ETD Archive

2018

# Expanding Our Present Knowledge of the Non-fictional World: An Analysis of Transportation and Identification with Victims and Perpetrators

Shantale D. Roberts
*Cleveland State University*

EXPANDING OUR PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE NON-FICTIONAL WORLD:

AN ANALYSIS OF TRANSPORTATION AND IDENTIFICATION WITH VICTIMS

AND PERPETRATORS

SHANTALE D. ROBERTS

Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies

Cleveland State University

December 2015

submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

MASTER OF APPLIED COMMUNICATION THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2018

We hereby approve this thesis

For

SHANTALE D. ROBERTS

Candidate for the Master's degree

for Applied Communication Theory and Methodology

And

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY'S

College of Graduate Studies by

_____

Thesis Committee Chairperson, Dr. Cheryl Bracken

_____

Department of Communication, May 18, 2018

_____

Dr. Richard Perloff

_____

Department of Communication, May 18, 2018

_____

Dr. Valerie Wright

_____

Department of Criminology and Anthropology, May 18, 2018

Student's Date of Defense: May 18, 2018

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXPANDING OUT PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE NON-FICTIONAL WORLD:

AN ANALYSIS OF TRANSPORTATION AND IDENTIFICATION WITH VICTIMS

AND PERPETRATORS

SHANTALE D. ROBERTS

**ABSTRACT**

This study tests for transportation and identification in non- fiction documentaries that portrayed victims and perpetrators of crime. Participants were a combination of college students and individual who were recruited via social media. The two video conditions demonstrated adult women who were portrayed as either a victim or perpetrator; this is where the manipulation occurred. Participants were randomly selected to view a documentary of a black or white victim, or a black or white perpetrator. Results found that participants were able to be transported into a non- fiction video. Participants also expressed high levels of identification with the women portrayed in the non- fiction videos. Results also indicated a positive correlation between transportation and identification.

Keywords: transportation, identification, non- fiction, documentaries

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a considerable amount of high profile cases has received media attention showcasing women as either the perpetrator or victim of serious crimes. In August of 2012, public outrage across the country was exhibited when Marissa Anderson was found guilty on two counts of aggravated assault and was sentenced to a mandatory 20 years in prison. In 2010, Marissa began to receive threatening phone calls and texts from her estranged husband who insisted that he would kill her. Since domestic abuse was common in their relationship in the past, Marissa believed she had good reason to trust that she was in danger. According to Marissa, she tried to escape from her husband through a garage door that was not working properly, it was then that she grabbed her gun from her car and fired a single warning shot at head level toward her husband.

Marissa believed that she would be covered by Florida's "stand your ground rule," which is the same rule that set Travon Martin's killer George Zimmerman free in 2013, but that was not the case. Although no one was injured during the encounter, Marissa later served three years behind bars and two years on house arrest before having her conviction overturned in 2017.

On May 8, 2013, in Cleveland, Ohio, Amanda Berry escaped captivity with her six-year-old daughter. Between 2002 and 2004, Amanda Berry, Georgina DeJesus, and Michelle Knight became missing women who appeared to have vanished. It was later determined that all three women had something in common; they had accepted a ride from their capturer Ariel Castro. Michelle Knight was offered a ride after leaving from a cousin's house. She was suspected of being missing when she did not show up for custody court for her son the day following her disappearance, although her case was never thoroughly investigated. Amanda Berry would go missing a day before her seventeenth birthday when she received a ride from Castro after leaving from work. She was deemed a runaway by the police until an unknown male phoned her mother and confirmed that he had captured her. And finally, Georgina DeJesus, who was a good friend of Castro's daughter, was led into captivation after accepting a ride from Castro who she trusted. All three women described instances of sexual, mental, and physical abuse while being held in Castro's home. Amanda Berry shared a child with Castro. The women would remain in the house of captivation between nine to eleven years, until that faithful day Amanda Berry grabbed the attention of neighbors and was set free. Castro was later charged with their kidnappings, but he committed suicide soon after. The disappearance of these three women caused an outpour of concern and confusion about the precautions taken to ensure these women were saved. People far and wide began to question the effectiveness of Amber Alerts and police concern for missing children everywhere.

These non-fiction news stories have an impact on how audiences interpret specific events and situations and react. The current study seeks to understand the mechanisms of

influence at work in these stories, specifically transportation and identification experienced by the viewers. This will be accomplished by applying the theoretical constructs of transportation and identification to highlight major factors in determining the various levels of involvement.

While there are numerous definitions of transportation, the most popular is offered by Green and Brock (2000) as the "focus of attention, emotion, and imagery of a story" (p. 323). More recently there have been additional interpretations of transportation such as a "readers undertaking a mental journey into a world of narrative" (Appel & Richter, 2010, p. 103). A consistent usage of the term transportation is that someone, a reader, is immersed into a narrative world of fiction. Transportation differs from other cognitive elaboration types of persuasion because when one is transported they are less likely to provide counterarguments while absorbed into a story.

When one is immersed into a story, the narrative world may become more realistic encouraging the process of transportation. In turn, individuals create strong bonds and feelings towards the characters. Green and Brock (2000) assert that the experiences of characters can lead to attitude change through the relationships that are formed within the narrative world.

> As with any message, consumers of narratives are often an active audience, bringing their own interpretations to stories. Perhaps more than other messages, narratives allow readers to find different meanings; lessons from stories may resonate with people in ways that depend on their own background and current situation (Green, Kass, Carrey, Herzig, Feeney, & Sabini, 2008 p. 49).

The concept of transportation predicts audiences can be impacted by media messages regardless of the form of the narrative. Written narratives are the most common scenarios of transportation, but researchers have extended the study of transportation to

visual narratives as well (Green & Brock, 2000). Because Transportation functions through psychological immersive processes, the current study asserts that both fictional and nonfictional narratives can induce transportation.

A related concept to Transportation is character identification, which is a concept that has an array of definitions. Researchers generally define identification as the perceived connection between an audience member and a media character within a narrative and the story receiver. Researchers have explained this connection as being due to liking a character, or perceived similarity to a character, and even perspective taking with a specific character within a narrative (Cohen, 2001; Sestir & Green, 2010). Transportation and identification have been correlated together (Igartua, 2010; Moyer-Guse & Nabi, 2010; Murphy, Frank, Chatterjee & Baezconde-Garbanati, 2013). But while researchers have found a correlation between the two concepts, they are fundamentally different. Transportation can exist without identification, and identification can exist without transportation.

For many years, concepts such as transportation and identification have focused on the effects of fictional narratives and have continuously ignored the possibility of effects in the non-fiction world. The purpose of this study is to determine if one can be transported into a non-fiction narrative and if identification is possible with people who are portrayed in a documentary. Little research has been done to link the nonfiction world and the theories of mass effects. Both fields have an interest that coincides with the effects of the other. The current study will explore the effects of narrative persuasion: Transportation and identification.

More specifically, an experiment was conducted comparing non-fiction characters in four video clips: two perpetrators of a crime and two victims of a crime. The videos will display stories from the perspective of women. To avoid the stereotype of men as the perpetrator and women as the victim, a decision was made to select women as the core concentration of this study, because few studies offer insight on women as both the victim and offender of a crime. Research in mass media effects has primarily focused on the effects of nonfiction depictions, so to broaden the spectrum, this thesis attempts to demonstrate that mass media effects can have an impact on nonfiction narratives as well as change behavior intent.

**Rationale**

Green and Brock (2000) explain in their early studies that transportation is possible within the non-fiction narratives, but this avenue has been neglected by scholars of the field. Most research on identification and transportation focus their work mainly on fictional narratives (Appel & Richter, 2010; Brumbaugh, 2009; Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008; Cohen, 2001). Additionally, causal attribution will be included in this study to test for internal and external attributes associated with the victims and perpetrators. In past studies, causal attribution has been considered an effect of narrative persuasion (Lewis & Sznitman, 2017). Because of this determination, causal attribution will be incorporated into this study to analyze whether the effects of transportation and/ or identification effects the way a participant assess attribution to victims and perpetrators. Specifically, this study is looking to examine if attribution will become correlated with transportation and identification, and whether the race of participants effect the way participants assess attribution (whether internally or externally) to victims versus perpetrators.

The proposed study intends to expand transportation to include the examination of non-fiction content, in hopes of opening doors and eyes to an understudied area of transportation. The anticipated findings may offer new insight into Transportation research which may include the impact and use of transportation with stories about real people, how audience members may react to the message received, and how audience beliefs and attitudes may be changed.

The results of this study contribute to the area of research by  providing a new focus for transportation and identification research. Specifically, the examination of non-fiction character or real people has been understudied. However, documentaries can have strong impact on media audiences (Chattoo & Das, 2014). The results of this research will encourage future scholars to study and apply non-fiction scenarios, such as criminality and victimization, and use this scholarship as a basis for future research. The results of this study may provide one avenue to confront unconscious prejudices that are stagnant until confronted, and the choices (just or unjust) we make when under the influence of narrative persuasion. Also, this thesis will focus on narrative persuasion in a way that directs audience's attention on social justice issues and portrayals of specific demographics in narratives. This study will directly contribute to research by exploring perceptions of victims and perpetrators, these results will become useful in the field of communication practice as well as sociological settings.

Chapter one will focus first on the relevant literature on narrative persuasion, transportation and identification. Three hypotheses will be proposed based on the literature and theories, as well as six research questions that are not definitively supported with past research. Next, chapter two describes the methodology for this research which

will include additional effects of social attraction and perceived realism on viewing non-fictional videos will be examined and discussed in the chapter on results. This thesis will conclude with a discussion of conclusions, implications, and direction for future research.

# CHAPTER II

# LITERATURE REVIEW

**Narrative Persuasion**

Narrative persuasion has been historically used as a mechanism to determine the degree of attitude change of an audience member once they have been exposed to a story. It is through the process of narrative persuasion that researchers have determined that attitudes, beliefs and behaviors can be changed. Having an empirical definition of a term is necessary to move forward to operationalization of the concept. Narrative persuasion is the use of narrative messages to persuade an audience. Narratives are not limited to books, in that narratives are expanded to any avenue of messages displayed in a story form. Narrative persuasion is an observable concept. However, there are individual differences in the experience of transport, attitude, and emotion within narrative persuasion. In previous research, narrative persuasion has been used under other terms such as narrative understanding and narrative engagement. Zwarun and Hall (2012), examined how narrative persuasion, transportation and need for cognition, measured believes and intentions of fantastical films. In this study, the definition offered by Zwarun and Hall who defined narrative persuasion as "the likelihood that one will uncritically absorb the narrative message and experience belief or attitude change increase" (2012, p. 329).

There appears to be a strong correlation between how much one is transported into the narrative and how much they are persuaded. Narrative persuasion is not fixed; in that it can vary based on individual differences (i.e., willingness and concentration of an individual) and characteristics of the story (i.e., the time in the narrative that the individual experiences their transport into the narrative). Narrative persuasion effects individuals in a variety of ways that are not consistent across the spectrum. For example, what might persuade one person may not work for the next person. This is also true with time. Not all individuals will be persuaded at the same time in a narrative as another viewer or reader, meaning, one individual may be transported at the beginning of a narrative, whereas someone else may experience transportation at the end. (Mazzocco, Green, Sasota & Jones, 2010). Empirically, narrative persuasion requires that an unsuspecting individual is unconsciously submerged into a narrative in which they have been influenced. They are sequentially tapped into their own positive or negative preexisting beliefs and attitudes, that in turn ends or concludes with an attitude change that is from a seemingly stronger stand point on social control, health issues and politics due to narrative (Butler, Koopman & Zimbardo, 1995; Green, 2006).

Narrative persuasion is an also considered a multidimensional process due to the effects of persuasion. The narrative impact varies (greater or lesser) on an individual basis in how each person process mentally, attentively and with imagery (Hoeken & Sinkeldam, 2014). It is through the process of narrative persuasion that cognitive processes such as transportation can exist.

**Applications of Narrative Persuasion**

Narrative persuasion has widely been used to examine sensitive topics including homosexuality, obesity, and additional real-world phenomenon's. In 2010, Mazzocco, Green, Sasota, and Jones examined narrative persuasion in participants who read various narratives that promoted tolerance toward homosexuality. Participants of one condition read a short story that was designed to produce tolerance and acceptance of homosexuality. The results of the study suggest that when the narrative evoked emotional responses, the participant became more transported which in turn resulted in attitude change and tolerance for homosexuality.

Butler, Koopman and Zimbardo (1995) tested the effects of narrative persuasion and its impact of historical fiction films. The authors were interested in investigating how historical fiction films could shape attitudes and beliefs despite their controversial content. The study strived to answer the question if fictional movies could create real world attitude change. Participants were chosen while they entered and exited Oliver Stone's controversial film "*JFK*." Those who were chosen to participate in the survey after watching the film showed signs of anger and changed beliefs about the conspiracy hypothesis from multiple agents and agencies about the assignation of JFK. More specifically, Butler et al (1995) found that the controversial film of the JFK assassination made an impact on mood, beliefs, and judgements consistent with themes and the persuasive messages in the story line of the film, but the changes did not carry over into general political judgements.

Narrative persuasion has been linked to causal attribution in past studies. The studies suggest that through narrative persuasion, audience members begin to attribute

causes to a character or a person. But, how attribution is assessed is strongly related to the level of narrative persuasion produced.

