

January 2012

# Live Versus Recorded: Exploring Television Sales Presentations

Christopher Craig Novak

University of South Florida, [cnovak6@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:cnovak6@tampabay.rr.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

## Scholar Commons Citation

Novak, Christopher Craig, "Live Versus Recorded: Exploring Television Sales Presentations" (2012). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.

<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/4186>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [scholarcommons@usf.edu](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).

Live Versus Recorded: Exploring Television Sales Presentations

by

Christopher C. Novak

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
Department of Mass Communications  
College of Arts and Sciences  
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Scott Liu, Ph.D.  
Kenneth Killebrew, Ph.D.  
Kelly Page Werder, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:  
June 28, 2012

Keywords: Credibility, Authenticity, Home, Shopping, Broadcasting

Copyright © 2012, Christopher C. Novak

## **Dedication**

For Mary and Jim, you are missed beyond words.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to give a special thanks to the following people without whom this thesis would not be possible: Dr. Michael Mitrook, Dr. Roxanne Watson, Tiffany Schweikart, Lauren Klinger, Kristen Arnold-Ruyle, Harold Vincent, Dr. Ambar Basu, Dr. Abraham Khan, Dr. Emily Ryalls, and Dr. Christopher McRae. Next, I would like to give an extra special thanks to Dr. Kelly Page Werder for all the encouragement, Dr. Kenneth Killebrew for his time and patience during all our time working together, and Dr. Scott Liu for planting the seed and helping it grow. Lastly, the biggest thanks of all to Vicky Perry, Steve and Pat Novak, my daughter Bethany, and my wife Melinda.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
List of Figures	v
Abstract	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	4
A History of Live	4
The Live Context	6
Live Home Shopping Variations	6
Credibility	11
Authenticity	13
Involvement	18
Urgency	21
Informativeness	23
Entertaining Value	25
Sense of Real Time	26
Spontaneity	28
Interactivity	29
Research Questions	29
Chapter 3: Methodology	33
Participants	33
Design	35
Stimulus Materials	35
Procedure	36
Dependent Measures	37
Chapter 4: Results	40
Manipulation Checks	40
RQ 1-9: Differences in the Nine Factors	41
RQ 10-12: Differences in Attitudes and Purchase Intentions	43
RQ 13-14: The Nine Factors, Attitudes and Purchase Intentions	44
Chapter 5: Discussion and Limitations	55
Discussion	55
Limitations	64

Chapter 6: Conclusion	67
References	71
Appendices	74
Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter	75
Appendix B: Questionnaire	77
Appendix C: Instructions to Test Participants	81
Appendix D: Slides/Description of Key Points of Presentation	82

### List of Tables

Table 1	Distribution of Participants' Gender	34
Table 2	Distribution of Participants' Ethnicity	34
Table 3	Distribution of Participants Age	34
Table 4	Cronbach's Alpha of the Nine Factors	38
Table 5	Cronbach's Alphas of Attitude Measures	39
Table 6	Manipulation Checks	41
Table 7	Descriptive Statistics: Live vs. Recorded	42
Table 8	T-test Results: Live vs. Recorded	43
Table 9	Descriptive Statistics of Attitudes & Purchase Intentions	44
Table 10	T-tests of Attitudes and Purchase Intentions	44
Table 11	Regression Results from Live & Recorded Conditions Criterion: Attitude toward Presentation	45
Table 12	Regression Results from Live & Recorded Conditions Criterion: Attitude toward Product	46
Table 13	Regression Results from Live & Recorded Conditions Criterion: Purchase Intentions	47
Table 14	Regression Results from Live Condition Criterion: Attitude Toward Presentation	48
Table 15	Regression Results from Live Condition Criterion: Attitude Toward Product	49
Table 16	Regression Results from Live Condition Criterion: Purchase Intentions	50

Table 17	Regression Results from Recorded Condition Criterion: Attitude Toward Presentation	51
Table 18	Regression Results from Recorded Condition Criterion: Attitude Toward Product	52
Table 19	Regression Results from Recorded Condition Criterion: Purchase Intentions	53
Table 20	Summary of Regression Results	54



## List of Figures

Figure C1	Introduction	82
Figure C2	Comparisons	82
Figure C3	Stacks and Counters	83
Figure C4	Carrots and Freshness	83
Figure C5	Breaking Carrots	84
Figure C6	Three Weeks Old	84
Figure C7	Lettuce and Sound Demonstrations	85
Figure C8	Reusable and Lasting Quality	85
Figure C9	Pepper Freshness	86
Figure C10	Refrigerator Demonstration	86
Figure C11	Countdown Clock	87
Figure C12	Taking A Phone Call	87
Figure C13	More Appearances	88

### **Abstract**

This is an exploratory study that poses the questions and discussion regarding live and recorded sales presentations via television. With its rich history, it appears that live television has more types of appeal that will get the shopper buying products. However, the recorded and edited presentation played back on television has had its share to grab the shopper's attention. Research questions are presented to determine which broadcasting method is stronger by examining factors related to home shopping such as credibility, authenticity, involvement, urgency, informativeness, entertaining value, sense of real time, spontaneity and interactivity. Additional questions will look at the overall presentation, the product itself, and what the potential future of home shopping may be based upon this study. The main findings show there is a significant difference in all factors between live and recorded; however, some factors are stronger than others between live and recorded. These factors could indicate where home shopping may want to concentrate its efforts to remain a viable entity in electronic retail.

## Chapter One: Introduction

Is the magic of live television losing its ground in mass communication today? Shows such as *Saturday Night Live*, *Dancing with the Stars*, and *American Idol* would indicate live broadcasts are strong. Live broadcasting networks like CNN, HSN, and QVC indicate that there is still room for live television in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Home shopping channels in particular and their live stream equivalents on the Internet have made a huge impression and apparently are doing well financially. This could give them an advantage over their retail store, infomercial, and advertising competitors. Just how effective are live home shopping broadcasts? Could the answer be that people are not going to the store to buy various items from retail outlets because of rising fuel prices? Do home shopping products stand a better chance of being sold using such an outlet as a live home shopping channel? What factors are important to the strengths of live versus the recorded sell? Out of those factors, what could be important to the presentation of a product? Also, which factors are important to the product itself?

Live broadcasting, as a whole, is a chaotic world behind the scenes. The viewer hardly, if at all, sees the work it takes to produce a live show. The realm of home shopping television falls under this blanket of chaos. The work to produce the shows requires the host studying and practicing the products. It also requires the guest presenters making sure they will cover every angle of the product to insure it sells, and the producers looking over the hourly quota and reading over presentation materials for the product. There are the live show crews examining the sets, the lights, the

microphones, the cameras, the graphics, and the video support for each product to make sure the show is executed properly when the time comes. Once all these elements are combined, the execution of the live shopping program takes place. The tension in the control room and studio is high because there is one chance to get the product demonstration right. The standard live presentation contains a small introduction of the product by a show host. Then a possible expert (or guest) representing the product comes in with the host to give the demonstration. This is the point where factors like credibility, authenticity, involvement, urgency, and informativeness of what is shown become important. If the demonstration of the product goes as planned, the likelihood of high sales of the product will take place. There can also be live phone calls of testimonials that could boost product sales and potentially enhance the above factors further, as well as entertainment values, sense of real-time, spontaneity, and interactivity. Sales could go as high as six figures made in one hour with the success of the overall presentation during prime time hours. However, if the demonstration fails to live up to the claims of the product, or if there is evidence the product being shown is not working to its full potential, then it could be a financial disaster for both the product and the network presenting the item.

The infomercial, on the other hand, has been a mainstay on local and network television for years. It has the some of the same characteristics from a home shopping perspective. There is the standard introduction of the product followed by demonstrations of the product by an expert, and re-emphasis of what makes the product so special by discussing or in some cases pushing key selling points. However, there are general differences between the infomercials and the live presentation to consider as well.

For instance, there are hardly any show hosts to introduce the product. There is no one to call in to give live testimonials. The only testimonials may come from the studio audience (if the producers even allow one to participate), or from a pre-recorded interview of a customer that has used the product. Most importantly, the entire presentation is not live. The presentation is shot and recorded in multiple takes. The raw footage is then edited into a viewable linear package to be aired by various stations across the country locally.

This author has worked as a broadcaster at a live home shopping channel for over fourteen years. The positions over the years entailed various work in the control room, studios, and managerial areas regarding broadcasting operations. The tasks involved have always been in some capacity as the executor of the presentation without ever understanding how it works from in front of the camera. Therefore, there is considerable curiosity as to what makes the live presentation strong enough to get hundreds, if not thousands, of people to buy within a certain time frame.

This thesis will provide a literature review that features a history of live programming and the definition of what live broadcast is by today's standards. The review places emphasis on nine different factors that make live presentations effective. Next, there will be an empirical study that examines the nine factors that give strength to live presentations as opposed to recorded presentations of the same product, followed by a discussion of the findings and the limitations of the study. This thesis concludes by discussing the implications of the study for future research and home shopping via television.

## Chapter Two: Literature Review

### A History of Live

History has shown positives in the realm of live television. History expressed this for outsiders so there is a boost of credibility regarding how shows are produced. This has been done since the 1940s with programs showing backstage in the radio medium (LaFollette, 2002). More educational shows were shown on television with *Serving with Science* and *The Nature of Things* as examples, with the latter being a live broadcast lending truth to the behavior of how things work on a scientific level or as LaFollette (2002) phrases it as “realistic re-creation.” There are further points made in regards to scientific shows broadcasted live such as *Museum of Science and Industry* and *Meet Me at the Zoo* were broadcasted live. These shows had regular hosts and guests from various science industries explaining the content and display items that would be of interest to the audience. Other shows would have guests of stature, such as Admiral Chester Nimitz and astronomer Harlow Shapley, to give the show more of an more authentic tone. As television went into the 50’s, the live format started to disappear in favor of more filmed footage or material where it would be difficult to shoot live and therefore had to be recorded (LaFollette, 2002). However, when the recorded format arrived, the format gave what was being shown on television “explanations, gestures, expressions, and exclamations about a successful experiment were all part of the script. Television thrived on rehearsal and preparation-all for the sake of re-creating spontaneity” (LaFollette, 2002, p. 46). Nevertheless, the concern now arises that fact and fiction are now making a

hybrid type of television where people are comfortable with the information received. Instead of broadcasts rich in information, they are now rich in entertainment competing for the audience attention. Recorded television took over and dominated live television for the simple reason that it was easier to make. By doing so, recorded television created a void in credibility and authenticity for these programs.

