence to be encouraged. When I think of diversity, I want to have access to many different choices. And when I think of engaged learning, I want to have the opportunity to be involved in as many different avenues as possible, that give my education its full potential. By providing excellence, diversity, and engaged learning, I want the university to fulfill these requirements by providing contemporary, modern day, and assessable education in so many different areas of study. I want my university to have majors in the arts, sciences, in the humanities, and in possible professions. A university can also provide excellence, diversity, and engaged learning by providing the opportunity for students and faculty to conduct research together by providing the opportunity for students to receive scholarships and by encouraging creative activity and knowledge. I want the university that I attend to strive to serve the public, to engage the public, and to prepare its students to lead productive, responsible, and satisfying lives in the region and the global society. This is exactly the mission statement of Cleveland State, and this is exactly the reason why I choose Cleveland State University as my college of choice.
Appendix B

Textual Non-Narrative Script

Cleveland State University is a mid-size, urban public university located in downtown Cleveland. The location of the university in the heart of the city provides an urban learning experience and culturally diverse and enriching living. Many of the students attending Cleveland State University come from high schools in Northeast, Ohio. Cleveland State University offers a wide array of choices when it comes to fields of studies and majors. The mission of the university is to prepare its student body for careers in the contemporary work environment across the nation and the world. Our mission is to encourage excellence in teaching and research. Cleveland State University is known for an engaged learning environment, and a contemporary and assessable education in the arts, sciences, humanities, and professions. The university offers majors across arts, social sciences, and sciences. We have world renowned faculty who conduct research, scholarship, and creative activity across all branches of knowledge. Our student’s receive scholarships and get the opportunity to work with our faculty on cutting edge research projects. Cleveland State University prepares and trains its students to be engaged, and productive citizens in an increasingly globalizing world. The university promotes equality and diversity in students, faculty, and staff. We encourage real world learning opportunities outside of classrooms in association with our community partners. Cleveland State University is among a select group of universities nationally that has received the Carnegie Foundation’s community engagement certification for making engagement, diversity, and community partnerships a part of its core mission. We endeavor to serve and engage the public, and prepare our students to lead productive, responsible, and satisfying lives in the region, the nation, and global society.
Appendix C

YouTube Link to Audiovisual Narrative

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QJrHsWw3rxY
Appendix D

YouTube Link to Audiovisual Non-Narrative

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TK_YRox6IGw
Appendix E

Cleveland State University Mission Statement Message

“Our mission is to encourage excellence, diversity and engaged learning by providing a contemporary and accessible education in the arts, sciences, humanities and professions, and by conducting research, scholarship, and creative activity across these branches of knowledge. We endeavor to serve and engage the public and prepare our students to lead productive, responsible and satisfying lives in the region and global society.”

Immediate Recall Scale Items

1. The mission is to encourage excellence, diversity, and engaged learning
   (1) True (2) False
2. The mission is to provide a modern-day, accessible education
   (1) True (2) False
3. The mission does not offer education in the field of humanities
   (1) True (2) False
4. The mission does not prepare students to lead satisfying, responsible lives in the global society
   (1) True (2) False
5. According to the mission, scholarship is not an option
   (1) True (2) False

Open-ended question:
“Describe in 100 words or less what you interpret the Cleveland State University mission statement to mean.”
Appendix F

Green & Brock Narrative Transportation Scale (2000)*

Narrative Questionnaire

Circle the number under each question that best represents your opinion about the narrative you just read.

1. While I was reading the narrative, I could easily picture the events in it taking place.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much

2. While I was reading the narrative, activity going on in the room around me was on my mind.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much

3. I could picture myself in the scene of the events described in the narrative.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much

4. I was mentally involved in the narrative while reading it.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much

5. After the narrative ended, I found it easy to put it out of my mind.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much

6. I wanted to learn how the narrative ended.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much

7. The narrative affected me emotionally.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all very much
8. I found myself thinking of ways the narrative could have turned out differently.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very much

9. I found my mind wandering while reading the narrative.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very much

10. The events in the narrative are relevant to my everyday life.
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    not at all  very much

11. The events in the narrative have changed my life.
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    not at all  very much

12. I had a vivid mental image of [character name].
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    not at all  very much

Notes: Items 2, 5, and 9 are reverse-scored.
Item 12 can be repeated for the number of main characters in the story, substituting a different character name for each item.

Appendix G

Personal Involvement Inventory Scale (Zaichkowsky, 1985)

The PII Items

1. Important – unimportant *
2. Of no concern – of concern to me
3. Irrelevant – relevant
4. Means a lot to me – means nothing to me *
5. Useless – useful
6. Valuable – worthless *
7. Trivial – fundamental
8. Beneficial – not beneficial *
9. Matters to me – doesn’t matter *
10. Uninterested – interested
11. Significant – insignificant *
12. Vital – superfluous *
13. Boring – interesting
14. Unexciting – exciting
15. Appealing – unappealing *
16. Mundane – fascinating
17. Essential – nonessential *
18. Undesirable – desirable
19. Wanted – unwanted *
20. Not needed – needed

NOTE: * Denotes that items are reversed scored
Appendix H

Likelihood to Speak Positively Scale Items

1. After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to speak positively about Cleveland State University to friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to donate money to Cleveland State University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to recommend Cleveland State University to prospective students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to speak positively about Cleveland State University to acquaintances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. After reading the mission statement, how likely are you to recommend Cleveland State University to friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

**Source Credibility Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not care about me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has my interests at heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t have my interests at heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-centered</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insensitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not understanding</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix J

Table 1. Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual narrative</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual non-narrative</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual narrative</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual non-narrative</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviations of Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to Speak</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Immediate Recall</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transportation</td>
<td>0.128*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.187**</td>
<td>0.409**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source Credibility</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>0.304**</td>
<td>0.610**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Likelihood to Speak</td>
<td>0.145*</td>
<td>0.405**</td>
<td>0.571**</td>
<td>0.606**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01
Table 4. T-Test Table Comparing Participants Receiving Narrative Mission Statement Message Treatment with the Non-Narrative Mission Statement Message Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Narrative Mean</th>
<th>Non-Narrative Mean</th>
<th>Narrative SD</th>
<th>Non-Narrative SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to Speak Positively</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. T-Test Table Comparing Participants Receiving the Audiovisual Mission Statement Message Treatments and the Textual Mission Statement Message Treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Audiovisual Mean</th>
<th>Textual Mean</th>
<th>Audiovisual SD</th>
<th>Textual SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to Speak Positively</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. T-Test Table Comparing Participants Receiving the Audiovisual Narrative Mission Statement Message Compared to the Other Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>AV/Nar Mean</th>
<th>AV/Narrative SD</th>
<th>All Others Mean</th>
<th>All Others SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to Speak Positively</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>