**Applications of Narrative Persuasion and Causal Attribution**

Attributions are the various reasons individuals believe that an event occurred, which in turn allows for an understanding of how individuals may judge certain events. Within the process of attribution there is a special case of human processing that involves the attribution of responsibility for actions, events, and outcomes (Young & Thompson, 2011). When attribution is assessed toward an individual, surrounding factors are considered to further determine whether responsibility is to be directed internally or externally. Actions are deemed questionable when the behavior addressed appears to be abnormal to that of which others would have done if in a similar situation. Additional research has been produced to examine the effects of narrative persuasion and attribution in relation to counterarguments. In 2011, Niederdeppe, Shapiro, and Porticella looked at the growing epidemic of obesity in the United States and strived to observe attributions of responsibility in addressing the issue. Using narrative and nonnarrative messages, their results indicated that narrative messages increased the belief that societal actors or external factors (government, employers) are responsible for addressing the issues of obesity. Results patterns were partially due to success in creating narrative messages that reduced counterarguments. Previous research has examined attribution and addressed how either internal or external causes can be assessed to an individual in relation to events. Additional research has also determined that narrative persuasion tactics can be used to control whether internal or external attributes should be used to determine behavior change, as well as reduce counterarguments.

In a more recent study, Lewis and Sznitman (2017) examined two narrative characteristics that may impact narrative persuasion: responsibility attribution and stigma. The attribution theory focuses on our natural tendency to find casual relationships for our observations or experiences (Weiner, 1995). More specifically, Lewis and Sznitman investigated the effects of internal and external attribution. Internal attribution contributed to the perceptions that an outcome is caused by factors that that are under an individual's control (pg. 184, 2017). According to Lewis and Sznitman (2017), external attributions happen when an outcome is perceived to be outside the control of the individual. Stigma was defined as "a simplified, standardized image of the disgrace of a certain people under held in a common community at large" (Smith, 2007). Their study examined the effects of the narrative persuasive attitudes toward medical cannabis. Conditions were set to demonstrate the protagonist (Alon) either contracted HIV from either a sexual partner or through illicit drug use. Participants who were given either story were asked whether the protagonist had a successful treatment or an unsuccessful treatment, and whether the protagonist took responsibility for their actions that lead to the diagnosis. Results demonstrated participants who watched the condition with a protagonist who had a stigmatized illness and was responsible for how they contracted the disease expressed negative attitudes toward medical cannabis. The results of this study also drew attention to the effectiveness of narratives and its ability to transport. Sheer, Shen, and Li(2015), suggest that the effectiveness of videos may relate to the ability to evoke emotions and the amount of transport of a viewer, which are important factors of narrative persuasion (2015). In 2018, Walter, Murphy and Gilling, conducted a study that examined how narrative persuasion tactics can change casual attribution

through story exploration and characters customization on transgender teenagers. Results provided evidence that story exploration influenced identification and narrative engagement with characters which lead participants to increase external attributions for the characters negative actions.

Narrative persuasion has considerable effects on individuals and how a message is processed and therefore holds the power to tell a story while simultaneously aligning the views of the audience to coincide with the goals of characters. It is through narrative persuasion that models such as the transportation imagery model and identification can successfully have effects and create behavioral changes with a targeted audience. In this study, causal attribution was included to examine how participants assess attributions to victims and perpetrators. The studies citied above have conducted research that supports the notion that narrative persuasion can result in the way a participant assess causal attribution, whether this be internally (the persons own fault) or externally ( factors around the person that caused their outcome). This study will further investigate the relationship between narrative persuasion and attribution and extend researchers findings to transportation. Also, this study will examine whether race of participants effect internal or external assess of attribution on victims versus perpetrators.

**The Transportation-Imagery Model**

Narratives are a form of storytelling which has historically been a fundamental method for human communication. Stories or narratives are used traditionally to enhance education, entertainment, and to help define kinship within a group (Kinnebrock & Bilandzic, 2006). Narratives today come in many different shapes and forms, which include written form or visual form which can include film or television format.

Transportation is a mechanism that allow for narratives to persuade (Green & Brock, 2000). When one experiences the effects of transportation they become unaware of the world around them and become involved in the story. Once transported into a story, an individual becomes a part of a story. They begin to engage with the story as if they are written into the narrative alongside the characters. The effects of transportation prohibit the audience from counterarguments that may create conflict between that of the characters and one's own. Unlike identification, transportation involves being immersed into the suspense of the plot and story world.

Transportation is conceptualized as "a distant mental process, an integrative melding of attention, imagery, and feelings" (Green & Clark, 2013, p. 478). Green and Bracken assert that Transportation can be influenced by narrative quality, individual differences, and situational factors. Also, transportation leads to belief change by reducing the number of counterarguments and disbelief, creating connections with characters, and heightening the perception of realism. In a study that tested whether identification with characters would be evoked by narrative transportations, narrative transportation was conceptualized as "implications of events experienced by the character may carry special weight in shifting a readers' attitudes" (Hoekan & Sinkeldam,2014).

**Transportation Imagery Model Compared to ELM**

It is worth noting that transportation is contrast different than that of other mental processing models such as the Elaboration Likelihood Model. Differences in the two narrative persuasive techniques can be attributed to the different processing tactics that are done when individuals engage with a story. Rather than processing information in a systematic manner, individuals are engaging in a story to be entertained, and may be

unaware of the persuasive qualities of a narrative (Green & Brock, 2000). In the ELM model, individuals are subjected to use cues to determine the avenue in which they prefer to process a message. The peripheral route is used for individuals who do not wish to spend great amount of time on a message, but instead, are searching for a quick reference. These processors use cues such as celebrities and appearance to determine if they agree with a message. Persuasion is achieved at this level of processing (O'Keefe, 2008). The second route is called central. Persuasion is achieved at this level when one has done a fair share of careful examination, of the information embedded in the message, scrutiny of the message's arguments, and consideration of the issue relevant material (2008).

Escalas (2007) comprised a study that analyzed self- referencing and persuasion or the transportation versus analytical elaboration model. Self- referencing, in the 2007 study, is defined as the "cognitive processes individuals use to understand incoming information stored in memory." Transportation in conceptualized as "immersion into a text." Escalas hypothesized that the degree of narrative thought moderates the impact of argument strength on persuasion. Regarding transportation theory, she hypothesized that the degree of transportation will not vary across levels of argument strength. The results supported the idea that self-referencing persuades because of transportation. In this study, this meant that the participants who were more transported into stories also felt more positive feelings and fewer counterarguments. In a second study, Escalas reported participants engage in narratives self-referencing when they are transported by their thoughts and from there they are distracted from evaluating the strength of the message.

**Perceived Realism**

Perceived realism is the extent to which we perceive that something in the media or narrative can be true or is happening in real life. Under the effects of perceived realism, it becomes difficult for an individual to determine what is reality and what is make believe. In other terms, "perceived realism is the audiences' judgement of the degree to which the narrative world is reflective of the world" (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). Perceived reality is worth noting in this body of work and its relation to narrative persuasion. Perceived realism can be extended to the effects of additional components of narrative persuasion such as transportation and identification. In past research, it is suggested that a message characteristic that is important to narrative persuasion is perceived realism (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008; Green, 2004; Larkey & Hecht, 2010). Green, Brock, and Kaufman (2004) found that increased levels of transportation were accompanied by higher perceptions of realism. Also, past research on narrative persuasion has also suggested that perceived realism nay be a narrative characteristic that stimulates identification (Larkey & Hecht, 2010; Livingstone, 1990; Potter, 1986; Zillmann, 1980).

Perceived realism consists of three sub dimensions that help create narratives into reality for individuals. Perceived plausibility refers to "the degree in which narrative presentations and events could possibly occur in the real world" (Hall, 2003, pg. 637). Perceived typicality is referring to "the degree to which narrative portrayals appear to fall within the parameters of the audiences past and present experiences" (Hall, 2003). Third, perceived factuality, is "the degree to which a narrative is perceived to portray a specific individual, or event in the real world" (Hall, 2003). Next is perceived narrative

consistency, this refers to "the degree to which a story and its elements are judged to be congruent and coherent, and without contradictions." And finally, perceived perceptual quality, which refers to "to degree to which the audio, visual, and other manufactured elements of a media narrative comprises a convincing and compelling portrayal of a real-world reality "as stated in Hall's early study. (Hall, 2003). Through these five avenues of perceived realism one can determine what they believe is factual or fake.

**Narrative Quality**

The quality of the message is an important predictor in determining the impact on a receivers' attitudes and beliefs. The implication of transportation is that the further a person is transported into a narrative, the more persuaded one will be to the persuasive messages received, which may lead to attitude change (Green & Brock, 2000). Transportation is affected by attributes from both the receiver of the message and the narrative (Green & Clark, 2013). The development of the plot, characters, structure, and production qualities all serve as determine factors in the effects of transportation. When an individual engages in a narrative that is not well written and has a storyline difficult for the recipient to follow, it becomes difficult for one to fully commit to the narrative. But, if a narrative is completely thought out with well-developed characters that follow a cohesive plot, the recipient is more likely to engage in the narrative and become immersed in the story. Narratives that follow along certain genres such as: crime, health issues and comedic entertainment can help evoke the effects of transportation (2013).

Green and Clark (2013) also developed a study that focused on a health and social control approach. This study focused on a movie narrative and how movies can change smoking attitudes and beliefs. The researchers felt that through implicit (activating

unconscious associations) and explicit (blatant glamorization) processes attitude change can occur. The study ultimately broke down the many effects that's go into transportation into smoking narrative by does-response effects, placement and farming, illusion of venerability, and the immediate effects of transportation (Green & Clark, 2013).

In the current study, transportation will be redefined in as "an unconscious connection to a character." Transportation can make counter- arguments difficult, which in this study is believed to lead to identification as well. Following previous research, it is hypothesized that transportation will lead to more story consistent attitudes, thus translating into a behavior change. Also, it is hypothesized that transportation will be a predictor in the difficulty for one to counterargue any decisions that are not in favor of the criminals or victims. Further, transportation in this body of research differs from that of past research because the effects of transportation will be tested on nonfictional characters in a documentary. With this change in stimulus, this study investigates the questions of whether identification and transportation will be stronger when participants see the victims in the videos versus the perpetrators. Based on the literature discussed, the following predictions and research questions are offered:

**Hypothesis 1 and 2**

*H1- Participants who report higher levels of transportation will report less counter-arguments.*

*H2- Participants who report higher levels of transportation will report story consistent attitudes.*

**Research Question 1**

*RQ1-Are there differences in the level of transportation when the participants see a victim vs. perpetrator?*

**Identification**

Identification is a specific feeling of being absorbed into the story through the position and role of the character with who is being identified with. Identification is defined as "a process in which one loses self-awareness and it is temporarily replaced with heightened emotional and cognitive connections with a character" (Cohen, 2001, p. 251). Identification and empathy have been linked as a key component of the process of narrative persuasion and transportation (2006).

In previous research, character identification has also been defined as identification with media characters as a perceived connection between a character within a narrative and the story recipient. This may be due to liking a character, or perceived similarity to a character, and even perspective taking with a specific character within a narrative (Cohen, 2001; Sestir & Green, 2010). Green (2006) view identification as necessary component of transportation. Identification allows the audience to share the experience of the character and experience empathy or emotions that are directly related to the success or failure of the plans of the narrative. Through the forged construction by identification, implications of experience and assertions of the character may shift the reader's beliefs (Green, 2006).

Brumbaugh (2009) investigated how an individual identifies with characters constructed on a match in race between viewer and characters. The study concluded that blacks who identified with the black character advertisements did so based on cultural

meanings. Also, American social norms were also found to be significant in this research., concluding that when whites were depicted as dominant they were less identifiable among study participants. Additional studies have also looked at the effects of identification when individuals are faced with narratives regarding stereotypes and character similarity.

Igartua and Ramos (2015) conducted a study that tested media entertainment, narrative persuasion, stereotypes in audiovisual fiction and intergroup media contact and immigration. This study ultimately concluded that the narrative setting influenced the participants assigning "criminal" their characters (in most cases when the character was portrayed as an immigrant). Educational level and socio-economic status was also ranked lower for immigration characters, and participants were less likely to report identification with the immigrant characters.

Cohen (2001), argued that judgements about characters such as similarity and liking are different from identification. This is because identification is an experience of the recipients from a narrative. It is credible that judgments like similarity of a character to a reader are also related to the experience of identification (2001). Cohen found that readers who perceive themselves as similar to a character may be more likely to identify with this character. In contrast, readers can identify with a character and not perceive themselves as similar (Cohen, 2001). A media user who identifies with a character adopts the point of view of the character in the story and begins to experience the story from that standpoint (Cohen, 2001).

Identifying with a character can also bring along emotional responses and connections as well. If the identifying reader demonstrates emotions that are aligned with

that of the character, then the successes of the character will make the reader feel closer to the character and display positive emotions. But, if the events produce failure to the character the reader will feel negative emotions (Cohen, 2001). Empirical evidence has demonstrated that there have been growing importance for identification elements to be experienced for complete effects of narrative persuasion. Moyer-Guse and Nabi (2010) found that identifying with characters with a greater quality television series has shown to influence higher perceptions of teen pregnancy, intentions to have safe sex, and the intentions to talk with friends about sexually transmitted infections. Due to past research provided on the relationship between transportation and identification, the present study asks if high levels of identification will lead to story consistent attitudes or behaviors intentions. And will high levels of identification lead to more story consistent attitudes. Lastly, given the controversial nature of the victim versus criminal stimulus, it is reasonable to question whether there will be an overlap of identification with both victim and criminal.