As the viewing audience moved into contemporary times, concern was expressed over the apparent, degrading importance of live broadcasting. Bourdon (2000) argues in spite of general audience channels broadcasting worldwide, there is more call of narrowcasting or appealing to special niche audiences. It is claimed that themed channels can emphasize live broadcasting along the general audience channels if the programmers wished (Bourdon, 2000). If live is disappearing, then why are there still shows called *Saturday Night Live*, *Primetime Live*, and *Live with Dan Shilon Interviewing*? The continued presence of live shows is because that the liveness of television connects us to people and places in real time and helps us as a society discover things that would never be thought of. In other words, there is a sense of authenticity and truth in live television regardless of its secondary feel in nature. The Barcelona Olympics is cited as an example where stylistic recorded material can blend in well with the liveness of sporting events. Live television can be applicable not only to sports, but variety shows, music shows, amateur presentations on the Internet, etc. With all the options that are found with live television, it is important that people believe what they are seeing. Excitement is stronger with live because of the combination of improvisation and rehearsed work involved. The believability of live broadcast is also enhanced by the presence of unplanned events or even accidents (Bourdon, 2000) The unpredictable nature of live makes it difficult for

people to doubt what they see. By contrast, as Bourdon (2000) points out, the seamless continuity of recorded broadcast leaves some room for doubt in the viewer's mind.

### The Live Context

Elana Levine has done work in regards to television "liveness." Live television's growth was in the 1950s at a time when it overtook film and theater as the popular medium. Owning a television was certainly a privilege. The limitations of time and space were broken by live television. In today's world, television is struggling to survive, and the key to its survival is in live television productions (Levine, 2008). There are further arguments in regards to how credibility is sought by live show producers to fulfilling audience needs. The potential for anything to happen is central to the appeal of live. The potential "train wreck" that is waiting to happen in the live environment is another part of the appeal. The "train wreck" can be defined as when a disaster in a figurative sense has the potential to happen based upon what is being broadcast. An interesting conclusion given by Levine (2008) shows that with the rise of the recorded program, live programming has become less important on television. Live television is more important than ever with the advent of new media such as the Internet and the concepts of live streaming. Furthermore, live has a rapid, if not urgent, production time so any attempts at creativity are taken out of the equation. Removing the creativity aspect and letting the production flow can enhance credibility and authenticity (Levine, 2008).

### Live Home Shopping Variations

There has been discussion regarding how home shopping is now a media phenomenon. At one time (and this speaks from personal experience working these



shows) hosts on the network were doing anything to sell from working with a circus to running around the studio behaving wild. “Brand names, celebrity guests, live remote broadcasts, and studio audiences are all part of today’s television shopping” (Gudelunas, 2006, p. 230). The show hosts for these networks became the equivalent to soap opera stars in that they were not well known outside of the network, just like a star of a soap opera was not well known outside the show they worked on. Also soap operas and the home shopping audiences comprise of mainly stay at home women. Gudelunas (2006) then discusses the media system dependency in this article. Media system dependency is defined as an ecological theory that attempts to explore and explain role of media in society by examining dependency relations. This means that there is a possibility that the home shopping viewer (or at least a certain percentage of them) become so dependent on the show host they are viewing. The dependency generated enables the viewer to buy anything the show host presents because Gudelunas (2006) believes that the show host is talking directly to the viewer almost as if it was their best friend speaking to them. Phone calls and testimonials can make an impact in this area as well because the interaction between viewer and show host is now greater.

The next theory that is presented by Gudelunas (2006) is parasocial interaction. The concept was created back in the 1950s as an illusion that certain media create between the viewer and what is on the media of being face-to-face action. This type of interaction is important for loyal viewership and loyal buyers of the products. There are examinations of the home shopping viewer presented. There are skeptical viewers that are categorized as younger and not really sure if the item is a good, but they will find the presentations funny (Gudelunas, 2006). Odds are these viewers will not really bother

buying in the end. If they do any type of buying, it would most likely be in the e-commerce community. Then there are the practical viewers with an average age of 55. They will watch the presentation and make sound judgments as to buy the item or not. This is dependent on the strength of the presentation as a whole. So in essence, getting the presentation right (since these channels are live) is very important if you want to get these viewers buying. Finally, there are the compulsive buyers and, according to Gudelunas (2006), they are age 59 or older. These individuals look to these channels for companionship. They have the money to buy and the time to spend watching these channels. These customers are more susceptible to having the show hosts be that “best friend” through the world of buying.

Singh, Balasubramanian, and Chakraborty (2000) examined the standard advertisement against the infomercial against the direct experience regarding a product. The primary research involved asked which of the three was the most effective compared to the others. Characteristics of the infomercial are presented in such a way it is pointed out how the infomercial is mainly a combination of the advertisement and the direct experience of a product (Singh et al., 2000). The definitions of the three are immediately examined. An advertisement is a thirty-second presentation of a product where there is hardly a demonstration and considerable acting involved in attempts to make the product memorable to the buyer and in turn buy the product (Singh et al., 2000). Sometimes the use of giving away free samples to test will make the ad more effective. The direct experience definition involves a live demonstration in front of people to show how the product works and what it can do with emphasis on the positive traits of the product. At the same time, there is involvement getting members of the audience in the demonstration

to show effectiveness of the product. The main idea is to try the goods but not to give the goods away. The infomercial definition is an advertisement from fifteen to thirty minutes in length that airs on a television station. This type of advertisement explains what the product is, what it can do, and proceeds to give demonstrations of the product sometimes recorded with a studio audience (Singh et al., 2000).

Comparisons of the three were made by looking at the overall message of the presentation and the cognition, affect, and connotation of the product. Between the definitions and the message examinations, it was concluded that the direct experience is the most powerful in terms of learning mainly due to the direct contact of the product and how to use it. Also customers actively seek information to assess the product and by doing so create a stronger learning experience (Singh et al., 2000). The vicarious learning model is introduced mentioning that it “attempts to change behavior by having an individual observe the actions of others (i.e. models) and the consequences of those behaviors” (Singh et al., 2000, p. 61). This model is important because infomercials promote vicariously for two reasons that are the length of the message and the demonstrations involved. Infomercials also have the luxury of re-emphasizing key points of the product because of its length. This method promotes stronger recall. The direct experience is stronger than infomercials and more effective than advertisements. With the combination of elements of the direct experience and the infomercial, it then becomes understandable why home shopping related channels are successful.

Class ideology is involved in selling to the customer on certain channels (Cook, 2000). The channels looked at were QVC (a.k.a. Quality-Value-Convenience), HSN (a.k.a. The Home Shopping Network), and Q2 (a sister channel affiliated with QVC).

On all three channels, the programming as a whole is to engage and promote consumerism. The home shopping shows consistently reflect social class of the audience. Social class is “that awareness acknowledges economic limitations (when necessary) and simultaneously fosters what be called class anxiety or, more specifically, working-class anxiety” (Cook, 2000, p. 374). The presentations from the channels researched showed that looking rich is portrayed as desirable. The programs are designated for women as the primary consumers. The HSN, QVC, and Q2 networks were examined further in terms of the items they sell. Both channels sold more affordable items much quicker than Q2, which primarily was selling higher end items. Cook (2000) notes that the wealthy buy cheap items for fun while the poor buy expensive items to fit in to the rich side of society. A more important point by Cook (2000) is that while HSN and QVC broadcast live, the Q2 channel showed programming that were presentations of products that were edited for re-broadcast. This type of programming and the higher prices of the items on Q2 lead to its demise in 1998. While Q2 was on the air, financial limitations of customers or what was considered the “in” item of the day were not considered important. This final observation by Cook (2000) shows that viewers of HSN and QVC when informed that the product was displayed as upscale at the time caused the product sales to increase. The study did not address the potential of credibility as a factor for sales and the end of the Q2 channel. However, there is emphasis that the live demonstrations are still a key since HSN and QVC are still on the air.

What are the factors that could possibly make live television strong on home shopping related channels? Could pre-recorded material be just as strong in these factors in spite of what has been cited above? A considerable amount of time has passed

between this literature and today and therefore calls for variables between live and pre-recorded material to be examined. We will examine nine of the variables that may help explain the differences between live and recorded sales presentations based on existing research.

### Credibility

When it comes to live presentations, credibility is a huge factor. Why would anyone buy a product if the product has no honesty within the presentation? No truth in the presentation would hurt it, the product's sales, and the future of the product. Audience perceptions and how they are related to the degrees of credibility within a live presentation environment are looked at (Lee, Park, Lee, & Cameron, 2009). The presentations were specific to news stories and public relations releases. "Previous literature concludes that when people perceive the source or medium carrying the message to be highly credible, they will tend to rely on and use the information more often than people who evaluate it to be less credible" (Lee et al., 2009, p. 310). This research illuminates the difference between public relations and news material with sources attaining stronger credibility. The visual aspects of the material remain memorable in the consumers mind depending on the source according to another argument. Across both sources, when the overall production value is perceived to be high, then the credibility of the complete presentation is thought to be high (Lee et al., 2009). The greater amount of work and precision to detail that is given to the release; there will be a higher degree of acceptance by the population. Presentations have stronger amounts of credibility when placed on television than in the various forms of print media (Lee et al., 2009). Lastly, if the stories can be verified, the credibility will

increase further. This article mainly looked at news presentations and credibility in multiple media environments.