**Research Question 2, 3, and 4**

*RQ2-Does higher levels of identification lead to lower levels of counter-arguments?*

*RQ3-Will higher levels of identification lead to more story consistent attitudes?*

*RQ4-Are there differences in the level of identification when the participants see a victim vs. perpetrator?*

**Story Perspective**

Story perspective has also been in question in understanding the way individuals identify with characters. Andringa (1986) reported that participants who read first- person narratives about a court session from the judge's perspective, reported that they

21

understood the judge more than the first-person narrative from the view of the defendant. Van Peer and Pander Maat (1996) discovered that when participants read a story about a marital disagreement, where the perceptions and thoughts of the wife were more sympathetic than those who read from the perspective of the husband. According to Cohen (2001), sympathy and understanding for a character are closely related to identification.

**Social Attraction**

In 1974, McCroskey and McCain explored the effects of interpersonal attraction. Interpersonal attraction refers to the how much we "think" that we may like another person. In the 1974 study, McCroskey and McCain simply wanted to create a scale that would accurately measure individuals liking for another. After testing their scale on 215 undergraduates they were able to conclude that there were three presumed dimensions of interpersonal attraction: social attraction, physical attraction, and task attraction.

Chory (2013) found in her study that looked at viewers Identification, like, dislike and neutrality, that viewers who demonstrated a social attraction was the most significant predictor of identification. Viewers who also reported on a non-fictional character rather than a character from the drama or comedy, depicted stronger "wishful" identification. Hoffner and Buchanan (2005) produced a similar study examine young adults' wishful identification with television characters. Participants reported greater identification with same-gender characters and characters who portrayed the same ideas as their own. Both men and women identified with characters that were the same gender as they were, but they differed in the attributes that predicted their wishful identification. Men identified more with male characters who they perceived as successful, intelligent

and violent. Whereas females identified with female characters who were perceived as successful, intelligent, attractive, and admired. In contrast to previous research, this study considers participants are likely to identify and empathize with nonfiction characters that are perceived to come from the same racially dynamic background as one does.

**Links between Transportation and Identification**

Both transportation and identification can be connected to the way that audience member engages with a character. Green, Brock and Kaufman (2004), suggests that transportation "may be a prerequisite for identification with fictional characters." They argue that for one to adopt the characters goals and plans this requires that the audience be put in a place where they become part of the story world. And it is then predicted that if the world depicted is the narrative becomes real enough to the audience then it will begin to take over the plan and goals of the character. Additional research have manipulated transportation with procedures that do not avoid affecting the level of identification with characters (Green & Brock, 2000).

Green and Brock manipulated transportation by assigning different direction that encouraged either being completely absorbed into a story or engaging in a cognitive task that required focusing of the exterior aspects of the story (2000). Results showed that transportation was higher in the complete absorption condition, but the impact differing instructions on identification were not conclusive. Reduction in the ability to identify with the characters may have been attributed to the additional demands by the additional task, which resulted in increased narrative persuasion. Sestir and Green (2010) conducted a study that tested the effects of identification and transportation on the activation of media concepts in the "real world" lives of media consumers. They found

that when identification was high, participants would temporarily display increased activation of trait characteristics displayed by a character of a film clip within their self-concept (2010). The results of their study indicated that identification and transportation play a significant role of increased activation.

While measuring the effects of identification and transportation on controversial two-sided narratives, Cohen, Tal-Or, and Mazor-Tregerman (2015) found that when identification was manipulated concordant characters tended to diverge attitudes, whereas identification with discordant characters tempered attitudes. When transportation was manipulated pre-exposure, attitudes were moderated. To my knowledge, the research presented by Cohen et al., is the only body of work that linked the effects of identification and transportation to a controversial phenomenon. Murphy, Frank, Catterjee and Baezconde (2013) tested whether using fictional narrative produces greater impact on health-related knowledge, attitudes, and behavioral intentions than presenting the same information in a nonfiction, nonnarrative format. Results indicated that when participants watched a film on the issue of cervical cancer, the narrative was more effective in increasing knowledge and behaviors. Also, when study participants were exposed to narratives that featured Latinos, and Mexican Americans they reported that they were more transported, identified more with the characters, and experienced strong emotions.

The present study argues that the same is true for non- fictional characters as well. If one can develop a sense of identify with a fictional character, then the same should hold for characters who could be them. This study proposes that there will be correlation between transportation and identification. This study also examines questions of whether race of participants will be a factor when identifying, becoming transported, attributing

justification and carrying story consistent attitudes, and if identification and transportation will show correlation with attribution. Finally, to extend previous research, this study will examine casual attribution on nonfiction narrative messages.

**Hypothesis 3**

*H3-Transportation and identification will be positively correlated.*

**Research Question 5 and 6**

*RQ5-Will transportation and identification correlate with attribution?*

*RQ6-Will the race of participants and video condition impact a) identification with person, b) transportation, c) attribution, and d) story consistent attitudes?*

# CHAPTER III

# METHOD

**Design Statement**

A 2 x 2 factorial design experiment was conducted. The independent variables were character (victim versus perpetrator) x race (Caucasian versus African American). An independent t- Test was conducted to test Research Question 1 and Research Question 4. A Pearson's correlation was conducted to test Hypothesis 3 and Research Question 5. One- way ANOVAs was conducted to test Hypothesis 1 and 2, as well as Research Questions 2 and 3. A series of two- way ANOVAs was conducted to test Research Question 6.

**Participants.** Undergraduate students from a diverse university in the Metropolitan region of Ohio were recruited via email. Many students were enrolled in either a communication or criminology course in the spring 2018 and some offered extra credit. Participants were informed of their rights to decline participation and agreed to an informed consent agreement prior to starting the study.

**Stimulus.** Participants were randomly assigned to watch one of four videos. The videos were all two minute and 30-second-long documentaries in length and were edited to meet duration requirements. Two of the four videos edited were collected from

26

television series *"Women Behind Bars."* The other two videos were from Michigan's Crime Victims Compensation Program. These videos were chosen due to similarities of crime in the non-fiction and fiction story Murder in the Mall, used in Green and Brock's original study of narrative persuasion and transportation (Green & Brock, 2000). Two of the videos feature female victims of crime and the other two feature female convicted perpetrators.

   ***Victim videos.*** Benita (African American) tells the story of her encounter with her perpetrator. She describes that her perpetrator was a customer of her previous employer who she gives a lottery number. The lottery numbers are winning, and he calls her and says that she won $250 of the earnings. She meets up with her perpetrator to claim her share and she is held hostage. Her perpetrator becomes violent and refuses to let her go in fear of Benita telling the police. After two hours she was able to escape and go to the police. Benita describes that she now has trust issues and must see a therapist. She did not go to work for 30 days and felt that her life was in shambles. The URL for the video is (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9QnFOOMyx44) .

   The second video portrays victim Heather (Caucasian) who's home was broken into and was awaken by her barking dog. She describes seeing a shadow coming at her who came towards her and raped her. She called the police and was taken to the hospital for a rape kit analysis. When she gave her description of the man she was informed that she was attacked by someone who had raped and attacked approximately 15 women over a two-year period in her area. The URL for the video is

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VNX_VOK_wo8.

The remaining two videos were edited from the TV series documentary "Women Behind Bars," and portrayed two women who committed crimes and give their rationale behind their choices.

*Perpetrator videos.* Lori (Caucasian) was accused of fatally stabbing her boyfriend. Lori and her boyfriend were together for two years. She claimed that her boyfriend lashed out her verbally and was in control of the relationship. Lori's boyfriend tells her that he hides in the bushes and watches her get in and out of other cars. Lori tells her boyfriend that she will kill him, and he laughs at her. Lori's boyfriend came over to her house around 10-10:30 pm. Her boyfriend was already drunk when he starts to yell at the characters on the TV and then punches the TV. She then grabs a towel and stuffs it into his mouth to make him be quiet, but he spits it out and starts to bite her hand. She then begins to strangle him but isn't strong enough. Lori says that she could have backed out at any time, but she felt that she couldn't. she felt that she was in too deep and had to do this. The URL for the video is https://youtu.be/mNCswqSqN1k.

Finally, Deborah (African American) began to question her husband about his work hours and his increased drinking habits. He would then curse at her and later apologize, but she explains that it would happen again. Deborah says that eventually the cursing turned into punches and beatings. One afternoon when Deborah was washing her baby girl, her daughter was in a state of fright. She picked her daughter up and sat her on her lap and he daughter explained to her mother what her father does to her. Deborah says that she literally lost her mind. Her husband was over her house one evening when he said that he would like to come back over to see the girls. Her husband got up out of his chair and went over to her and asked her if she had a photo of all three of their

28

daughters. Deborah went to get the photo album and sat it on her bed. Her husband took the knife and went to plunge the knife into her, but Deborah pushes him, and he loses his balance and Deborah grabs ahold of the gun behind her. The URL for the video is https://youtu.be/xkjvGGS3ph4

**Measurement**

*Victim/ Perpetrator.* Participants were randomly assigned to watch one video. Videos were selected to either portray a woman who is presented as the victim of a crime or a perpetrator of a crime. Videos that portrayed victims of crimes were selected based on description of attacks and level of self-help that was available to escape from attackers. Women portrayed as the perpetrator of a crime were selected based on similar natures. Both female perpetrators explained that they had killed their significant other who was allegedly abusing them or someone around them.

*Race of Character.* Participants were randomly assigned to one video with either a Caucasian or African American woman. The race of the female victim and perpetrators was also manipulated during testing. One black victim and one white victim was chosen. The same was true for the female perpetrators; one black perpetrator and one white perpetrator.

**Measured Independent Variables**

*Transportation.* A Likert type 7- point scale was produced using Green and Brock's (2000) narrative transportation questionnaire. Twelve Items were used to measure transportation define participant's level of involvement with the narrative. These questionnaire items were taken from Green and Brock's (2000) narrative transportation questionnaire, the wording was adapted to apply to a video instead of a short story.

Sample items include: "While I was watching the video, I could easily picture the events in it taking place," "I was mentally involved with the video, while watching it," and "After watching the video it was easy to put it out of my mind" (reverse coded). "High" versus "Low" group (*mdn*=1, *range* 1).The Cronbach's Alpha is .66.

   ***Identification.*** Identification was measure using Igartua's (2010) character identification questionnaire. The scale includes five items and a Likert type 7- point scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Examples items include "I thought I was like the characters or very similar to them," "I identified with the characters,", and "I thought that I would like to be like or act like the characters," for the perspective taking dimension. "I understood the characters' way of acting, thinking or feeling," "I tried to see things from the point of view of the characters," and "I felt emotionally involved with the characters' feelings." A median split was also executed to investigate the extent to which more participants expressed identification effects with the women in the videos, essentially creating the scale into a "high" versus "low" group (*mdn*=1, *range*=1). The Cronbach's Alpha is .92.

*Dependent Variables*

   Each of the dependent variables presented below were measured on a seven-point Likert-based scale (unless otherwise noted) where 1 indicates the strongest level of disagreement and 7 indicates the strongest level of disagreement with each item. Items were measured in this way so that participants can easily identify a response and to increase variance.

   ***Character identification.*** Character identification has basic dimensions that include emotional and cognitive empathy. Emotional empathy entails the ability to feel

what the character feels, whereas cognitive empathy involves feeling as though you are temporarily in that character's shoes. The scale was created using Igartua's (2010) identification with characters and narrative persuasion research. These questionnaire items address the loss of self-awareness indicative of identification as well as the empathic reaction to characters. Sample items include: "I thought I was like the characters or very similar to them," "I identified with the characters,", and "I thought that I would like to be like or act like the characters," for the perspective taking dimension. "I understood the characters' way of acting, thinking or feeling," "I tried to see things from the point of view of the characters," and "I felt emotionally involved with the characters' feelings" addressed the empathic dimension. The Cronbach's Alpha is .92.

     ***Causal attribution.*** Recently causal attribution has been added to measure justification and behavior intentions assessed with the effects of Transportation. Using the casual dimensions scale designed by Russell (1982), a modified version was created to accurately measure attribution effects of the documentary. Sample items include: "I can see myself doing the same thing as the woman in the videos," "You can control the situations that the women in the videos found themselves in," "The effects of the events taken place are temporary," "The effects of the events taken place are permanent," "The events shown in the videos are changeable," "The events shown in the videos are unchangeable," "No one in the videos are responsible for what happened to them," and "Someone in the video is responsible for what happened to them." According to Russell (1982), a total score of each subscale is arrived by summing responses in the individual items. The mean of the overall scale can be taken once completed. Overall the

Cronbach's Alpha is .72. And the sub-dimensions of casual attribution were divided into Controllability (.76), Stability (.64), and Causality (.76).

   *Perceived realism.* Perceived realism is commonly added to researcher's studies because it is said that perceived realism has an important role in narrative persuasion. Perceived reality was measured using Hall's (2003) previous conceptualization of perceived realism and dimensions constructed by Cho et al (2016).