Media outlets are showing more concern for audience perceptions of media credibility (Oyedeji, 2007). An investigation was done regarding how brand credibility affects the attitudes of consumers towards specific brands. Credibility is the main factor that can cause attitude changes, insure success and keep companies as competitive as possible. It was demonstrated that credibility is stronger on television than in newspapers. If people are to take a brand seriously, they can get that perceived credibility from the television medium.

Several research questions were posed ranging from asking what the audience perceptions were for credibility on certain channels to perceptions of quality, loyalty, knowledge, and awareness related to credibility (Oyedeji, 2007). The findings were some channels such as CNN were stronger in credibility than Fox News. There were significant credibility concerns in regards to the four sub-categories listed above. The more subjects had these cognitive sub-categories; the strength of source credibility could be determined. Credibility should be a concern for television because younger generations are getting their information increasingly from the Internet. In order to get these generations to watch television, the level of believability needs to be stronger (Oyedeji, 2007). Media managers should find ways to increase audience perceptions of credibility of their respective media networks.

Credibility in the information age is important for the successful live show sale. Live news credibility can be applied here as to the success of the story. Perceived credibility, according to Kioussis (2001), is mainly a function to source and channel

characteristics. There can be many lines that can influence credibility of channels. Who is delivering the information? Who does the seller represent? What is the medium in which the information is relayed? The limitations of exposure to the medium are a link to the lack of credibility a station carries. The traditional print exposure has more credibility than a television broadcast (Kiouisis, 2001). However, credibility in news is correlated across print, on-line, and broadcasting. One finding in this study is on-line news is perceived as more credible than television news. A potential reason behind this is how on-line sources changed public opinion of media credibility as a whole thus reducing trust in television and increasing trust in newspapers. Watching television is considered a group experience while gathering information from a source is an individual experience hence the lack of bias among group members that would sway an opinion (Kiouisis, 2001). In the end, text-based channels hold credibility for everyone since there is more trust in the written word .

### Authenticity

With authenticity though, one must be ever so careful of potential misleads, omissions, or incorrect statements that could not only harm the authenticity factor but lead to severe litigation on the sellers part. If the product does not appear or perform what it is supposed to do, then what is the point of even selling the item? ‘Bait and Switch’ tactics are not unheard of, but if these tactics are discovered, this could also present problems for the product. There are products that exist that could lead to potential injury of the consumer unless there is a disclaimer of the product given during the sell (Morgan & Stoltman, 1997). If there is no disclaimer, it leads the consumer to believe that the seller may have known that something unfortunate could happen.

Demonstrations can lead a consumer to believe that a product can be used one way when it was meant for something else. To enhance authenticity, advertisers and sellers will need to find ways to reduce the number of injuries to a customer because of their products. It has been suggested that the courts look at the products to see if the consumers have the knowledge of how the product works (Morgan & Stoltman, 1997). The courts do not want to be skeptical of every consumer that brings a claim, but it seems to be happening more often. Legislatures may need to act if there is a potential issue with a product by creating new laws that are for the protection of the consumer and the product's parent company to prevent further litigation. A conclusion found here is that advertising in another language can be misleading to the consumer (Morgan & Stoltman, 1997). Laws at the federal level are needed to try and curb this. Miscommunication can be prevented with advertisers scrutinizing over the ads and selling methods to make sure there are no misunderstandings with the presentations.

Simple word usage is important to the product demonstration being aired. These words if used in the incorrect context can be damaging to authenticity even if they are just small words. A term such as 'puffery' comes to mind in situations such as this. Puffery is defined as "...the difference between precise, testable, factual claim and a vague, untestable, evaluative claim" (Simonson & Holbrook, 1993, p. 217). Puffery dilutes fact from opinion because the statements regarding products are difficult to close to impossible to classify. Puffery is also used as protection to avoid accountability of a claim regarding a product or service. Another definition of puffery addressed is the advertising and representations which praises the product aired with subjective opinions. Issues could arise regarding the preciseness and reliability of the claims made regarding



the product. It now becomes a problem when liability is involved. Since there is no clear protection, now everything is looked at on a case-by-case basis. There are problems defining puffery and also identifying it. Truth is determined by the expertise of the seller.

Lastly, there are attempts to figure out which family member is being identified as the buyer. Who would be more susceptible to buy? To further prove there is no negative puffery, it is asked to what degree the buyer has to access the product to test it before buying (Simonson & Holbrook, 1993). If there is authenticity, then there is lesser liability on the seller. Simonson and Holbrook's (1993) study showed there are contrasting differences in court judgments regarding puffery. However those judgments fall under permissible puffery, in other words puffery that leans more towards truthful advertising. There are underlying factors to be discovered that leads someone to buy a product outside of puffery statements. The final determination in the study is the strength of puffery, and if it is considered such by certain audience members. (Simonson & Holbrook, 1993).

Journalists are assigned to many live from the field reports especially when politics are involved. Live reporting is regarded as very appealing to journalists (Snoeijs, de Vreese, & Semetko, 2002). The dimension of authenticity in this area of broadcasting is important because of the 'seeing is believing' mentality. Importance of the story and involvement between the viewers to the story in question weigh just as strong as authenticity (Snoeijs et al., 2002). Live related broadcasts could possibly be recalled than a field report that is sent into the studio. Live cross talk could be evaluated more positively than field reporting in political arenas. The effects of live recall were significant in the experiments. This was due to the immediacy of the story that is being

presented (Snoeijs et al., 2002). The reports were also thought of more positively than field reports; however there was no support for positive live cross talk for political issues. This could be due to the lack of importance, objectivity, and understandability of the issues at hand. There were conclusions stated that if the live broadcast is of a breaking news nature then it will be looked at as authentic. However, if there is the feeling of rehearsed cross talk in a live environment, then viewers will think differently.

Advertising can teeter between the truths and misleads in accessibility of information and the product itself. Advertising is argued to be one of the most controversial forms of business communications. The argument continues by showing how deceptive it can be and the negative psychological effects it can cause to people involved (Feary, 1992). These same thoughts could possibly apply to vendors. Feary (1992) argues that John Stuart Mill was one of the people responsible for discrediting advertising. When it comes to advertising, this type of speech does not conform to Mill's principles regarding freedom of expression. Another issue Feary (1992) has with Mill is how he supports any special restrictions and regulations on products that are necessary thus leading to a ban on ads completely. Feary (1992) then argues how the Virginia State Board of Pharmacy case ruling which protected ads because of the necessary information needed for the consumer to make an appropriate purchase, created a free flow of information for ads. Another example used involved *Talsky v. Department of Registration and Education*, which emphasized truth in health advertising because of the critical importance of health information on consumers. *Central Hudson Gas and Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission* is another case where information is important to strengthen the message given by the company. There are arguments on a

philosophical level where advertising should be taken seriously. These ideas are how accessibility in advertising gives us the ability to make autonomous decisions (Feary, 1992). The industry will thrive as long as advertising is true and does not mislead in any way and has no misinformation that is made accessible. To complicate matters, states are making commercial speech rulings on their level, instead of the federal level, creates multiple unclear definitions of what should be in fact protected. It is then suggested that if advertising regulation (and thus accessibility) is kept at the federal level, then there can be considerable adherence by companies to abide by their regulations (Feary, 1992). Until changes as above can be made then there is no true legitimacy in product's information. This could hinder choices to make decisions on buying products.

Do consumers recognize something that is misleading or incorrect advertising? A study in web related advertising attempted to answer this question. With the rise of the Internet, it gave organizations a chance to get consumers observing "simulated direct experiences" with a product (Mitra, Raymond, & Hopkins, 2008). When claims are made, the information on those claims is readily available on the Internet. The downside of this type of rapid growth makes skeptical consumers worried they are being exposed to misleading advertisement (Mitra et al., 2008). There are concerns which could rise with the Internet for advertising. The environment could make the consumer feel he/she is at the demonstration and the experience of telepresence. Telepresence is the sense of being in a remote environment that can give the consumer the direct experience (Mitra et al., 2008). Results of the study showed that computer-mediated direct product learning could lead to stronger beliefs and positive attitudes regarding the product. Media richness as well can lead to how consumers perceive truth from fiction in ads found on-line.

Whether or not a consumer will believe what they see depends on how truthful the ad was and the level of involvement of the consumer on the Internet.

### Involvement

How do the host and guest involve themselves with the product? Do presentations have elements of intimacy? Have the host and guest engaged the viewer in such a way that purchasing the product is inevitable? Personal relevance of the product between the show host and the viewer could be important. Hogan (2006) starts off with simplicity by explaining the definitions of the words “covert”, “persuade”, and “persuasion.” The main idea is to “bypass the critical factor of the human mind without the process being known to the receiver of the message” (Hogan, 2006, p. 3). There is the necessity to discuss ethics of this type of practice early on. The first idea addressed is having the subject think of a different memory than the one that is in their head about the topic being discussed. Another idea mentioned is to immediately agree with subject’s point of view. It relieves any potential tension that may come.

The next issue discussed is how people will immediately use the answer “no” (Hogan, 2006). This word can be argued to be a natural defense mechanism. The first steps to have the subject say “yes” is to get them to remember a positive related experience tied to the concern the seller may have. One can guide the subject by explaining what the future can look like if he/she says “yes.” Using this technique requires deeper thoughts and explanations as to how things will work out. Finally, the seller needs to get the subject to act out the positive behavior to get the positive response.