**Perceived Realism Sub-Dimensions** (overall Cronbach's Alpha=.86)

   *Plausibility.* All items include: "The video showed something that could happen in real life," "The events in the video portrayed possible real-life situations," "The story in the video could actually happen in real life," "Never in real life would what was shown in the video happen," and "Real people would not do the things described in the video" (Cronbach's Alpha= .88).

   *Typicality.* "Not many people are likely to experience the events portrayed in the videos," "The videos portrayed events that happen to a lot of people," and "What happened to the people in the videos is what happens to people in real world" (Cronbach's Alpha = .75).

   *Narrative consistency.* "The video showed a coherent story," "The stories portrayed in the video were consistent," "Parts of the video were contradicting of each other," "The story portrayed in the video made sense," and "The events in the video had a logical flow" (Cronbach's Alpha = .83).

   *Perceptual quality.* "The visual elements in the video were realistic," "The audio elements of the video were realistic," "The acting the video was realistic," "The

scenes in the video were realistic," and "I felt the overall production elements of the video were realistic" (Cronbach's Alpha = .92).

*Story consistent attitudes.* Story consistent attitudes were measured using three questions designed by the researchers to measure behavioral intent. The questions were asked directly following viewing of the videos. Items included: "I would have done the same thing as the women in the video if it were me," "What happened to the woman in the video could happen to me," and "After watching the video, I will take more precautions." The Cronbach's Alpha is .56.

*Social attraction.* Social attraction was assessed using the McCroskey and McCain (1974) scale measuring for interpersonal attraction. Six items were used from the original scale to focus only on social attraction effects in this study. Additionally, wording was also modified to fit the nature of the stimulus. Sample included statements such as: "I think she could be a friend of mine," "I would like to have a friendly chat with her," "It would be difficult to meet and talk with her," "She just wouldn't fit in my circle of friends," "We could never establish a personal friendship with each other," and "She would be pleasant to be with." The Cronbach's Alpha is .80.

*Counterarguments.* Argument strength was measured using the Zhao, Strasser, Cappella, Lerman, and Fishbein (2011) scale designed to measure perceived argument strength. Nine items were used to measure argument strength for both criminality and victimization. Items included two statements. The first statement was directed toward criminality stating "Every action you make causes consequences to your future. All you need is to get caught to be sent to prison. Making the right choices can save your future." Statements were measured using items such as, "The statement is a reason for making the

right choices that is believable," "The statement is a reason for making the right choices that is convincing," and "the statement gives a reason for making the right choices that is important to me." The second statement directed towards victimization stated: "Every friend you make may not have your best interest. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life." The Cronbach's Alpha is .87.

**Additional Measures**

**Attention Checks.** Participants were asked two true/false items to monitor whether they watched the film. These items included: "One of the characters give their attacker a winning lottery numbers" and "One of the main characters are serving a life sentence for killing their child." If participants answered either of these questions wrong, they were eliminated from the study.

**Demographics.** Participants were asked about the area they live in, age, gender, education level, and to describe their ethnic background.

Table 1. *Scale Reliabilities*

| Scales | | Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation | . | 12 | .66 |
| Identification | . | 11 | .92 |
| Causal Attribution | | 8 | .72 |
| Perceived Realism | | 21 | .86 |
| Story Consistent Attitudes | | 3 | .56 |
| Social Attraction | | 6 | .80 |
| Counter Arguments | | 18 | .87 |

**Procedure**

The data collection was a single process. An email invitation was sent to perspective participants for this study. Participants were informed they would watch a short video and then answer a questionnaire. Only respondents that successfully complete the survey were included in following results.

# CHAPTER IV

# RESULTS

The data collected from this experiment was input into SPSS for analysis. The independent and dependent variables were tested using bivariate correlations, independent samples t-Test, and ANOVAs.

**Sample Description**

A total of 214 respondents participated and completed the questionnaire in this study. The sample was composed of 71% female (n= 152), 28% male (n= 60), .5% transgendered (n= 1), and .5% other (n= 1). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 58. In terms of race, 43% were Caucasian (n = 92), 32.2% were African American (n = 69), 11.2% were bi-racial (n= 24), and 13.6% were categorized as "other" (n= 29). Results also indicated that 54.7% (n= 117) has Some College education, 19.2% (n= 41) had a 2-year degree, 18.2% (n= 39) had a 4-year degree, 3.3% (n= 7) had a Master's or higher, 3.3% (n= 7) were a High School graduate, and 1.4% (n= 3) had a Professional degree. More descriptive statistics about all demographics variable can be found in Table A. 1 in the Appendix.

**Hypothesis 1 and 2**

A one- way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of higher levels of transportation from less counterargument. Results can be found in Table 2. An analysis of variance showed that the effect of high transportation on lower counterarguments was positively significant, (F $_{(1,212)}$ =11.51, $p=$ .001). Participants who reported higher transportation *(M=5.14, SD=0.71)* were more likely to have fewer counter arguments than participants who reported less transportation *(M= 4.79. SD=0.80).*

Table 2. *One-Way ANOVA Predicting Higher Levels of Transportation from Less Counter-Arguments*

| | Mean | *sd* | *n* | Sum of Squares | *Df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation | | | | 6.57 | 1 | 6.57 | 11.51 | **.001** | .92 |
| Low | 4.79 | .80 | 101 | | | | | | |
| High | 5.14 | .71 | 113 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Error | | | | 121.01 | 212 | .571 | | | |
| Corrected Total | | | | 127.58 | 213 | | | | |

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants who reported higher levels of transportation would also be more likely to report more story consistent attitudes after viewing the videos. The results of a one- way ANOVA test was significant (F $_{(1,212)}$ =31.35, $p=$ .000), showing that higher levels of transportation *(M=5.07, SD=1.24),* lead to more story consistent attitudes than lower levels of transportation *(M=4.09, SD=1.32),* supporting Hypothesis 2 (See Table 3).

Table 3. *One-Way ANOVA Predicting Higher Levels of Transportation from Story Consistent Attitudes*

| | Mean | *sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *Df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation | | | | 51.36 | 1 | 51.36 | 31.35 | **.000** | .13 |
|   Low | 4.09 | 1.32 | 101 | | | | | | |
|   High | 5.07 | 1.24 | 113 | | | | | | |
| Error | | | | 347.30 | 212 | 1.63 | | | |
| Corrected Total | | | | 398.66 | 213 | | | | |

## Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked if there are differences in the levels of transportation when participants viewed a video of a victim versus viewing a video about a perpetrator. An independent t-Test was conducted to compare transportation in victims and perpetrators video conditions and indicated a significance (*t (212) = 2.11, p = .04)*. Participants who viewed videos of perpetrators *(M= 4.30, SD=.67)* were more likely to experience transportation than participants who viewed videos that portrayed a victim *(M= 4.09, SD= .78)*.

Table 4. *Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Transportation in Victim and Perpetrator Videos*

| Videos | | | | | | 95% CI for Mean Difference | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Victim | | | Perpetrator | | | | | |
| M | SD | n | M | SD | n | | t | df |
| 4.09 | .78 | 101 | 4.30 | .67 | 113 | -.40, -.01 | 2.11* | 1 |

* p < .05.

38

**Research Question 2, 3 and 4**

Research Question 2 asked whether higher levels of identification with women in the videos would lead to less counterargument. The results of a one- way ANOVA predicting higher levels of identification with the women in the videos leading to less counterargument are shown in Table 5. The analysis of variance indicated a significant relationship $(F_{(1,212)} = 5.67, p= .02)$. Participants with high identification with the woman portrayed in the video have less counterarguments $(M=5.10, SD=.78)$ than participants who reported less identification with the woman portrayed in the video $(M=4.85, SD=.75)$.

Table 5. *One- Way ANOVA Predicting Higher Levels of Identification from Less Counter-Arguments*

| | Mean | *Sd* | *n* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Identification | | | | 3.32 | 1 | 3.32 | 5.67 | **.02** | .03 |
| Low | 4.85 | .75 | 105 | | | | | | |
| High | 5.10 | .78 | 109 | | | | | | |
| Error | | | | 124.26 | 212 | .586 | | | |
| Corrected Total | | | | 127.58 | 213 | | | | |

Research Question 3 asked if higher levels of identification would lead to positive story consistent attitudes. Results showing a one- way ANOVA predicting story consistent attitudes from high levels of character identification is shown in Table 7. An analysis of variance showed a significant positive relationship $(F_{(1,212)} = 68.4, p= .000)$. Participants who experienced high levels of identification with the woman in the video

*(M=5.27, SD=1.11)* also reported more story consistent attitudes than participants who reported lower levels of identification *(M=3.92, SD= 1.27).*

Table 6.
*One- Way ANOVA Predicting Story Consistent Attitudes from Character Identification*

|  | Mean | *sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Identification |  |  |  | 97.23 | 1 | 97.23 | 68.4 | **.000** | .24 |
| Low | 3.92 | 1.27 | 105 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 5.27 | 1.11 | 109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Error |  |  |  | 301.43 | 212 | 1.42 |  |  |  |
| Corrected Total |  |  |  | 398.66 | 213 |  |  |  |  |

Research Question 4 asked if there would be differences in levels of identification when participants viewed videos of a victim versus a perpetrator. Result are indicated in Table 7. An independent- samples t-Test was conducted to compare identification to victim and perpetrator conditions. There was a significant difference in scores for identification in victim and perpetrator conditions*; t (212) = 4.07, p = .000.* Participants who were randomly selected to view videos that portrayed a perpetrator *(M=4.98, SD= 1.05)* were more likely to identify with the woman portrayed than the participants who were randomly selected to view videos that portrayed a victim *(M=4.34, SD= 1.25).* More specifically, Table 9 results indicates that participants reported higher levels of identification with the woman in the video that showed the black perpetrator *(M=5.01, SD=1.6).*

Table 7. *Results of t-Test and Descriptive Statistics for Identification in Victim and Perpetrator Videos*

| | Videos | | | | | | 95% CI for Mean Difference | | |
| | Victim | | | Perpetrator | | | | | |
| | M | SD | N | M | SD | n | | t | Df |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 4.34 | 1.25 | 101 | 4.98 | 1.05 | 113 | -.95, -.33 | 4.07*** | 212 |

*** p < .001.

## Hypothesis 3 and Research Question 5

Hypothesis 3 predicted a positive a positive correlation between transportation and identification. The results of a Pearson's correlation test were significant and revealed a positive relationship between transportation and identification *(r=.65, p<.01),* results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. *Pearson's Correlations of Transportation, Identification, and Attribution (N = 214)*

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Transportation | – | | |
| | | – | |
| 2. Identification | .65** | – | |
| | | | – |
| 3. Attribution | -.09 | -.03 | – |

Note: ** p<.01

Research Question 5 asked about the relationship between transportation, identification, and attribution (see Table 8), and a Pearson's correlation revealed a non-significant

negative relationship between transportation and attribution *(r =-.09)* and identification and attribution *(r =-.03).*

**Research Question 6**

Research Question 6 asked if the race of participants might impact identification, transportation, attribution, and story consistent attitudes. The results of a series of two-way ANOVA's were conducted. The results are presented in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12. Results indicated a non-significant relationship between race and identification *(F $_{(1, 198)}$ =.02, p=.89).* The results also indicated a non- significant relationship between race and transportation *(F $_{(1, 198)}$ = .20, p=.65)*. Additionally, results also indicated no significant relationship between race and story consistent attitudes *(F $_{(1, 198)}$ = .01, p=.91)* or race and attribution *(F $_{(1,198)}$ =1.36, p=. 25)*. However, results indicated a significance between the video condition and identification, transportation, and story consistent attitudes. Participants reported high levels of identification (F $_{(3,198)}$ =13.16, p=.000), high levels of transportation (F $_{(3,198)}$ =4.33, p=.01), and more story consistent attitudes (F $_{(3,198)}$ =10.7, p=.000).

| | Mean | *Sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ID Race** | | | | .20 | 1 | .20 | .02 | .89 | .00 |
| **African American** | 4.65 | .13 | 92 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian** | 4.67 | .11 | 69 | | | | | | |
| **Video Condition** | | | | 43.56 | 3 | 14.52 | 13.16 | **.000** | .21 |
| **White Victim** | 4.93 | .17 | 46 | | | | | | |
| **White Perp** | 3.70 | .18 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Victim** | 4.99 | .17 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Perp** | 5.01 | 1.6 | 58 | | | | | | |
| **Interaction: ID Race X Video Condition** | | | | 4.51 | 3 | 1.50 | 1.36 | .26 | .03 |
| **African American/White Victim** | 4.73 | 1.09 | 16 | | | | | | |
| **African American/White Perpetrator** | 3.56 | .85 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **African American/Black Victim** | 5.16 | 1.30 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **African American/ Black Perpetrator** | 5.16 | .81 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Victim** | 5.16 | .95 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Perp** | 3.84 | 1.09 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Victim** | 4.82 | .89 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Perp** | 4.87 | 1.21 | 25 | | | | | | |
| **Error** | | | | 168.79 | 153 | 1.10 | | | |
| **Corrected Total** | | | | 217.79 | 160 | | | | |

Table 9. *Two-Factor ANOVA Predicting Identification from Race and Video Condition.*

Table 10. *Two-Factor ANOVA Predicting Transportation from Race and Video Condition.*

| | Mean | *Sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ID Race** | | | | .11 | 1 | .11 | .20 | .65 | .00 |
| **African American** | 4.22 | .09 | 92 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian** | 4.17 | .08 | 69 | | | | | | |
| **Video Condition** | | | | 6.75 | 3 | 2.25 | 4.33 | **.01** | .08 |
| **White Victim** | 4.28 | .17 | 46 | | | | | | |
| **White Perp** | 3.82 | .12 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Victim** | 4.32 | .12 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Perp** | 4.36 | .12 | 58 | | | | | | |
| **Interaction: ID Race X Video Condition** | | | | 2.05 | 3 | .68 | 1.31 | .27 | .03 |
| **African American/White Victim** | 4.19 | .18 | 16 | | | | | | |
| **African American/White Perpetrator** | 3.73 | .19 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **African American/Black Victim** | 4.52 | .16 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **African American/ Black Perpetrator** | 4.42 | .16 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Victim** | 3.37 | .15 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Perp** | 3.91 | .15 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Victim** | 4.21 | .16 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Perp** | 4.19 | .14 | 25 | | | | | | |
| **Error** | | | | 79.47 | 153 | .52 | | | |
| **Corrected Total** | | | | 88.24 | 160 | | | | |

Table 11. *Two-Factor ANOVA Predicting Story Consistent Attitudes from Race and Video Condition.*

| | Mean | *Sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ID Race** | | | | .02 | 1 | .02 | .91 | .91 | .00 |
| **African American** | 4.65 | .15 | 92 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian** | 4.63 | .13 | 69 | | | | | | |
| **Video Condition** | | | | 48.31 | 3 | 16.10 | 10.7 | **.000** | .17 |
| **White Victim** | 4.79 | .19 | 46 | | | | | | |
| **White Perp** | 3.65 | .21 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Victim** | 5.12 | .19 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Perp** | 4.99 | .18 | 58 | | | | | | |
| **Interaction: ID Race X Video Condition** | | | | 4.19 | 3 | 1.39 | .93. | .43 | .02 |
| **African American/White Victim** | 4.54 | 1.65 | 16 | | | | | | |
| **African American/White Perpetrator** | 3.74 | 1.19 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **African American/Black Victim** | 5.13 | 1.52 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **African American/ Black Perpetrator** | 5.18 | .83 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Victim** | 5.04 | 1.14 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Perp** | 3.56 | 1.30 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Victim** | 5.12 | 1.02 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Perp** | 4.81 | 1.05 | 25 | | | | | | |
| **Error** | | | | 229.34 | 153 | 1.50 | | | |
| **Corrected Total** | | | | 287.56 | 160 | | | | |

| Table 12. *Two-Factor ANOVA Predicting Attribution from Race and Video Condition.* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | *Sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
| **ID Race** | | | | .76 | 1 | .76 | 1.36 | .25 | .01 |
| **African American** | 3.15 | .09 | 92 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian** | 3.01 | .08 | 69 | | | | | | |
| **Video Condition** | | | | 3.59 | 3 | 1.19 | 2.14 | .09 | .04 |
| **White Victim** | 2.83 | .12 | 46 | | | | | | |
| **White Perp** | 3.23 | .13 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Victim** | 3.07 | .12 | 55 | | | | | | |
| **Black Perp** | 3.12 | .11 | 58 | | | | | | |
| **Interaction: ID Race X Video Condition** | | | | 2.59 | 3 | .87 | 1.55 | .20 | .03 |
| **African American/White Victim** | 2.98 | .79 | 16 | | | | | | |
| **African American/White Perpetrator** | 3.49 | .48 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **African American/Black Victim** | 2.96 | .81 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **African American/ Black Perpetrator** | 3.19 | .61 | 20 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Victim** | 2.68 | .99 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/White Perp** | 2.99 | .74 | 24 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Victim** | 3.12 | .76 | 13 | | | | | | |
| **Caucasian/Black Perp** | 3.17 | .69 | 25 | | | | | | |
| **Error** | | | | 85.41 | 153 | .56 | | | |
| **Corrected Total** | | | | 92.32 | 160 | | | | |

**Additional Analyses**

Perceived realism is traditionally an important variable in transportation, in the past it has been suggested that a message characteristic that is important to transportation is perceived realism. In past studies, Green (2004) found that increased levels of transportation were complemented by an audience's perception of realism (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008; Green, 2004; Larkey & Hecht, 2010). Therefore, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to test high levels of transportation from perceived realism. The results are shown in Table 13. The analysis of variance showed a significant relationship *(F $_{(1,212)}$ =43.63, p= .000).* Participants who reported high levels of transportation *(M=5.88, SD=.76)* were more likely to report perceived realism than participants who reported low levels of transportation *(M=4.29, SD=.75).*

Table 13. *One-Way ANOVA Predicting High Levels of Transportation from Perceptions of Perceived Realism*

|  | Mean | *Sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation |  |  |  | 20.44 | 1 | 20.44 | 43.63 | **.000** | .17 |
| Low | 5.29 | .75 | 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 5.88 | .76 | 113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Error |  |  |  | 99.33 | 212 | .47 |  |  |  |
| Corrected Error |  |  |  | 119.77 | 213 |  |  |  |  |

Additionally, social attraction has been a predictor of higher levels of identification with a character. Although not predicted this study considers that participants are likely to take on the role of identification effects when expressing higher levels of transportation. In past research, it was found that viewers who demonstrated social attraction with characters indicated higher levels of identification (Chory, 2013). A

one- way ANOVA was conducted to test the relationship between social attraction and high levels of transportation versus low levels of transportation. Results are shown in Table 14. An analysis of variance expressed a significant relationship ($F_{(1,212)} = 27.49$, $p=$ .000). Participants who reported high levels of transportation *(M=4.92, SD=1.10)* were more likely to report social attraction to the women in the videos than participants who reported low levels of transportation *(M=4.12, SD= 1.12)*.

Table 14. *One- Way ANOVA Predicting High Levels of Transportation from Perceptions of Social Attraction*

| | Mean | *Sd* | *N* | Sum of Squares | *df* | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial eta$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation | | | | 33.89 | 1 | 33.89 | 27.49 | **.000** | .12 |
| Low | 4.12 | 1.12 | 101 | | | | | | |
| High | 4.92 | 1.10 | 113 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Error | | | | 261.25 | 212 | 1.23 | | | |
| Corrected Error | | | | 295.14 | 213 | | | | |

Table 17. *Research Questions and Hypotheses Results*

| | | Supported | Results |
|---|---|---|---|
| $H_1$ | Participants who report high levels of transportation will report fewer counter-arguments. | Yes | Participants who reported higher levels of transportation, reported less counter arguments. |
| $H_2$ | Participants who report high levels of transportation will lead to more story consistent attitudes. | Yes | Participants who reported higher levels of transportation reported more story consistent attitudes. |
| $RQ_1$ | Are there differences in the levels of transportation when a participant views a victim vs. perpetrator story? | n/a | There was a significant difference in levels of transportation when participants viewed a victim vs. perpetrator. |
| $RQ_2$ | Do high levels of identification lead to fewer counter-arguments? | n/a | Higher levels of identification resulted in less counter arguments. |
| $RQ_3$ | Will high levels of identification lead to more story consistent attitudes? | n/a | Higher levels of identification led to story consistent attitudes. |
| $RQ_4$ | Are there differences in the level of identification when the participants see a victim vs. perpetrator story? | n/a | There are different levels of identification when participants viewed videos of white victim and perpetrators vs. black victims and perpetrators. |
| $H_3$ | Transportation and identification will be positively correlated. | Yes | There was a significant correlation between transportation and identification. |
| $RQ_5$ | Will transportation and identification correlate with attribution? | n/a | There was a non- significant correlation between transportation, identification, and attribution. |
| $RQ_6$ | Will the race of participants impact a) identification with person, b) transportation, c) attribution, and d) story consistent attitudes? | n/a | The race of participants did not impact identification, transportation, or story consistent attitudes, or attribution. But, the video condition did play a role. |

# CHAPTER V

# DISCUSSION

**Hypothesis Testing and Research Questions**

Hypothesis 1 and 2 predicted that people who watched non-fiction videos of victims and perpetrators would form less counter-arguments and more story consistent attitudes. Results of a one-way ANOVA showed support for each prediction. Research Question 1 attempted to identify if transportation levels were significantly different when participants watched a victim video versus a video of a perpetrator. Results from an independent samples t-Test showed that there was a significant difference between the victim and perpetrator conditions. The results indicated that participants who viewed videos that portrayed a perpetrator were more likely to be transported than participants who viewed videos of a victim.

Research Questions 2, 3, and 4 attempted to identify whether the effects of identification would predict the effects of transportation. Research Question 2 investigated if higher levels of identification would predict less counterarguments, A one-way ANOVA supported this prediction. Research Question 3 investigated whether high levels of identification would lead to more story consistent attitudes. Results from a one-

way ANOVA supported this prediction as well. Research Question 4 investigated if there would be a difference in identification levels in the victim or perpetrator condition, an independent samples t-Test indicated that there was a significant difference between the victim and perpetrator video condition. Results indicated that participants who viewed videos that portrayed perpetrators were more likely to identify with the woman portrayed than participants who viewed videos of victims.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be a positive correlation between transportation and identification, a Pearson's correlation indicated a positive correlation between transportation and identification, as stated earlier, but no correlation was found between attribution and transportation and identification. Research Question 6 considered whether race of the participant would impact identification, transportation, attribution, and story consistent attitudes. A series of two-way ANOVA's did not result in any significant differences between race and identification, transportation, or story consistent attitudes, or attribution. Results indicated there that race was not a significant factor when participants responded on their levels of identification, transportation, story consistent attitudes, or attribution. Results did however show a significance between the video condition and identification, transportation, and story consistent attitudes.

Additional analyses were conducted in this study to test the significance of perceived realism and social attraction on high levels of transportation. A one-way ANOVA supported this investigation. Participants who reported more transportation were more likely to report perceived realism than participants who reported lower levels of transportation. Also, participants who reported high levels of transportation were more

likely to experience social attraction to the women in the videos than participants who reported low levels of transportation.

**Theoretical and Practical Findings**

The Transportation- Imagery model posits that viewers are mentally immersed into a story and feel as though they have become a part of the narrative. While experiencing the effects of transportation, counterarguments to the message of the narrative are decreased and viewers begin to express positive story consistent attitudes. Hypothesis 1 and 2 predicted that people who watched non-fiction videos of victims and perpetrators would form less counter-arguments and more story consistent attitudes. The results of this portion of the study were significant, which supports past literature (Green & Brock, 2000; Escalas, 2007). Further, this finding contributes to the literature by testing the effects of transportation on documentary videos. This is a significant contribution because past research has been concentrated on fictional material. As stated, this study provides evidence for fewer counter arguments and more story consistent attitudes when high levels of transportation are reported. This finding extends the work of previous researchers and can be referenced in future research to measure counter arguments and story consistent attitudes in real world messages.

Research Question 1 attempted to identify the different levels of transportation when participants watched a victim video versus a video of a perpetrator. Results from an independent samples t-Test showed that there was a significant difference of transportation between videos that portrayed a victim versus a perpetrator. More specifically, participants who viewed videos that portrayed a woman as a perpetrator were more transported than participants who viewed a video of a victim. Though there is

not any research that specifies to whom story a person is more likely to be transported into, Green and Brock's (2013) indicated that narrative quality is an important component of transportation. The manipulated videos of the perpetrators were more intense and visually appealing than those of the victims. This finding provides additional contributions to their research. It should also be considered whether the participants of this study viewed our perpetrators as perpetrators or as victims. The results expressed that participants were more likely to be transported into perpetrator videos. In the videos the perpetrators are women who have killed their spouses because of some form of abuse. In the real world, one may evaluate such story as a victim story and not a perpetrator. A manipulation check was not conducted in this study to assess whether the participants did in fact perceive our victims as victims and our perpetrators as perpetrators. The results from Research Question 1 may be an indication of how participants perceived perpetrators as victims rather than the intended perpetrators. Also, because this study centered on non-fictional stimulus it contributes that narrative quality is a consistent component even if the characters in the video are non-fictional. This finding is also an implication of Green and Brock's "*Murder in the Mall*" 2000 study. Both conditions of videos were centered on crime, which is the genre of choice for the 2000 study. This finding provides additional evidence that crime is a genre that stimulates high levels of transportation. Further, non-fictional stories of crime can produce the same high levels of transportation as fictional stories.

**Identification**

The concept character identification allows the viewer to lose self-awareness and take on the role or position of a character in a narrative to which one identifies with. In past research, identification has been considered a predicting variable in intensifying levels of transportation (Green, Brock & Kaufmann, 2004). In accordance with research, Research Questions 2, 3, and 4 attempted to identify whether the effects of identification would predict the effects of transportation. Specifically, the results showed that participants who reported higher levels of identification were less likely to report counterarguments and more likely to report story consistent attitudes. Both Research Questions 2 and 3 show support for past research on the relationship between transportation and identification. In their 2015 study, Murphy, Cohen, Tal-Or, and Mazor-Tregerman found that when participants read controversial topics of two- sided narratives, transportation and identification levels would heighten, therefore moderating attitudes. This study contributes to this finding by extending work to women in controversial non-fiction stories. The findings from this study contributes to literature by testing the effects of transportation on identification. Results also show support for the Murphy et al 2015 study, implicating that attitudes are affected by the levels of identification. In addition, past research has not explicitly investigated levels of counterarguments or story consistent attitudes with identification alone. This study provides evidence for this relationship.