Hogan (2006) at this point feels the seller has the subject they want to persuade where they want them. It is time to use specific tactics to seal the deal. The first tactic

discussed is to rapidly build a rapport with the target (Hogan, 2006). The seller must try to keep the conversation as positive as possible. Try to keep things friendly so the rapport will remain on a consistent level. The next step is to use interesting content to create and build such rapport. This works by discovering what the interests of the target's are and molding the seller's own ideas around the target's to feel comfortable. This will give the target's ideas of thinking that they are like the seller in these ways and the trust process will grow stronger (Hogan, 2006). Then the seller must proceed to use processes to build rapport. The processes which need to be used are doing the same activities as the target's to enhance the seller's similarities. One can discuss commonalities of work, business, and families to make the other feel better. Synchronization of the target is the next area to proceed to. "First, you must begin where the other person is; he must feel that you are just like him. He must identify with you on some level for you to have any power to persuade" (Hogan, 2006, p.49). The next step is to synchronize each of their voices. The seller's vocal pace is the same as the target's. It is important to mirror the pace of the target and remain on that level throughout. This also applies to breathing, posture and movement, and vocal tone/pitch. The next step is where the seller moves to reciprocity. This is where the seller does something for the target and the target will do something for the seller. Then the seller can share what kind of person they are with the target.

Hogan (2006) then proceeds to discuss twenty keys to succeed using covert persuasion in a story. Get the listeners attention as quickly as possible. Get to the point of intentions early so time is not wasted. Sort out in what the target should think or feel when the story is told. Make sure the purpose is as clear and concise as possible to your

target. Make sure any revelations will touch your target in an emotional way. Share information in a simple manner and be humble while doing this (Hogan, 2006). Make visualizations as vivid as possible and avoid what the future could bring in the presentation. One needs to make sure that all information that is given during the presentation is verifiable. The last thing anyone needs is to hear claims that cannot be backed up. The next task is to find ways to have others that have benefited from the experience relay it to the target. Testimonials such as these can enhance results that would work for the seller (Hogan, 2006). It is important that the seller can inspire the target to make actions that will benefit all. All of these keys can establish positive involvement from the target.

In other areas of researching involvement, there have been studies that address marketing, and the hows and whys of the shopping experience through various media. Graves (2010) simply begins by stating if something is plausible to us, then we will automatically treat it as genuine. The things we wish to buy are all based on beliefs and perceptions. Arguments are made how marketing researchers are wrong in many respects regarding people. “The fact that people react similarly to consistently executed questioning process doesn’t tell us anything other than that the cause-and-effect relationship of such research is consistent” (Graves, 2010, p. 3). Focus groups and discussions do not work much because there is always someone leading the conversation and others in the group will just agree with him/her. There must be more concern in regards to the here and now and not what people may do or even possibly consider (Graves, 2010).

There is information for us about the unconscious reasons of why we buy things but we have no explanation for it (Graves, 2010). The Pepsi Challenge is example of how the unconscious can work to a groups benefit. The challenge was a blind taste test between Coke and Pepsi. People like Pepsi better than Coke in the test; however this was done in one taste sitting. If it was done in several sittings, the odds are, one would know what the drink is and pick that instead. New Coke was developed because of this challenge. The product backfired because no one took into account what the unconscious mind was thinking. Basically if one does something enough times, it becomes so ingrained in their head that when one does it, one does not even think about the fact that they are doing it. In an experiment, people were provided with data on washing machines that they can purchase (Graves, 2010). With this data, the subjects could make an informed decision on which brand of washing machine to buy. The subjects proceeded to buy a washing machine from a product brand that they have used before and are familiar with. This was done regardless of what kind of information was given about it, even if it was good or bad (Graves, 2010). The subjects bought the item because of their familiarity and trust in the brand. Once someone is used to doing something or buying a particular brand, it is hard to break that person of that habit on the unconscious level.

### Urgency

How important is it for the viewer to have that item right now? How much of a priority is there to buy that item off of television at that moment? Live broadcasts streamed through the Internet are just as important. The streaming of live presentations “make it appear as if representations are unmediated because images and texts seem to be presented on the screen at the same time as the viewer is watching” (White, 2006, p.

342). Direct addresses on-line is aware of the personal interests of the user and at the same time attempting to tailor make the presentation to the viewer's buying habits, behaviors, wants, and needs (White, 2006). There are considerations that the Internet is currently one giant advertisement that attempts to seduce the viewer to doing what it wants. Webcam sites are the chief reasons why people are attracted to the Internet and why people ignore what is going on around them. These sites have the greatest appeal of the desires of the viewer, which can lead them to where they would like to go. When not used properly though, the Internet could possibly find too much of the user. Narratives attempt to reach the user may be obscured by the sites themselves which raises the question of how trusting can these live streaming camera sites be.

Perceptions in realism, accessibility, and urgency can be another critical factor as well. Television in general can affect a person's judgment. Heavier viewers in television are apt to make quicker judgments (Busselle, 2001). There are arguments presented showing that there are three reasons for exemplar urgency. The first reason is greater frequency. More recent views of a channel will cause people to do things. Second, information comes from examples whether true or not. Third, examples are presented will affect subsequent judgments in those examples. The possible reason why some events are memorable while some are not is because when the aftermath of the event is shown, it makes the presentation less involved and memorable to the point where people will forget passively (Busselle, 2001). When a decision such as buying a product is made, people evaluate how they came to this important decision. This move is found to be very counter-productive and can cause serious doubts in the purchase. In order for something to be urgent, its presentation must be quick so it can be remembered. Items



that measure perceived realism must be looked at to insure the right decisions are always made in a social context (Busselle, 2001). There must be a fine line between social conceptions and perceived reality. What we decide based on this type of realism will certainly affect the outcome of our real life decisions.

### *Informativeness*

Is the presentation rich in information about the product and how it works?

Informativeness could be another factor in the equation of home shopping presentations and products. Arguments suggest one way exposure to the media may help the judgment of enhancing informativeness (Busselle & Shrum, 2003). This can help the information given aid in rendering a final judgment in picking the appropriate product. If informativeness is manipulated, beware of unintended positive or negative effects. There are cultivation effects occurring through the television giving the idea of informativeness. It is stated that the more television viewing is involved with the product, the greater the possibility the product will be bought (Busselle & Shrum, 2003). Judgments from viewers and shoppers will be arrived at more quickly through this medium.

Informativeness can be attributed to three factors, which are vividness, realism and distinctiveness (Busselle & Shrum, 2003). Vivid demonstrations are more likely to attract attention. Distinctive demonstrations can show how the product is unique compared to products that may be similar to a certain degree. Realistic demonstrations exemplify the truth in the product leads to the selling of the product. Media exposure can increase accessibility of what is being shown. The ease of retrieving the item in question can be with the increased impression of informativeness. If there is experience in informativeness lacking in consumers, it has a profound effect of how strong the interest

of the product will result negatively (Busselle & Shrum, 2003). If informativeness of what is being shown is not re-enforced constantly, it can increase the lack of memory regarding it, which will have a significant negative effect on product consumption again.

There have been discussions with regard to how images make a powerful impression on others. Pratkanis and Aronson (2001) immediately use an example of a prosecution gone wrong. The prosecutor blames advertising for why things did not work. Another image that was used to create impact was a rape shown on a television show. The intent was to show how horrifying the experience is and what to do if this may happen. A frightening example given is when in 1982, someone was poisoning bottles of Tylenol. Because of the images shown, they inspired copycats who were poisoning in the same method. Images can make a considerable impact on others, positive or negative (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001). There are outlines that discuss how Americans are exposed to a huge amount of advertising and various other images on a daily basis. This can influence Americans to take action, both good and bad. These actions can take place not only at home but also at work where managers hold meetings and use visuals to impact employees in a certain way. The society we live in has accepted being persuaded. Other societies do not give people the kind of options that ours give. With the rise of mediums such as newspapers, radio, and television and now the Internet we have become the ultimate example of a persuasive society (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001).

There are four strategies of influence with regard to informativeness. The first is to take charge of the situation one is involved in and make the message one presents in a comfortable environment (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001). Then one must establish source credibility by way of creating favorable images in the minds of the target audience

(Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001). The next step is to focus the message in a way that keeps the attention of the target audience. Lastly, arouse the emotions of target audience and get them to respond to the course of action one wishes to pursue through those emotions. The examples of these actions are Abraham Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address, the labeling that comes from Rush Limbaugh and the case of Paul Ingram's alleged crimes against his daughters. By using the above tactics, Lincoln was able to boost the morale of his country, Limbaugh is able to raise anger against certain people in the government, and Paul Ingram's conviction was upheld (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001).

The arguments used in communication to induce thoughts in others that in some cases may be true (Lincoln's Gettysburg Address) or in other cases may seem outlandish (Limbaugh and Ingram), regardless of what is being said, people will remember and process it in such a way in which no matter what the facts are, what is said must be true (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001). In order to insure that one does not fall into these types of traps it is suggested that, "the goal becomes to prove yourself superior and right no matter what. We become dependent on those who will support our masquerade." (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001, p. 66).

### Entertaining Value

Are these presentations enjoyable to watch while at the same time trying to help one make an informed decision about purchasing the item? As to continuing further with overall perceptions of the home shopping media, it is important to stress the way advertisements are perceived as important with regards to their effectiveness. Well-liked ads are more effective in the grand scheme (Aaker & Bruzzone, 1981). It is possible where well-liked product demonstrations can be just as effective on the sale of the

product. Various inquiries made by Aaker and Bruzzone (1981) were made about the overall appeal of the commercial. Can the friendliness and affinity of personalities related to the commercial create support for or against associations to viewer reactions? Are there perceptions of the personalities and their friendly personalities in the presentations which could be considered intrusive or just wrong to the viewer?

There were four factors found which may be responsible in creating positive reactions of viewers when commercial presentations are given. The first factor is the “dislike” factor which measured if the viewer’s felt comfortable with the presentation or did it make them feel uneasy about they saw (Aaker & Bruzzone, 1981). There is the “entertaining” factor which is measured by how amusing the overall presentation was to the viewing audience. The “warmth” factor shows how friendly the commercial could be to family, children, and friends. The final factor is of “personal relevance” defined as presenting useful information to the viewer. Collectively, these factors could be important with regard to the positive perceptions of the overall presentation and the product itself (Aaker & Bruzzone, 1981).

### *Sense of Real Time*

Is what we are seeing giving us the idea that this presentation is in fact happening right now? Does this sense of “as it is happening” mentality make a difference in terms of buying the item? The news industry visually got its first exposure by way of the newsreel and became popular worldwide as the best delivery system for the news during the 1940s (Althaus, 2010). The reason for this popularity was because this type of news was shot while actual events were happening. This was the historical equivalent of satellite news. It was considered stronger because of the larger and more diverse

audiences that existed at the time. Could these newsreels be the pre-cursor to live television? The newsreel has now become a forgotten medium instead of it being the main contribution for the types of news that we as a society are used to (Althaus, 2010). Granted that this footage was edited before it reached the theaters, it still showed the events as they were taking place. This made live events more important to the medium but also to the distributors who produced it and the theater owners that were financially dependent on it (Althaus, 2010).

Live television, with its real time aspects, can put particular pressure on the government. The “CNN effect” is taken into account for consideration for real time coverage of news events to the point where foreign policy is concerned (Gilboa, 2003). The “CNN effect” is when the news events that are covered in real-time will affect the policies of other entities including the United States Government. There are positive and negative effects that may come of this. The negative effects are when the events are shown on television; it forces the government to make a swift decision that results from what is being seen by the viewers for the sake of national interest. The positive effects are when the footage is shown in real time it causes “direct communication with foreign leaders” (Gilboa, 2003, p. 98). “Breaking News” is seen by policy makers as intensification for an immediate response to what is taking place. Gilboa (2003) feels this type of coverage applies this pressure on purpose to see if they can change policy to their benefit. If the policy is changed that hinders the press, then they become overly critical of what has been decided. It becomes a Catch-22 for the policy makers as soon as the real time footage comes to air. With the advent of twenty-four hour news stations, it makes policy making decisions even more complex. Lastly, Gilboa (2003) suggests there

should be contingency plans in case something is aired so government officials will be ready for potential responses. Communication experts should play a role with policy makers regarding the messages being given with the footage to insure there is no decrease in diplomacy with any other foreign entities involved.

### Spontaneity

Things suddenly happen during a live presentation, good or bad, can have implications in terms of purchasing a product. When it comes to broadcasters, “Liveness in the sense that they express a desire to please audiences by engaging them in a spontaneous, informal, unscripted ‘here and now’” (Lundell, 2009, p. 271). There are expressions of how ‘liveness’ can be impartial, objective, balanced, and versatile when scripts for live shows are done correctly. Lundell (2009) further defines ‘liveness’ as events that connect us as they happen. ‘Liveness’ is connected to authenticity and truth. In order to keep interviews as genuine as possible, scripted live is preferred. There is always a chance though that someone will go off the script to create the spontaneity that is desired by the audience. Authenticity is stronger in the live environment with the use of a live studio audience and their participation within the program (Lundell, 2009). With a live studio audience there is a certain amount of risk where audience members will ask questions that may seem awkward to the interview subject. In order to minimize that risk, the producers will have questions prepared. This can make one doubt what he or she watches on television even if the material is live. These doubts could deteriorate the spontaneity, credibility, and authenticity of the overall show. There is now more control of live on the air performances than ever before with a show being rigorously scripted.

### Interactivity

Conversations and interactions between the show host and guest with a phone caller could help people make up their minds about buying the product. If there is a testimonial involved in the conversation, there is a good chance that sales of the item in question could be elevated further. One study looked at the interactivity of live reality television broadcasts in which the viewer votes on contestants with real time taken into account. Kjus (2009) looks at how well regulated these shows are and if the production values are consistent. Events that are live and immediate are protected from time-shifting technologies which may cause harm to the advertising revenues of archived television genres. The music, fashion, tourism, and business fields depend on the strength of credibility these live shows have. There is evidence these shows and their voting mechanisms have been tampered with which will need to be addressed. The live events could create connections between the audience and the advertiser. These connections could create giant marketing strategies that can be financially beneficial (Kjus, 2009). The live event can only last for a short time. With the right marketing and freedom from scandal, these live dimensions increase the value of the production and keep the voting mechanisms completely legal. Live keeps these commercial industries regulated (Kjus, 2009).

### Research Questions

In light of the literature review and the numerous factors that can be investigated, the nine specific factors above are potential keys to the success and failures of live presenting and recorded presenting of products to be sold via the television. One can go

on further to inquire which way to present a product on television is stronger. With this in mind, this study can begin by asking:

- RQ1: Does live TV product sales presentation generate stronger perceived credibility than recorded sales presentation?
- RQ2: Does live TV product sales presentation generate stronger perceived authenticity than recorded sales presentation?

Credibility and authenticity are predicted to be considerably stronger and the recorded equivalent of the presentation. For live to be the stronger variable, the presentation in this study must be honest at all time. The demonstrations in the presentation for this study should always work. Authenticity should reflect there is no types of ‘puffery’. The presentation should feature claims that are genuine to the point where it would convince someone to buy the item. Furthermore, in order to insure that there will be discoveries found to strengthen the differences between live and recorded, the following questions were also posed:

- RQ3: Does live TV product sales presentation generate stronger viewer involvement than recorded sales presentation?
- RQ4: Does live TV product sales presentation generate a stronger sense of urgency to purchase the product than recorded sales presentation?
- RQ5: Does live TV product sales presentation generate stronger perceived informativeness than recorded sales presentation?
- RQ6: Does live TV product sales presentation generate stronger entertaining value than recorded sales presentation?
- RQ7: Does live TV product sales presentation generate a stronger sense of “real time” than recorded sales presentation?

With involvement, there needs to be an examination that looks at how engaging and intimate the presentation and product was overall. Urgency will be broken down as



to how quickly the buyers should item. How much of a rush is there to purchase item before it is too late. Research question five will be determined by the amount of facts given by the show host and/or guest. Was there enough information given to the point that an informed decision could be made by the viewer? Entertainment will encompass the fun aspects of the presentation overall. Since the product is airing either live or recorded, do the sense of “real time” issues affect the judgment of the viewer/shopper to make the purchase? Will the viewer want to buy the product at the end of the presentation?

RQ8: Does live TV product sales presentation generate a stronger feeling of spontaneity than recorded sales presentation?

RQ9: Does live TV product sells presentation generate a stronger feeling of interactivity than recorded sales presentation?

The last factors to be examined to show differences between live and recorded are spontaneity and interactivity. Does the presentation have a natural or unscripted feel to it that there is no time to be creative and therefore make one realize that this presentation has a realistic feel to the point of buying the product? Also does the presentation have enough interactivity between the host/guest and the buyer that it would strengthen the presentation to where it would convince others to buy the product?

Ultimately the nine factors examined in this study are expected to mediate viewers' attitude toward the sales presentation and the product, which in turn mediate viewers' intentions to purchase or use the product. The following research questions pertaining to attitudes, purchase intentions and their relationships with the nine factors were thus raised.

RQ10. Does live TV product sales presentation generate a more positive attitude toward the presentation than recorded sales presentation?

RQ11. Does live TV product sales presentation generate a more positive attitude toward the product than recorded sales presentation?

RQ12. Does live TV product sales presentation generate stronger purchase intentions than recorded sales presentation?

RQ13: To what extent can the nine factors be used to determine viewers' attitudes toward live and recorded sales presentations and the product?

RQ14: To what extent can the nine factors be used to determine viewers' intentions to purchase the product after exposure to live and recorded sales presentations?

### Chapter Three: Methodology

#### Participants

There were a total of 231 participants in this study. All were undergraduate students that were participating in summer courses from either the Mass Communications or Communications curriculum at the University of South Florida. The participants in this group fell into the 18-23 age bracket with the mean at age 21. The majority of the subjects were female (155=female, 76=male). The reason that undergraduate students were chosen for this study is that this age group will be the future of the home shopping industry. This age group will eventually determine what products will succeed and fail for future home shopping ventures on any channel as they get older. This group will also potentially determine the success of the actual home shopping related channel and give us insight as to where the future of home shopping will potentially lead. The courses that were chosen for recruitment were based upon class size, availability of the class to the researcher, and also to insure there would be little to no repeat participants since some of the subjects would be taking multiple courses during the semester. Eleven course instructors willingly gave consent for the study to take place during class time. The study was given either at the very beginning or almost end of class depending on the instructors needs for the class for the day the study was to take place for no more than fifteen minutes per class. In order to insure randomization as to which class got to see the live presentation or the recorded presentation, a lot was drawn from a hat with one paper showing live and the other showing recorded. Whichever one was picked, that was the

one that was used. However, at the point where there was clearly more of one group picked than another, then the opposite variable lot would be chosen to balance the study participants out so there would be an equal amount between live and recorded when the data collection was completed.

Table 1

## Distribution of Participants' Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	76	32.9	32.9	32.9
Valid Female	155	67.1	67.1	100.0
Total	231	100.0	100.0	

Table 2

## Distribution of Participants' Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Caucasian	142	61.5	61.5	61.5
African American	31	13.4	13.4	74.9
Latin American	30	13.0	13.0	87.9
Valid Asian American	11	4.8	4.8	92.6
Middle Eastern	1	.4	.4	93.1
Other	16	6.9	6.9	100.0
Total	231	100.0	100.0	

Table 3

## Distribution of Participants Age

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	231	18	23	21.02	1.268
Valid N (listwise)	231				

### Design

[post-test only with presentation format (live vs. recorded) as the between-subject factor.]

In order to find differences between live and recorded presentation, the study was done in an experimental format. This design manipulates the live and recorded variables. The manipulation is to convince each respective group that the presentation viewed was in fact live, or a presentation taking place at this moment, or recorded or a presentation that was shot in one or more takes and various elements edited and replayed as a package for later viewing. After the viewing, the study participants then voluntarily answered a questionnaire that involved factors such as credibility, authenticity, urgency, etc. The participants were asked to answer the questions truthfully based upon what they saw and were told by the examiner. One hundred and nineteen participants viewed the live presentation while 113 viewed the recorded presentation.