Research Question 4 investigated if there would be a difference in identification levels when a viewer watched a video of a perpetrator versus a victim. An independent samples t- Test indicated results were significant. Specifically, participants who viewed

videos that portrayed a perpetrator reported higher levels of identification than participants who viewed a video of a victim. This was a surprising finding due to the nature of the study. Although this finding is not completely aligned with past research, Cohen (2001) produced a study that examined the effects of identification and how audience members found themselves similar or like a character. In identification, viewers begin to take on the standpoint of the character of which they identify with. Cohen found that readers who perceive themselves as similar to a character may be more likely to identify with the character. The present study manipulated videos of victims who experienced torture and sexual violence and perpetrators who were convicted of killing their significant others following abuse. Based on past literature, individuals who experience identification are more likely to understand the characters point of view. The findings of this study suggest that participants were more likely to relate to characters that experience spousal abuse than sexual violence and torture. One reason for this indication could be that participants were less likely to be victims or know someone who are victims of sexual violence or torture but are more familiar with domestic violence. Or, as stated above for Research Question 1, participants did not perceive the perpetrators in this study as perpetrators, but instead viewed them as victims.

Also, past research on the relationship between transportation and identification has stated that identification is an important factor of transportation (Moyer-Guse, Nabi, 2010). This finding provides additional evidence for this relationship. As stated above, participants were more likely to be transported into the perpetrator videos than the videos that portrayed victims. Research Question 4 remains consistent with this finding by revealing more identification levels from participants with the perpetrator videos. This

finding also contributes to the literature by offering a new perspective of identification with perpetrators with documented materials.

As stated before, transportation and identification have been continuously cited as connecting variables in the process of narrative persuasion and/ or character identification. Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be a positive correlation between transportation and identification, the results showed support. To further research the effects of transportation and identification, casual attribution was measured in this study. In the past, casual attribution has been connected to narrative persuasion (Lewis & Snitzman, 2017). Attribution can be considered the various reasons that an event happens, which in turn may lead to understanding of judgments. Because of reduced counterarguments and story consistent attitudes associated with transportation and identification, Research Question 5 investigated the correlation between transportation, identification, and causal attribution. A Pearson's correlation did not support a positive significance between all variables. Although past literature suggests that there is a relationship between attribution and narrative persuasion. Results expressed a negative non- significant relationship.

Within the process of attribution there is a special case of human processing that involves the attribution of responsibility for actions, events, and outcomes (Young & Thompson, 2011). When attribution is assessed toward an individual, surrounding factors are considered to further determine whether responsibility is to be directed internally or externally. Although the participants indicated that they would have done the same thing as the women in the videos, attribution did not correlate with identification and transportation. One reason for this finding can be that audience members simply did not

believe that someone outside of the women in the documentaries was responsible for what happened to them. A second reason is focused on the nature of the crimes committed in each video. Although viewers showed high levels of identification in the video conditions, identification has not been previously considered a factor of attribution. Participants were likely to identify with the victim or perpetrator but felt that there was more that could have been done to prevent the outcome.

In the past, narrative persuasion has been linked to causal attribution, but this correlation has not been further investigated with transportation. Research has been produced to examine the effects of narrative persuasion and attribution in relation to counterarguments (Niederdeppe, Shapiro & Porticella, 2011). Regarding the results of this study, it is likely that causal attribution participants do not have to experience transportation to access attribution to a character.

Research Question 6 considered whether race of the participant would impact identification, transportation, attribution, and story consistent attitudes. The analysis was constructed using the "race" variable as a whole and calculating significance from the group itself, which again may have impacted the results of this investigation. The results of a series of two- way ANOVA's showed that there was not a significant relationship between race and identification, transportation, or story consistent attitudes, or attribution. Thus, not supporting the research question. Due to the nature of the videos chosen, race was not predicted to be a significant factor when participants responded to varies levels of identification, transportation, story consistency, or attribution. Although it would have been interesting for a significance to emerge, the results from this analysis show that participants were not bias when assessing effects from the documentaries. This

finding is a significant and contributes to research. Future research should use the results from this study to assess race on varies media effects. Also, this finding creates new evidence for how we can examine transportation and identification. Participants remained immersed in the stories and did not allow for their race to become a factor, which gives evidence for the high levels of transportation, identification, and story consistent attitudes observed in the previous analysis. Additionally, this analysis did discover a significance between the video condition and identification, transportation, and story consistent attitudes. This finding supports the rationale for this study, stating that non-fiction content can impact both identification and transportation,

Additional analyses were conducted in this study to test the significance of perceived realism and social attraction on high levels of transportation. Perceived realism is the extent to which a viewer or reader gets the perception that a narrative could happen in real life. In the past, perceived realism has been connected to transportation and cited on discussions to further investigate the effects of narrative persuasion (Green, Brock & Kauffman, 2004). Social attraction has not been used as a variable when considering levels of transportation but has been used as an avenue for higher levels of identification (Chory, 2013). It has already been stated that there is a correlational relationship between identification and transportation, therefore the effects of each have been tested on one another. Additional analyses were conducted testing perceived realism and social attraction on high levels of identification. A one- way ANOVA supported this investigation; there was great significance between all variables.

**Results Conclusion**

The results of this study make a significant contribution to present literature in media effects and communication, while also implying sociological implication as well. Results presented offer insight and can impact the real world, specifically in jury selection. Jury selection is a rigorous process that entails various of test and examinations to ensure a match between juror and case. The results from this study indicates the effects of transportation and identification into victims and perpetrators stories. The results also indicate that not all perpetrators are seen as a perpetrator but are perceived as victims. This study can be used in future practices of jury selection to further investigate how an individual is transported and identify with the case or case that is similar. The results from this study can also assist in how a juror may assess attributional causes to a victim or perpetrator.

Overall, this study has found a substantial amount of support for the effects of transportation and identification. The effects of high transportation and counterarguments and positive story consistent attitudes were found significant, which supports the transportation concept (Green & Clark, 2013). This study also offers insight into the different levels of transportation when participants watched a documented video of a victim versus a perpetrator. The results of this study also found support for identification and effects of transportation. There were significant results in high levels of identification with counterarguments and positive story consistent attitudes. The results from this analysis are aligned with previous research, suggesting that there is a strong relationship between identification and transportation. More specifically, the results of this study

provide new evidence that the relationship between identification and transportation remains significant even when tested on non-fictional stories.

Like transportation, the results of this study showed that there was significance between higher levels of identification and whether participants viewed a video of a victim or perpetrator. Supporting past research, this study continued to find a correlation between transportation and identification (Green, Brock, & Kauffman, 2004). Additional analysis was conducted to review the relationships between attribution, identification, and transportation. The relationships were not supported among all three variables

This study supports past research by testing the relationship between high levels of transportation and high levels of perceived realism and in addition testing social attraction. The predicted significance between transportation and perceived realism was supported, as well as the relationship between transportation and social attraction. Although social attraction is commonly linked to identification, results support research that the identification and transportation effects are considered variables of one another (Green & Brock, 2000).

The data from this study, more specifically, further investigation into the relationship between transportation and identification on non- fictional documentaries, offers a contribution of new direction in the existing relationship between the two concepts. Aside from data contributions, this study makes a methodological contribution to transportation and identification, as it is the first of its kind to create this experiment design using documentaries and testing on non-fiction stimuli. The authors of this study manipulated real stories told by real victims and perpetrators while using real participants to analyze. Although mentioned in Green and Brock's 2000 narrative persuasion study,

no study to the knowledge of the researchers have tested the effects of transportation on documentaries. This design was unique and will likely produce continued variance in additional theories with a few changes of the experimental sample and conditions, as discussed in the following section.

**Limitations and Future Research**

There are several limitations implicated in this study. First, this study measured counterarguments with Zhao, Strasser, Capella, Lerman, and Fishbein's 2011 argument strength scale. This scale has not been traditionally used to measure counterarguments but worked effectively for this study. Future research should continue to assess the effectiveness of the argument strength scale to measure counterarguments. Also, there is a limitation to using the argument strength scale as well. Although this scale fit the hypothesis and question raised for this study, this may not be the case in future studies. Future scholars should continue to analyze counterargument scales to ensure measurements are tested accurately.  Secondly, this study only focused on videos of women who are portrayed as victims and perpetrators, future research should analyze these findings on a male victims and perpetrators as stimulus. Future research should use the results of this study and examine the differences in the responses of male and female participants to watching male and female victims and perpetrators. Thirdly, the women perpetrators selected for this study were convicted for killing their spouses. The perpetrators in the videos may have been viewed as victims rather than perpetrators, therefore resulting in the differences shown in levels of transportation and identification in favor of the perpetrators rather than the victims. Future research should conduct a manipulation check to ensure that participants perceived perpetrators as perpetrators and

victims as victims. Research should also examine the different crimes committed by perpetrators that may draw the thin line between victims and perpetrators in regards to criminals. Future research should analyze the findings of this study on less serious crimes such as theft and drug abuse. Fourthly, future research should assess individual race differences in identifying with victims and perpetrators. In this study high levels of identification and transportation differences were found significant when participants watched the video of a perpetrator versus a victim. This is an interesting finding, but this study did not further investigate what specific race or factors contributed to this finding. Additionally, this study found that there was a non- significance between race of the participant, the video condition, and variables transportation, identification, story consistent attitudes, or attribution. Future research should continue to analyze the specific race of the participant when assessing the effects of transportation, identification, and attribution.

Fifthly, casual attribution was used as an important variable from narrative persuasion, but in this study, attribution did not show significance between transportation and identification, but there is literature that states that causal attribution can have effects on counter- arguments. Future research should investigate this relationship to determine if there is a solid relationship between causal attribution and transportation.

Finally, additional research should also take the results of this study and continue to test identification and transportation on non-fiction stimuli. Additional research should explore the use of documentaries as an avenue to provide more insight into how individuals create relationships with real people. The results of this study can also be expanded beyond documentaries and into practice settings. More specifically, this study

investigated transportation and identification with victims and perpetrators. Future practices can use the results from this study in class room situations. Results indicated that participants were more likely to identify and be transported into videos that portrayed a perpetrator, future research should focus on crime and the way people perceive perpetrators and/or victims.

**Conclusion**

This study has contributed to the body of research regarding persuasion and media effects. More specifically, this study uses documentaries of women who are victims and perpetrators of crime and extends our knowledge of transportation and identification on a non-fiction stimulus. Also, this study offers insight into how participants perceived perpetrators or victims. Results indicated that individuals were more likely to identify with and be transported by perpetrators. Additionally, the study offers new insight into the field of crime and media by analyzing the relationships between persuasion and media effects: transportation and identification on a non- fictional crime plot. Lastly, this body of research contributed to research by testing the effects of each concept on one another. Meaning, the effects of transportation and identification were tested on one another leading to significant results.

# REFERENCES

Andringa, E. (1986). *Perspektivierung und Perspektivenuebernahme* [Perspectivization and taking over of perspective]. *Spiel*, 5(1), 135-146.

Appel, M., & Richter, T. (2010). Transportation and need for affect in narrative persuasion: A mediated moderation model. *Media Psychology*, *13*(2), 101-135.

Brumbaugh, A. M. (2009). Why do I identify with thee? let me count three ways: how ad context influences race-based character identification. *Psychology & Marketing, 26*(11), 970-986.

Busselle R., Bilandzic H. (2008). Fictionality and perceived realism in experiencing stories: A model of narrative comprehension and engagement. *Communication Theory*, *18*, 255-280.

Butler, L., Koopman, C., & Zimbardo, P.G. (1995) "The psychological impact of viewing the film jfk: emotions, beliefs, and political behavioral intentions," *Political Psychology*, *16*, (2), 237–57.

Chattoo, C. B., & Das, A. (2014). Assessing the social impact of issues-focused documentaries: Research methods & future considerations. *Center for Media and Social Impact*, 1-26.

Chory, R. M. (2013). Differences in television viewers' involvement: Identification with and attraction to liked, disliked, and neutral characters. *Communication Research Reports, 30*(4), 293-305.

Cohen, J. (2001). Defining identification: A Theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. *Mass Communication & Society, 4*(3), 245-264.

Cohen, J., Tal-Or, N. & Mazor-Tregerman, M. (2015). The tempering effect of transportation: Exploring the effects of transportation and identification during exposure to controversial two-sided narratives. *Journal of Communication*, *65*(2), 237–258.

Escalas, J. E. (2007). Self-referencing and persuasion: Narrative transportation versus analytical elaboration. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *33*(4), 421-429.

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26(*2*), 172-199.

Green, M. C. (2006), Narratives and cancer communication. *Journal of Communication*, *56*: S163–S183.

Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 701-721.

Green, M.C., Brock, T.C., & Kaufman, G. F. (2004) Understanding media enjoyment: The role of transportation into narrative worlds. *Communication Theory*, *14*, 311-327.

Green, M. C., & Clark, J. L. (2013), Transportation into narrative worlds: Implications for entertainment media influences on tobacco use. *Addiction, 108*: 477–484.

Green, M. C., Kass, S., Carrey, J., Herzig, B., Feeney, R., & Sabini, J. (2008). Transportation across media: Repeated exposure to print and film. *Media Psychology*, *11*(4), 512–539.