### Stimulus Materials

The only material that was the stimulus was the actual home shopping presentation that was viewed by everyone in the experiment. The presentation was recorded off HSN (a.k.a. The Home Shopping Network) during the 5:00 p.m. hour on Friday May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012. The product being sold during the presentation was called the “Green Boxes”. The item is described as a way to keep your vegetable items for a much longer time than what could be used with ordinary plastic containers one would use for the refrigerator. There are various important points in the presentation which feature one or more factors that have been noted by the researcher (but not revealed to the test participants) that can be found in Appendix D. The presentation included what one would get if they purchased it. There were differences shown between the foods used

with the plastic containers or Green Box containers for three weeks. There were demonstrations of how to use the Green Boxes in the refrigerator. There was a phone call from a new buyer who was familiar with the guest and previous items the guest had sold on the network. The presentation also featured on graphics shows that were coming up later in the day, shows that were coming up in the following weeks, how many of the product were sold up to that point, and how much time was left to buy this item.

### Procedure

The experimental sessions took place in classrooms where the eleven courses were taking place during the semester. Either at the beginning or towards the end of class for no more than fifteen minutes, the examiner would welcome everyone and then read off instructions (see Appendix C) stating what the study is, what they are about to view, whether it is live or recorded, expectations while watching the presentation, and expectations of what to do when the presentation is finished. The script read took approximately two minutes. For the live group, while the script was being read, the image of HSN.com and the mouse arrow pointing at the “live-stream” was shown as another way to convince the students that what they were about to see was live. The recorded subjects did not see anything on the screen prior to the presentation. This group just had to listen to what was read off the script. Once the script was completely read, then the examiner would go to the computer, turn off the HSN.com “live-stream” image, and then turn on the “Green Boxes” presentation. The actual presentation took six and half minutes to play. When the presentation was finished, then the test subjects were given the choice to participate and if so to fill out the consent form that was on a separate page in front of the questionnaire. Once the subjects consented, then they had to fill out a

five page questionnaire that contained thirty-six questions. Out of the thirty-six questions, twenty seven dealt with the nine factors discussed in the literature review (each factor was measured at three interrelated questions per factor, hence twenty-seven questions). Subjects had to rank from one to five or Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree respectively with three being neutral. There were three questions with the questionnaire (Questions 10, 20, and 30) that involved a manipulation check to make sure all participants believed whether or not the presentation they viewed was live or recorded. These questions were measured the same as the first twenty-seven. Three questions measured the attitudes of what was viewed for the overall presentation, the product itself, and if the subjects would buy the product. The last three questions asked of a subject's sex, age, and ethnicity. When the questionnaire was complete, the examiner took the finished questionnaires and the coded them to prepare for analysis of the results.

#### Dependent Measures

In order to measure the nine factors, there were three questions for each factor that was measured on a 5-point Likert Scale. Internal consistency is found on table 4. Items pertaining to each of the nine factors were averaged to create a composite measure of that factor.

Table 4  
Cronbach's Alpha of the Nine Factors

Factor	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Credibility	The presentation was trustworthy. The presentation was believable. The presentation was truthful.	0.807
Authenticity	The presentation was authentic. The presentation's information was precise. The presentation was making claims that were genuine.	0.725
Involvement	The presentation was intimate. The presentation was engaging. The presentation was personally relevant.	0.688
Urgency	The presentation gave a sense of urgency to purchase the item. The presentation was convincing me to buy the item right now. The presentation was prompting me to take action to buy the item.	0.744
Informativeness	The presentation contained sufficient product information. The presentation was giving an informative demonstration. The presentation was instructive.	0.707
Entertainment	This presentation was pleasurable to watch. The presentation was interesting to watch. The presentation was entertaining overall.	0.878
Sense of real-time	The presentation made me feel the need to purchase the product immediately. I felt like buying the product while watching the presentation. The presentation made me want to act before time runs out.	0.861
Spontaneity	The presentation was natural. The presentation appeared to be unscripted. The presentation was spontaneous.	0.690
Interactivity	The presentation enabled two-way conversation between the host/guest and the buyer. The presentation had responsive conversation between host/guest and the buyer. There were interactions between host/guest and the buyer.	0.790

Note: All items were measured using a 5-point the Likert Scale (1: Strongly Disagree, 5: Strongly Agree). Items pertaining to each of the nine factors were averaged to create a composite measure of that factor.



On the questionnaire, items were inquired to test participants about their attitude towards the presentation and their attitude towards the actual product on a 7-point semantic scale. Internal consistency is found on table 5. As with the factors, the items for the attitudes were averaged to make the composite measure.

Table 5  
Cronbach's Alphas of Attitude Measures

Factor	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Attitude toward Presentation	Overall, your assessment of the sales PRESENTATION is: Good/Bad, Like/Dislike, Positive/Negative, Favorable/Unfavorable	.928
Attitude toward Product	Overall, your assessment of the PRODUCT in the presentation is: Good/Bad, Like/Dislike, Positive/Negative, Favorable/Unfavorable	.957

Note: All items were measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale. Items pertaining to each attitudes were averaged to create a composite measure.

## Chapter 4: Results

### Manipulation Check

For each experimental condition (live vs. recorded), three questions were included in the questionnaire to determine if the experiment successfully manipulated the independent variable of interest. Specifically, participants in the live condition were asked to judge if (1) the presentation was similar to other live presentations, (2) the presentation was a typical live sales presentation on television, (3) it was clear to them that the presentation was a live broadcast on a 5-point Likert scale. Likewise, participants in the recorded condition were asked to judge on a Likert scale if (1) the presentation was similar to other pre-recorded presentations seen on television, (2) the presentation was a typical pre-recorded sales presentations on television, (3) it was clear to them that the presentation was a prerecorded broadcast. Results (see Table 6) indicate that the manipulation was successful. The vast majority of participants in the live condition strongly agreed, agreed or felt neutral that (1) the sales presentation was similar to other live presentations (97.5%), (2) it was a typical live presentation (96.7%), and (3) it was clear to them the presentation was live (85.7%). Similarly, the vast majority of participants in the recorded condition strongly agreed, agreed or felt neutral that (1) the presentation was similar to other pre-recorded sales presentations (93.8%), (2) it was a typical pre-recorded presentation (96.4%), and (3) it was clear to them the presentation was pre-recorded (92.9%).

Table 6  
Manipulation Checks

	Percent (n) strongly agree, agree or neutral
Live Condition (n=119)	
The presentation was similar to other live presentations.	97.5% (116)
The presentation was a typical live sales presentation on TV.	96.7% (115)
It was clear to me that the presentation was a live broadcast.	85.7% (102)
Recorded Condition (n=112)	
The presentation was similar to other pre-recorded presentations on TV.	93.8% (105)
The presentation was a typical pre-recorded sales presentation on TV.	96.4% (108)
It was clear to me that the presentation was a prerecorded broadcast.	92.9% (104)

### RQ1-9: Differences in the Nine Factors

The mean scores of the nine factors are presented in Table 7. A series of t-tests were performed to answer RQ 1 to 9 regarding the differences in the nine factors between live and recorded conditions. Results (Table 8) indicate that the differences in all nine factors reached statistical significance. Specifically, compared to the recorded presentation, the live presentation generated stronger perceived credibility ( $t=6.47$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger perceived authenticity ( $t=6.94$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger viewer involvement ( $t=8.65$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger sense of urgency to buy ( $t=6.76$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger perceived informativeness ( $t=7.74$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger entertaining value ( $t=6.19$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger sense of real-time ( $t=3.96$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ), stronger feeling of spontaneity ( $t=10.8$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ) and stronger feeling of interactivity ( $t=4.27$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Table 7  
Descriptive Statistics: Live vs. Recorded

	Live Or Recorded	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Credibility	Live	119	3.3361	.72550	.06651
	Recorded	112	2.7500	.64608	.06105
Authenticity	Live	119	3.4146	.65234	.05980
	Recorded	112	2.8274	.63116	.05964
Involvement	Live	119	3.4818	.75875	.06955
	Recorded	112	2.6667	.66667	.06299
Urgency	Live	119	3.5098	.91937	.08428
	Recorded	112	2.7262	.83494	.07889
Informativeness	Live	119	3.6863	.69202	.06344
	Recorded	112	3.0060	.63904	.06038
Entertainment	Live	119	3.3810	.93809	.08599
	Recorded	112	2.6726	.78904	.07456
Time	Live	119	2.6975	.99527	.09124
	Recorded	112	2.2083	.86891	.08210
Spontaneity	Live	119	3.2521	.71567	.06560
	Recorded	112	2.2917	.62019	.05860
Interactivity	Live	119	3.5798	.83639	.07667
	Recorded	112	3.1131	.82206	.07768

Table 8  
T-test Results: Live vs. Recorded

	t-test for Equality of Means			
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Credibility	6.47	229	.000	.58613
Authenticity	6.94	229	.000	.58718
Involvement	8.65	229	.000	.81513
Urgency	6.76	229	.000	.78361
Informativeness	7.74	229	.000	.68032
Entertainment	6.19	229	.000	.70833
Time	3.96	229	.000	.48915
Spontaneity	10.8	229	.000	.96043
Interactivity	4.27	229	.000	.46674

### RQ10-12: Differences in Attitudes and Purchase Intentions

Table 9 presents the mean values of attitude toward the presentation, attitude toward the product, and purchase intentions. T-tests showed that participants in the live condition had more positive attitude toward the presentation ( $t=2.061$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p<.05$ ) than those in the recorded condition. However, there was no significant difference in attitude toward the product ( $t=1.362$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p=.175$ ) and purchase intentions ( $t=.263$ ,  $df=229$ ,  $p=.792$ ) between live and recorded conditions.

Table 9  
Descriptive Statistics of Attitudes & Purchase Intentions

	Live Or Recorded	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Attitude toward Presentation	Live	119	4.5042	1.24447	.11408
	Recorded	112	4.1518	1.35415	.12796
Attitude toward product	Live	119	4.7626	1.33040	.12196
	Recorded	112	4.5223	1.35007	.12757
Purchase Intention	Live	119	2.40	1.011	.093
	Recorded	112	2.37	1.139	.108

Table 10  
T-tests of Attitudes and Purchase Intentions

	t-test for Equality of Means			
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Attitude toward Presentation	2.061	229	.040	.35242
Attitude toward Product	1.362	229	.175	.24028
Purchase Intention	.263	229	.792	.03701

#### RQ13-14: The Nine Factors, Attitudes and Purchase Intentions

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to better delineate the relative importance of the nine factors in mediating attitudes and purchase intentions. Table 11 shows the results of regressing the nine factors (the predictor variables) on attitude toward the presentation (the criterion variable) across live and recorded conditions. Of the nine factors, four reached statistical significance: Entertainment value ( $\beta=.400$ ,  $t=6.221$ ,  $p<.001$ ), sense of real time ( $\beta=.375$ ,  $t=3.496$ ,  $p<.001$ ), perceived credibility ( $\beta=.272$ ,  $t=3.496$ ,  $p<.01$ ), perceived urgency ( $\beta=-.168$ ,  $t=-2.52$ ,  $p<.02$ ). The  $R^2$  for the model was .571 (Adjusted  $R^2 = .554$ ), indicating that approximately 57% of the variance

of the participants' attitude toward the presentation could be accounted for by the linear combination of the nine factors.

Table 11  
Regression Results from Live & Recorded Conditions  
Criterion: Attitude toward Presentation

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.906	.317		2.863	.005
Credibility	.477	.137	.272	3.496	.001
Authenticity	.220	.157	.118	1.402	.162
Involvement	-.098	.114	-.062	-.859	.391
Urgency	-.229	.091	-.168	-2.520	.012
Informativeness	-.061	.115	-.035	-.526	.599
Entertainment	.559	.090	.400	6.221	.000
Time	.508	.094	.375	5.430	.000
Spontaneity	-.085	.096	-.053	-.888	.376
Interactivity	-.060	.081	-.040	-.742	.459

$R^2 = .571$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .554$ )

When attitude toward the product was treated as the criterion variable, five factors (see Table 12) reached statistical significance: Perceived credibility ( $\beta=.445$ ,  $t=5.551$ ,  $p<.001$ ), sense of real time ( $\beta=.429$ ,  $t=6.041$ ,  $p<.001$ ), entertainment value ( $\beta=.158$ ,  $t=2.392$ ,  $p<.02$ ), involvement ( $\beta=-.157$ ,  $t=-2.124$ ,  $p<.04$ ), perceived interactivity ( $\beta=-.133$ ,  $t=-2.42$ ,  $p<.02$ ).

Table 12  
Regression Results from Live & Recorded Conditions  
Criterion: Attitude toward Product

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.545	.334		4.625	.000
Credibility	.799	.144	.445	5.551	.000
Authenticity	.086	.165	.045	.523	.602
Involvement	-.256	.121	-.157	-2.124	.035
Urgency	-.062	.096	-.044	-.647	.518
Informativeness	.100	.122	.056	.819	.414
Entertainment	.227	.095	.158	2.392	.018
Time	.596	.099	.429	6.041	.000
Spontaneity	-.149	.101	-.092	-1.479	.141
Interactivity	-.208	.086	-.133	-2.420	.016

$R^2=.547$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .529$ )



Table 13 shows regression results using purchase intentions as the criterion variable. The only two factors that reached statistical significance were sense of time ( $\beta=.716$ ,  $t=10.348$ ,  $p<.001$ ) and perceived spontaneity ( $\beta=-.146$ ,  $t=-2.42$ ,  $p<.02$ ).

Table 13  
Regression Results from Live & Recorded Conditions  
Criterion: Purchase Intentions

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.285	.260		1.094	.275
Credibility	.207	.112	.144	1.842	.067
Authenticity	.039	.129	.026	.304	.761
Involvement	-.105	.094	-.080	-1.113	.267
Urgency	-.093	.075	-.083	-1.246	.214
Informativeness	.121	.095	.084	1.273	.204
Entertainment	.101	.074	.089	1.373	.171
Time	.796	.077	.716	10.348	.000
Spontaneity	-.190	.079	-.146	-2.420	.016
Interactivity	-.054	.067	-.043	-.805	.422

$R^2=.568$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .551$ )

Regression analyses were also performed within each individual experimental condition using the nine factors as predictors and attitudes and purchase intentions as criterion variables. Within the live condition, four factors reached statistical significance in predicting attitude toward the presentation: Credibility ( $\beta=.332$ ,  $t=3.175$ ,  $p<.003$ ), urgency ( $\beta=-.160$ ,  $t=-2.020$ ,  $p<.047$ ), entertainment value ( $\beta=.386$ ,  $t=4.733$ ,  $p<.001$ ), sense of time ( $\beta=.260$ ,  $t=3.004$ ,  $p<.004$ ).

Table 14  
Regression Results from Live Condition  
Criterion: Attitude Toward Presentation

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.147	.524		-.280	.780
Credibility	.569	.179	.332	3.175	.002
Authenticity	.175	.218	.092	.802	.424
Involvement	.058	.155	.035	.372	.710
Urgency	-.217	.107	-.160	-2.020	.046
Informativeness	.061	.151	.034	.402	.688
Entertainment	.512	.108	.386	4.733	.000
Time	.325	.108	.260	3.004	.003
Spontaneity	-.038	.126	-.022	-.302	.763
Interactivity	.002	.106	.001	.021	.984

$R^2=.614$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .583$ )

Within the live condition, four factors reached statistical significance in predicting attitude toward the product: Credibility ( $\beta=.427$ ,  $t=3.977$ ,  $p<.001$ ), informativeness ( $\beta=.174$ ,  $t=2.020$ ,  $p<.050$ ), sense of time ( $\beta=.411$ ,  $t=4.625$ ,  $p<.001$ ), interactivity ( $\beta=.171$ ,  $t=-2.345$ ,  $p<.025$ ).

Table 15  
Regression Results from Live Condition  
Criterion: Attitude Toward Product

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.827	.575		1.437	.154
Credibility	.783	.197	.427	3.977	.000
Authenticity	.127	.240	.062	.532	.596
Involvement	-.303	.170	-.173	-1.784	.077
Urgency	-.024	.118	-.016	-.202	.840
Informativeness	.334	.166	.174	2.020	.046
Entertainment	.180	.119	.127	1.518	.132
Time	.549	.119	.411	4.625	.000
Spontaneity	-.098	.139	-.053	-.706	.482
Interactivity	-.273	.116	-.171	-2.345	.021

$R^2=.593$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .520$ )

The only factor that reached significance in predicting purchase intentions in the live condition was sense of time ( $\beta=.604$ ,  $t=6.756$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Table 16  
Regression Results from Live Condition  
Criterion: Purchase Intentions

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.503	.440		-1.143	.255
Credibility	.294	.150	.211	1.952	.053
Authenticity	-.025	.183	-.016	-.139	.890
Involvement	-.095	.130	-.071	-.728	.468
Urgency	-.021	.090	-.019	-.233	.816
Informativeness	.224	.127	.153	1.768	.080
Entertainment	.105	.091	.097	1.154	.251
Time	.613	.091	.604	6.756	.000
Spontaneity	-.075	.106	-.053	-.711	.479
Interactivity	-.048	.089	-.040	-.542	.589

$R^2=.569$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .551$ )

Within the recorded condition, three factors reached statistical significance in predicting attitude toward the presentation: Credibility ( $\beta=.250$ ,  $t=2.426$ ,  $p<.02$ ), entertainment value ( $\beta=.413$ ,  $t=4.594$ ,  $p<.001$ ), sense of time ( $\beta=.421$ ,  $t=3.725$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Table 17  
Regression Results from Recorded Condition  
Criterion: Attitude Toward Presentation

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.670	.524		1.279	.204
Credibility	.525	.216	.250	2.426	.017
Authenticity	.163	.226	.076	.722	.472
Involvement	-.231	.183	-.114	-1.266	.208
Urgency	-.166	.163	-.102	-1.018	.311
Informativeness	-.236	.185	-.111	-1.272	.206
Entertainment	.709	.154	.413	4.594	.000
Time	.656	.176	.421	3.725	.000
Spontaneity	.227	.164	.104	1.390	.168
Interactivity	-.164	.124	-.100	-1.327	.188

$R^2=.596$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .560$ )

Three factors reached statistical significance in predicting attitude toward the product in the recorded condition: Credibility ( $\beta=.429$ ,  $t=4.052$ ,  $p<.001$ ), entertainment value ( $\beta=.255$ ,  $t=2.763$ ,  $p<.008$ ), sense of time ( $\beta=.354$ ,  $t=3.050$ ,  $p<.004$ ).