Hall, A. (2003). Reading realism: audiences' evaluations of the reality of media texts. *Journal of Communication*, 53, 624-641.

Hall, A., & Zwarun, L. (2012). Challenging entertainment: Enjoyment, transportation, and need for cognition in relation to fictional films viewed online. *Mass Communication and Society, 15*, 384-406. DOI: 10.1080/15205436.2011.583544

Hoeken, H., & Sinkeldam, J. (2014). The role of identification and perception of just outcome in evoking emotions in narrative persuasion. *Journal of Communication*, *64*(5), 935-955.

Hoffner, C., & Buchanan, M. (2005). Young adults' wishful identification with television characters: the role of perceived similarity and character attributes. *Media Psychology*, 7(4), 325-351.

Igartua, J.J. (2010). Identification with characters and narrative persuasion through fictional feature films. *Communications, 35*(4), 347-373. Doi: 10.1515/comm.2010.019

Igartua, J., & Ramos, M. M. (2015). Influence of character type and narrative setting on character design for fictional television series. *Communication & Society, 28*(1), 63-77.

Kinnebrock, S., & Bilandzic, H. (2006). *How to make a story work: Introducing the concept of narratively into narrative persuasion.* Germany, Europe: Publications served: Aachen Univ.

Larkey, L. K., & Hecht, M. L. (2010). A model of effects of narrative as culture-centric health promotion. *Journal of Health Communication*, *15*, 114-135.

Lewis, N., & Sznitman, S. R. (2017), You brought it on yourself: the joint effects of message type, stigma, and responsibility attribution on attitudes toward medical cannabis. *Journal of Communication*, *67*, 181–202.

66

Livingstone, S. M. (1990). Interpreting a television narrative: How different viewers see a story. *Journal of Communication*, *40*, 72-85.

Mazzocco, P. J., Green, M. C., Sasota, J. A., & Jones, N. W. (2010). This story is not for everyone: Transportability and narrative persuasion. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1 (*4*), 361-368.

McCroskey, J. C., & McCain, T. A. (1974). The measurement of interpersonal attraction. *Speech Monographs*, *41*, 261–266.

Moyer-Guse, E., & Nabi, R. L. (2010). Explaining the effects of narrative in an entertainment television program: Overcoming resistance to persuasion. *Human Communication Research*, 36(*1*), 26–52.

Murphy, S. T., Frank, L. B., Chatterjee, J. S., & Baezconde-Garbanati, L. (2013). Narrative versus nonnarrative: The role of identification, transportation, and emotion in reducing health disparities. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(1), 116-137.

Niederdeppe, J., Shapiro, M. A., & Porticella, N. (2011). Attributions of responsibility for obesity: Narrative communication reduces reactive counterarguing among liberals. *Human Communication Research*, *37*(3), 295-323. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2011.01409.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2008). Elaboration likelihood model. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of communication*. *4,* 1475-1480.

Potter, W. J. (1986). Perceived reality and the cultivation hypothesis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *30*, 159-174.

Russell, D. (1982). The Causal Dimension Scale: A measure of how individuals perceive causes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 42*, 137-1145.

Sestir, M., & Green, M. C. (2010). You are who you watch: Identification and transportation effects on temporary self-concept. *Social Influence*, 5(4), 272–288.

Shen, F., Sheer, V.C., &Li,R.(2015). Impact of narratives on persuasion in health communication: A meta-analysis. *Journal o fAdvertising*,*44*(2),105–113.

Smith, R.A. (2007). Language of the lost: An explication of stigma communication. *Communication Theory*, 17,462–485.

Van Peer, W. & Pander Maat, H. (1996) Perspectivation and sympathy: Effects of narrative point of view. *Empirical Approaches to Literature and Aesthetics*, *16*, 143-54.

Walter, N., Murphy, S. T., & Gillig, T. K. (2018). To walk a mile in someone else's shoes: How narratives can change causal attribution through story Exploration and character customization. *Human Communication Research*, *44*(1), 31-57. doi:10.1111

Weiner, B. (1995). Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct. New York*, NY*: *Guilford Press*.

Young, R. L., & Thompson, C. Y. (2011). Gender, attributions of responsibility, and negotiation of deviant labels in small groups. *Deviant Behavior*, *32*(7), 626-652. doi:10.1080/01639625.2010.514203

Zhao, X., Strasser, A., Cappella, J.N., Lerman, C. and Fishbein, M. (2011) A measure of perceived argument strength*:* reliability and validity. *Communication Methods and Measures,* 5(*1*): 48–75.

Zillmann, D. (1980). Anatomy of suspense. In P. H. Tannenbaum (Ed.), *The entertainment functions of television* (pp. 133-163). Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.

Zwarun, L., & Hall, A. (2012). Narrative persuasion, transportation, and the role of need for cognition in online viewing of fantastical films. *Media Psychology*, *15*(3), 327-355.

# APPENDIX A

*Descriptive Table*

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Story Consistent Attitudes | 214 | 4.6106 | 1.36808 |
| Social Attraction | 214 | 4.5397 | 1.17712 |
| Perceived Realism | 214 | 5.5857 | .74987 |
| Identification | 214 | 4.6753 | 1.18714 |
| Transportation | 214 | 4.2035 | .73012 |
| Attribution | 214 | 3.1197 | .79031 |
| Counter Argument | 214 | 4.9730 | .77392 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 214 | | |

# Examining Non-Fiction Worlds

---

Informed Consent

Our names are Dr. Cheryl Bracken, a faculty member, and Ms. Shantale Roberts, a student in the School of Communication at Cleveland State University. We are requesting your participation in a research study. The goal of our study is to explore people's feeling of absorption and identification with non-fiction characters. If you want more information about this research study, please contact myself at s.d.roberts32@vikes.csuohio.edu, or my thesis advisor & principal investigator Dr. Cheryl Bracken at cbracken@csuohio.edu. You may withdraw from this study at any time without any consequence whatsoever. Only summary results may be published, presented or used for instruction. If you agree to participate you will take the survey using this online software. The survey will ask questions your social media behaviors and attitudes. The survey will last no longer than 30 minutes to finish. There is no way to know which student filled out an individual questionnaire. The data may be used in publications/presentations. No personal identifiers will be included in such data. There are no direct benefits available to you as a participant in this research.  Risks associated with participation are considered to be minimal. Such risks are largely limited to compromised confidentiality. No records will be kept allowing your name to be associated with your responses in the study or on the survey. Your responses will be private. Only the researchers will see the data. Research records will be kept in a locked file. All electronic information will be coded and secured using a password protected file. Only summary results may be published, presented or used for instruction.Some participants may be eligible for extra credit. If this applies to you, you will have the choice to enter your name and the name of your instructor. If you provide your name, it will be removed from the data file before any data analysis is started. Please read the following: *"I understand that if I have any questions about my rights as a research subject, I can contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630."* Your signature below means that you understand the contents of this document. You also are at least 18 years of age. Finally, you voluntarily consent to participate in this research study.

◯ Yes, I agree to participate in this study.  (1)

◯ No, I do not agree to participate in this study  (2)

*Skip To: End of Survey If      Informed Consent      Our names are Dr. Cheryl Bracken, a faculty member, and Ms. Shantale R... = No, I do not agree to participate in this study*

Q35

Q36

Q33

Q34

**Thought Listing**

Q3 Please list all the things you were thinking about while you were watching the video (please list all thoughts below).

_____

_____

_____

_____
_____

**Story Consistent Attitudes/ Behavior Intent**

Q4 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

|  | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I would have done the same thing as the woman in the video if it were me. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| What happened to the woman in the video could happen to me (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| After watching the video, I will take more precautions. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q5 What was the ethnic background of the woman in the video?

_____

**Social Attraction**

Q6 Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I think the woman in the video could be a friend of mine. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I would like to have a friendly chat with her. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| It would be difficult to meet and talk with her. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| She just wouldn't fit in my circle of friends. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| We could never establish a personal friendship with each other. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**Perceived Realism**

Q7 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The video showed something that could possibly happen in real life. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The events in the video portrayed possible real life situations. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The story in the video could actually happen in real life. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Never in real life would what was shown in the video happen. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q11 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not many people are likely to experience the events portrayed in the video. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The video portrayed events that happen to a lot of people. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| What happened to the woman in the video is what happens to people in real world. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The video was based on real facts. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q12 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The video showed a coherent story. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The story portrayed in the video were consistent. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Parts of the video were contradicting of each other. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The story portrayed in the video made sense. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The events in the video had a logical flow. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**Character Identification**

Q13 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

77

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I felt emotionally involved with the main character's feelings. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I understood how the main character's act, think, and feel. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I understood the main character's emotions. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I imagined how I would act if I were the main characters. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I was concerned about what was happening to the main characters. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**Transportation**

Q14 Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| While I was watching the video, activity going on in the room around me was on my mind. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I felt I was part of the events portrayed in the video. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I was mentally involved in the video while watching it. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Now that the video has ended, I find it easy to put it out of my mind. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| As I was watching it, I wanted to know how the video would end. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The video affected me emotionally. (6) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I find myself thinking of ways the video could have turned out differently. (7) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I found my mind wandering while watching the video. (8) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I have a vivid mental impression of the person in the video (reflecting on the video after it ended). (9) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| While watching the video, I could easily picture the events in it taking place. (10) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The events in the video are relevant to my everyday life. (11) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The events in the video have changed my life. (12) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q15 Please indicate if you identified with the woman in the film.

○ Did not identify  (1)

○ not much  (2)

○ neutral  (3)

○ somewhat  (4)

○ Identified very much  (5)

Q16 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your whether you felt the woman in the video acted appropriately or inappropriately.

○ Extremely appropriate  (1)

○ Moderately appropriate  (2)

○ Slightly appropriate  (3)

○ Neither appropriate nor inappropriate  (4)

○ Slightly inappropriate  (5)

○ Moderately inappropriate  (6)

○ Extremely inappropriate  (7)

## Causal Attribution

Q17 For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I can see myself doing the same thing as the woman in the video (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| You can control the situations that the woman in the video found herself in. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The effects of the events taken place are temporary. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The effects of the events taken place are permanent. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The events shown in the video are changeable. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The woman in the video is not responsible for what happened to her. (6) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The woman in the video is responsible for what happened to her. (7) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

## Counter-Argument

Q18 Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future."
 Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The statement is a reason for making the right decisions that is believable. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The statement is a reason for making the right decisions that is convincing. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The statement gives a reason for making the right choices that is important to me. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The statement helped me feel confident about how best to make the right decisions. (4) | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The statement would help my friends make the right decisions. (5) | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The statement put thoughts in my mind about wanting to make the right decisions. (6) | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The statement put thought in my mind about not wanting to make the right decisions. (7) | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall, how much do you agree or disagree with the statement? (8) | | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q19 Answer the following question using a 7 -point scale from 1= very weak and 7= very strong.

| | Very Weak (1) | Weak (2) | Somewhat weak (3) | Neither weak or strong (4) | Somewhat strong (5) | Strong (6) | Very Strong (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Is the reason the statement gave for making the right decisions a strong or weak reason? (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q20 Some people say:  "Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."   Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| | Very weak (1) | Weak (2) | Somewhat weak (3) | Neither weak or strong (4) | Somewhat strong (5) | Strong (6) | Very strong (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The statement is a reason for staying aware of the people around me that is believable. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The statement is a reason for staying aware of the people around me that is convincing. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The statement gives a reason for staying aware of the people around me that is important to me. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The statement helped me feel confident about wanting to stay aware of the people around me. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The statement would help my friends stay aware of the people around them. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The statement put thoughts in my mind about wanting to stay aware of the people around me. (6) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The statement put thought in my mind about not wanting to stay aware of the people around me. (7) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Overall, how much do you agree or disagree with the statement? (8) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q21 Answer the following question using a  7 -point scale from 1= very weak and 7= very strong.

| | Very Weak (1) | Weak (2) | Somewhat weak (3) | Neither weak or strong (4) | Somewhat strong (5) | Strong (6) | Very Strong (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Is the reason the statement gave for making the right decisions a strong or weak reason? (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q22 Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least

_____ Action (1)
_____ Comedy (2)
_____ Crime drama (3)
_____ Mystery (4)
_____ Reality (5)
_____ News/Current Events (6)
_____ Sports (7)
_____ Drama (8)

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q23 What is your favorite TV show?

_____

Q24 Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements..

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The visual elements in the video were realistic. (1) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The audio elements of the video were realistic. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The acting the video was realistic. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| The scenes in the video were realistic. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I felt the overall production elements of the video were realistic. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q25  Please answer the following questions to assess how much attention was paid to detail while watching the film. If you cannot answer the following questions please consider watching the film again.

Have you seen this video before today?

○ Yes  (1)

○ No  (2)

Q26 The women in the video gives her attacker a winning lottery number.

○ True  (1)

○ False  (2)

Q27 The women in the video is serving a life sentence for killing her child.

○ True  (1)

○ False  (2)

Q28  The woman in the video had a dog who barked when her attacker broke into their home.

○ True  (1)

○ False  (2)

Q29 The woman in the video invited her ex- husband over to her house on the day of his murder.

○ True  (1)

○ False  (2)

Q30 You are almost finished. The next questions are about you.

Q31 What device are you using to complete this survey?

○ Smartphone  (1)

○ Desktop computer  (2)

○ Laptop computer  (3)

○ Tablet  (4)

○ Other  (5)

Q32 Please select the option that best describes where you live.

○ Rural  (1)

○ Suburban  (2)

○ Urban  (3)

Q33 How do you identify your political views?

○ Extremely Conservative  (1)

○ Conservative  (2)

○ Somewhat Conservative  (3)

○ Moderate, Middle of the Road  (12)

○ Somewhat Liberal  (13)

○ Liberal  (14)

○ Extremely Liberal  (15)

Q34 What is your gender?

○ Female  (1)

○ Male  (2)

○ Transgendered  (3)

○ Other  (4)

Q35 How old are you today?

_____

Q36  How would you describe your racial/ethnic background?

_____

Q37 What is your education level?

○ Less than high school  (1)

○ High school graduate  (2)

○ Some college  (3)

○ 2 year degree  (4)

○ 4 year degree  (5)

○ Professional degree  (6)

○ Master's or higher  (7)

Q38 If you are a student who is eligible for extra credit, please provide your name, course number, and instructor's name:

○ Your name  (1) _____

○ Number of your course (example COM 101)  (2)
_____

○ Title of your course (example Principles of Public Relations)  (3)
_____

○ Name of your instructor  (4) _____

Q39 Thank you for completing this survey!  Are you someone or know someone who have been a victim of a crime?  You can find information and advice by the following link:  http://victimsofcrime.org/help-for-crime-victims/get-help-bulletins-for-crime-victims/trauma-of-victimization

# APPENDIX C

**RE: IRB-FY2018-204**

**EXPANDING OUR PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE NON-FICTION WORLD**

The IRB has reviewed and approved your application for the above named project, under the category noted below. Approval for use of human subjects in this research is for a one-year period as noted below. If your study extends beyond this approval period, *you must contact this office to initiate an annual review of this research.*

**Approval Category: Expedited  Category 7**

**Approval Date:**        **March 13, 2018**

**Expiration Date:**      **March 12, 2019**

By accepting this decision, you agree to notify the IRB of: (1) any additions to or changes in procedures for your study that modify the subjects' risk in any way; and (2) any events that affect that safety or well-being of subjects. Notify the IRB of any revisions to the protocol, including the addition of researchers, prior to implementation.

Thank you for your efforts to maintain compliance with the federal regulations for the protection of human subjects. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Jane Karpinski

IRB Analyst

Cleveland State University

Sponsored Programs and Research Services

(216) 687-3624

m.karpinski2@csuohio.edu

**APPENDIX D**

*Item Means Table*

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I would have done the same thing as the woman in the video if it were me. | 214 | 4.19 | 1.994 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - What happened to the woman in the video could happen to me | 213 | 4.56 | 1.914 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - After watching the video, I will take more precautions. | 213 | 5.12 | 1.677 |
| Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions. - I think the woman in the video could be a friend of mine. | 214 | 4.17 | 1.750 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions. - I would like to have a friendly chat with her. | 214 | 4.61 | 1.506 |
| Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions. - It would be difficult to meet and talk with her. | 214 | 4.71 | 1.708 |
| Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions. - She just wouldn't fit in my circle of friends. | 214 | 4.34 | 1.836 |
| Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions. - We could never establish a personal friendship with each other. | 214 | 5.00 | 1.674 |
| Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following questions. - She would be pleasant to be with. | 214 | 4.39 | 1.436 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The video showed something that could possibly happen in real life. | 214 | 6.39 | .995 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The events in the video portrayed possible real life situations. | 214 | 6.36 | 1.050 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The story in the video could actually happen in real life. | 214 | 6.46 | .875 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Never in real life would what was shown in the video happen. | 214 | 6.46 | .932 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Real people would not do the things shown in the video. | 214 | 6.35 | 1.139 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Not many people are likely to experience the events portrayed in the video. | 214 | 4.85 | 1.733 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The video portrayed events that happen to a lot of people. | 214 | 4.82 | 1.576 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - What happened to the woman in the video is what happens to people in real world. | 214 | 5.52 | 1.270 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The video was based on real facts. | 214 | 5.50 | 1.198 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The video showed something that had really happened. | 214 | 5.56 | 1.227 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The video showed a coherent story. | 214 | 5.08 | 1.441 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The story portrayed in the video were consistent. | 214 | 5.25 | 1.215 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Parts of the video were contradicting of each other. | 214 | 4.82 | 1.400 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The story portrayed in the video made sense. | 214 | 5.31 | 1.296 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The events in the video had a logical flow. | 214 | 5.05 | 1.477 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I felt emotionally involved with the main character's feelings. | 214 | 4.72 | 1.796 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I understood how the main character's act, think, and feel. | 214 | 4.66 | 1.731 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I understood the main character's emotions. | 214 | 5.01 | 1.577 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I imagined how I would act if I were the main characters. | 213 | 5.44 | 1.464 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I was concerned about what was happening to the main characters. | 214 | 5.79 | 1.092 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I tried to imagine the main character's feelings, thoughts and reactions. | 214 | 5.69 | 1.222 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I tried to see things from the main character's point of view. | 214 | 5.79 | 1.072 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I felt as if I were the main character. | 214 | 3.71 | 1.849 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I, myself experienced the main character's emotional reactions. | 212 | 3.53 | 1.881 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I had the impression of living the main character's story myself. | 214 | 3.54 | 1.870 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I identified with the main characters. | 214 | 3.55 | 1.850 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - While I was watching the video, activity going on in the room around me was on my mind. | 214 | 4.78 | 1.890 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I felt I was part of the events portrayed in the video. | 214 | 3.27 | 1.726 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I was mentally involved in the video while watching it. | 214 | 5.13 | 1.478 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Now that the video has ended, I find it easy to put it out of my mind. | 214 | 4.24 | 1.666 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - As I was watching it, I wanted to know how the video would end. | 213 | 5.54 | 1.481 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The video affected me emotionally. | 214 | 4.13 | 1.760 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I find myself thinking of ways the video could have turned out differently. | 214 | 4.93 | 1.603 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I found my mind wandering while watching the video. | 214 | 4.74 | 1.705 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I have a vivid mental impression of the person in the video (reflecting on the video after it ended). | 214 | 4.78 | 1.638 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - While watching the video, I could easily picture the events in it taking place. | 214 | 5.19 | 1.389 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The events in the video are relevant to my everyday life. | 214 | 2.69 | 1.757 |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The events in the video have changed my life. | 214 | 2.65 | 1.587 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please indicate if you identified with the woman in the film. | 214 | 2.58 | 1.245 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your whether you felt the woman in the video acted appropriately or inappropriately. | 214 | 2.91 | 1.986 |
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - I can see myself doing the same thing as the woman in the video | 214 | 3.97 | 1.913 |
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - You can control the situations that the woman in the video found herself in. | 214 | 3.67 | 1.738 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The effects of the events taken place are temporary. | 214 | 2.34 | 1.460 |
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The effects of the events taken place are permanent. | 214 | 2.45 | 1.468 |
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The events shown in the video are changeable. | 213 | 3.54 | 1.736 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The woman in the video is not responsible for what happened to her. | 214 | 2.91 | 1.762 |
| For the following questions think about the situations the characters found themselves in and the events that led up to those moments. Then, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The woman in the video is responsible for what happened to her. | 214 | 2.95 | 1.821 |
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future."

Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement is a reason for making the right decisions that is believable. | 214 | 5.06 | 1.281 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement is a reason for making the right decisions that is convincing. | 214 | 4.91 | 1.394 |
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement gives a reason for making the right choices that is important to me. | 214 | 5.53 | 1.185 |
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement helped me feel confident about how best to make the right decisions. | 214 | 5.30 | 1.262 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future." Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement would help my friends make the right decisions. | 214 | 5.00 | 1.307 |
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future." Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement put thoughts in my mind about wanting to make the right decisions. | 214 | 5.46 | 1.141 |
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future." Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement put thought in my mind about not wanting to make the right decisions. | 214 | 2.95 | 1.686 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say "Every action you take has consequences to your future."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Overall, how much do you agree or disagree with the statement? | 213 | 5.77 | 1.136 |
| Answer the following question using a 7 -point scale from 1= very weak and 7= very strong. - Is the reason the statement gave for making the right decisions a strong or weak reason? | 214 | 5.21 | 1.339 |
| Some people say:<br><br>"Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement is a reason for staying aware of the people around me that is believable. | 214 | 5.28 | 1.320 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say:<br><br>"Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."<br><br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement is a reason for staying aware of the people around me that is convincing. | 214 | 5.14 | 1.331 |
| Some people say:<br><br>"Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."<br><br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement gives a reason for staying aware of the people around me that is important to me. | 213 | 5.17 | 1.378 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say: "Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life." Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement helped me feel confident about wanting to stay aware of the people around me. | 214 | 5.12 | 1.479 |
| Some people say: "Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life." Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement would help my friends stay aware of the people around them. | 214 | 5.07 | 1.362 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say:<br><br>"Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement put thoughts in my mind about wanting to stay aware of the people around me. | 214 | 5.16 | 1.518 |
| Some people say:<br><br>"Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."<br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - The statement put thought in my mind about not wanting to stay aware of the people around me. | 214 | 3.01 | 1.725 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Some people say:<br><br>"Every friend you make may not have your best intentions. All you need to do is let your guard down to be victimized. Staying aware today may save your life."<br><br><br>Keep this statement in mind as you indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. - Overall, how much do you agree or disagree with the statement? | 214 | 5.28 | 1.403 |
| Answer the following question using a 7 -point scale from 1= very weak and 7= very strong. - Is the reason the statement gave for making the right decisions a strong or weak reason? | 214 | 5.10 | 1.432 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Action | 214 | 4.15 | 2.085 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Comedy | 214 | 3.02 | 1.939 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Crime drama | 214 | 3.81 | 2.063 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Mystery | 214 | 4.94 | 1.736 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Reality | 214 | 4.59 | 2.276 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - News/Current Events | 214 | 5.43 | 2.267 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Sports | 214 | 5.67 | 2.489 |
| Please rank the television genre you watch from the most to the least - Drama | 214 | 4.38 | 2.097 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.. - The visual elements in the video were realistic. | 214 | 5.10 | 1.370 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.. - The audio elements of the video were realistic. | 214 | 5.25 | 1.319 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.. - The acting the video was realistic. | 214 | 5.21 | 1.372 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.. - The scenes in the video were realistic. | 214 | 5.08 | 1.390 |
| Please think about the video you just watched and indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.. - I felt the overall production elements of the video were realistic. | 214 | 5.16 | 1.341 |
| Please answer the following questions to assess how much attention was paid to detail while watching the film. If you cannot answer the following questions please consider watching the film again.

Have you seen this video before today? | 214 | 1.99 | .096 |
| The women in the video gives her attacker a winning lottery number. | 214 | 1.77 | .424 |
| The women in the video is serving a life sentence for killing her child. | 214 | 1.95 | .212 |
| The woman in the video had a dog who barked when her attacker broke into their home. | 214 | 1.75 | .435 |
| The woman in the video invited her ex- husband over to her house on the day of his murder. | 214 | 1.76 | .430 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| What device are you using to complete this survey? | 214 | 2.44 | .852 |
| Please select the option that best describes where you live. | 214 | 2.33 | .618 |
| How do you identify your political views? | 214 | 10.57 | 4.602 |
| What is your gender? | 214 | 1.30 | .500 |
| What is your education level? | 214 | 3.70 | 1.060 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 206 | | |

*Pearson's Correlation of all Measured Items*

| Correlations | | StoryConsiste ntAttitudes | SocialAttractio n | PercievedRea lism | Identification | Transporation | Attribution | CounterArgu ment | coded self described race | VIDCONDITO N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| StoryConsistentAttitudes | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .418** | .417** | .600** | .367** | -.081 | .074 | -.086 | .128 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .240 | .278 | .210 | .061 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| SocialAttraction | Pearson Correlation | .418** | 1 | .412** | .532** | .394** | -.155* | .081 | -.068 | .072 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .024 | .240 | .320 | .296 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| PercievedRealism | Pearson Correlation | .417** | .412** | 1 | .417** | .404** | -.303** | .175* | -.199** | -.111 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .010 | .003 | .105 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| Identification | Pearson Correlation | .600** | .532** | .417** | 1 | .654** | -.031 | .229** | -.058 | .127 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .655 | .001 | .400 | .064 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| Transporation | Pearson Correlation | .367** | .394** | .404** | .654** | 1 | -.095 | .205** | -.056 | .063 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .168 | .003 | .415 | .363 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| Attribution | Pearson Correlation | -.081 | -.155* | -.303** | -.031 | -.095 | 1 | .101 | .088 | .150* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .240 | .024 | .000 | .655 | .168 | | .142 | .198 | .028 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| CounterArgument | Pearson Correlation | .074 | .081 | .175* | .229** | .205** | .101 | 1 | .011 | .008 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .278 | .240 | .010 | .001 | .003 | .142 | | .869 | .908 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| coded self described race | Pearson Correlation | -.086 | -.068 | -.199** | -.058 | -.056 | .088 | .011 | 1 | -.003 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .210 | .320 | .003 | .400 | .415 | .198 | .869 | | .965 |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |
| VIDCONDITON | Pearson Correlation | .128 | .072 | -.111 | .127 | .063 | .150* | .008 | -.003 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .061 | .296 | .105 | .064 | .363 | .028 | .908 | .965 | |
| | N | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 214 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).