Table 18  
Regression Results from Recorded Condition  
Criterion: Attitude Toward Product

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.868	.536		1.619	.109
Credibility	.897	.221	.429	4.052	.000
Authenticity	-.028	.232	-.013	-.120	.905
Involvement	-.194	.187	-.096	-1.040	.301
Urgency	-.003	.167	-.002	-.019	.985
Informativeness	-.095	.190	-.045	-.501	.618
Entertainment	.437	.158	.255	2.763	.007
Time	.550	.180	.354	3.050	.003
Spontaneity	.165	.168	.076	.982	.328
Interactivity	-.219	.127	-.134	-1.732	.086

$R^2=.574$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .536$ )

Similar to results obtained from the live condition, the only factor that reached significance in predicting purchase intentions in the recorded condition was sense of time ( $\beta=.757$ ,  $t=7.094$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Table 19  
Regression Results from Recorded Condition  
Criterion: Purchase Intentions

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.249	.416		-.599	.551
Credibility	.144	.172	.081	.837	.405
Authenticity	.099	.180	.055	.549	.584
Involvement	.013	.145	.007	.087	.931
Urgency	-.192	.129	-.141	-1.487	.140
Informativeness	.092	.147	.051	.624	.534
Entertainment	.123	.123	.085	1.002	.319
Time	.992	.140	.757	7.094	.000
Spontaneity	.002	.130	.001	.015	.988
Interactivity	-.118	.098	-.085	-1.202	.232

$R^2=.640$  (Adjusted  $R^2 = .608$ )

Table 20 presents a summary of multiple regression results obtained from live and recorded, live only, and recorded only conditions. It can be seen that sense of time was the single most important predictor (mediator) of attitudes and purchase intentions in both live and recorded conditions. Credibility was a significant predictor of all three criterion variables in the live condition. Four factors (credibility, urgency, entertainment value, sense of time) were significant predictors of attitude toward the presentation in the live condition, whereas only two factors (sense of time, spontaneity) in the recorded condition reached significance. For attitude toward the product, four factors (credibility, informativeness, sense of time, interactivity) were significant predictors in the live

condition. Three of the same factors (credibility, informativeness, sense of time) were significant predictors in the recorded condition. For purchase intentions, credibility and sense of time were significant predictors in the live condition. In the recorded condition, the only significant predictor was sense of time.

Table 20  
Summary of Regression Results

	Attitude toward Presentation			Attitude toward Product			Purchase Intention		
	Overall	Live	Recorded	Overall	Live	Recorded	Overall	Live	Recorded
Credibility	X	X		X	X	X		X	
Authenticity									
Involvement				X					
Urgency	X	X							
Informativeness					X				
Entertainment	X	X		X		X			
Time	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Spontaneity			X				X		
Interactivity				X	X				

Note: X denotes significant predictor. Overall: live and recorded conditions combined; Live: Live condition only; Recorded: Recorded condition only.



## Chapter 5: Discussion and Limitations

### Discussion

What has the edge on home shopping success? Are live presentations dominant on television? Could recorded and edited presentations be strong? When it comes to home shopping, there is a huge difference between live and recorded material to the point that live is far more important and a greater positive outlet to use than the recorded counterpart. The majority of the test subjects showed favor for live over recorded materials. Which factors could possibly make live television strong on home shopping related channels? As indicated, it appears credibility and senses of time are the significant factors that give strength to these channels. The results show clearly there are some factors that are much more important than others. Could pre-recorded material be just as strong in these factors in spite of what has been cited above? In some areas these factors do help pre-recorded material but not to a dramatic extent. Is the magic of live television losing its ground in mass communication today? As far as home shopping is concerned, no. These questions were posed early in this thesis. Through this study, there is some confidence that these questions were answered to a certain degree.

There is a significant difference between live and recorded for the credibility factor. T-tests of items for this factor show .000. The test participants essentially felt credibility was everything to an extent. If the seller did not have the trust of the buyer, then the whole presentation would be pointless. There were portions of the presentation worth noting that would have made this an honest sell. For example, the presentation

was detailed in terms of how much you get, the comparisons of brands, and how fresh the food remains. This confirms a point mentioned by Lee et al. (2009) where the more there is precision and attention to detail, then the greater chance one has to hold the populations attention. Another important point is in regards to what Kiouisis (2001) stated before about who is delivering the message. In this case, it was a show host and a guest. Kiouisis (2001) points out how important the delivery is in order to insure that credibility remains strong and in this study's instance, it did just that.

Regression analysis show credibility is the second most important factor investigated here. It did not have an impact on attitude towards presentation-recorded, or purchase intention overall and recorded. This should tell programmers as long as an item is live, it must be believable at all times or else the sell will suffer. Recorded programmers should take note because if there is no credibility to their products, then this could be the main reason why they may not be generating as much revenue as they would like.

T-tests for authenticity show there is a significant difference between the live and recorded (.000 for all items tied to this factor). With the presentation used in the study, the guest was very knowledgeable regarding how long certain foods last, approvals by various agencies, and also suggested other clever uses for the product. Simonson and Holbrook (1993) mentioned the more factual information you present in your presentation, the better the presentation will be and the likelihood of buying the product will be higher. However, it was not like that as far as regression. This could be due to the lack of appeal, even though truthful, to the test subjects.

Snoeijer et al. (2002) discussed the more there is live cross talk between host and guest, the greater amount of authenticity will come from the presentation. There was a great amount of cross talk between the show host and guest in the presentation for the study which may be another reason for the significant difference. There were hardly any cuts in this presentation to lead one to think that the cross talk was fixed in any way. Most of the presentation was on one camera and it caught the host and guest in non-stop cross talk till the phone call came.

Regression tests for authenticity were a surprise. This factor had no significant impact across the board. This could be due to people not caring if the product if can what it claims to do. People may also have no concern if this product is a real product or a cheap imitation. Taking into account the amount of litigation which currently exists tied to false product claims, one would think this factor would be of greater importance regardless of either variable.

Does live have a greater perceived involvement of the buyer than the recorded and edited presentation? According to t-tests run on items related to this factor, yes it does. T-tests reflect there was a significant difference between the live and recorded (.000 for all items). One possible reason was the host and seller finding ways for the viewer to be involved by telling them what could happen to their vegetables if they do not use the product. This was a dominant theme brought up by Hogan (2006). By showing what could possibly happen, one slowly gets the viewer to change their mind about the product.

Another way according to Hogan (2006) to keep involvement going is to keep friendly rapport going between the host and the guest. In the instance of the presentation shown to both groups, both host and guest were on a first name basis and friendly to each other. Both of them were chatting during the sell and attempted to discuss life during the sell to the point where one could assume there was no sell. Hogan's (2006) point was to keep everything on a positive level as much as possible. In this case, keep the sell positive talking and showing how fresh the food would be if one bought this product.

Involvement was only important in attitude towards product in both categories when regression tests were complete. As long as people could see the host and guest demonstrating what the product could do and the product's success rate with the fresh food that was seen, it could be why the test participants felt that was enough for just this category. It is possible there was lack of interest with involvement by the test subjects because the demonstrations of the working product and just showing the product itself would have been good enough for a brief advertisement instead of six and a half minutes of time where they could be doing something else.

Research question four inquired about urgency and if there was a difference between the variables. According to the T-tests, yes there was. For all items related to this factor it was .000. Busselle (2001) states in order for something to be urgent, it has to be remembered quickly. The presentation for this study was about six and a half minutes. In that time, a considerable amount of ground was covered in terms of what you are getting and what the product does. Another issue pointed out by Busselle (2001) is heavier viewers for the television medium are likely to make faster decisions. In the presentations case, there is counter showing how many items have been sold so far. This

could give those watching television more than others a push to make the decision to buy the item. This can be another cause for the difference between the variables because the potential heavier viewers felt the need to take action now opposed to others.

Urgency was another factor thought to be of importance mainly due to claims where it was shown on screen how many units were left and/or how much time was there left in the presentation. This could lead someone to think that once time was up, one could not get the item at another time for the price shown. Urgency was only important for attitude towards presentation for both categories and live. With recorded, it appears there is no rush to buy the product because there is a good chance the same product will air again next week. The feeling of urgency is possibly only sensed in a live environment because there is only so much time for the presentation and then the show must move on to another product to sell. The importance of the “hurry before it’s too late” can give off that impression on a live channel. For the most part, it is true that once the product is gone or if time is up, one will have to wait a long time for the product or even a variation of it to come back.

Informativeness is another factor with a significant difference between live and recorded. T-tests show a difference of .000 for all items for this factor. There was plenty of vividness (via all the food on display), realism (via the factual information given by the host and guest), and distinctiveness given (via the demonstrations of freshness) per Busselle and Shrum (2003). These three sub-factors could have been the reason behind the significant differences. Another point to be made is repeating the information in the presentation, which was done verbally and visually. This was an important concern by Busselle and Shrum (2003) because if there was a lack of emphasis for the information

given, then the odds are the presentation would have lost value and the product would certainly not be bought.

Informativeness was only important for attitude towards the product in a live environment. This could be due to people, when watching a live network, would need all the information necessary to make the final decision to buy the item. Information may not be needed in recorded environments because the product, most likely in these instances, is found in stores. One would think that information would be important during the actual presentation. Perhaps with presentations, the actual demonstration of the product alone would make a stronger impact. For the information to become important in the presentation, it would be necessary to perhaps combine information with demonstration.

Research question six asked are the live TV product sells perceived as more entertaining than the recorded and edited presentation? T-tests showed there was a significant difference between the two (.000 for all items). It could be due to when one sees the live presentation; there are actual attempts to make it entertaining. However, with recorded material, it is just talking about and demonstrating the product. This can go back to the point made by Aaker and Bruzzone (1981) that well-liked ads are more effective. It was apparent based upon the data that this is presentation was entertaining. The “warmth” and “entertaining” sub-factors discussed by Aaker and Bruzzone could be said came into play since the numbers reflected a huge difference.

Entertainment is an important factor for the attitudes of the presentation in all categories but recorded, attitude towards product for all categories, but live, and is not important in purchase intent in all categories. For the presentation, in order to have

people continue to watch, there will most likely need to be some effort on the part of the show host to keep the presentation entertaining. With recorded presentations, since there appears to be more rehearsing done, there seems to be an ease of blending entertainment into the presentation that it would not feel important. The entertainment value factor could be more of a detractor towards purchase intent. It could be due to people wanting to know certain pieces of information that would help them make a somewhat informed decision. People may not care for jokes or things that may have anything to do with the product. People do not want their time wasted so therefore any type of entertainment for purchase intent is a waste.

Does live TV product sells generate a greater feeling of perceived sense of “real time” of the seller and the product than the recorded and edited presentation was research question seven. There is a significant difference between the two to reflect the answer is yes (.000 for all items). To go back to “The CNN Effect” discussed by Gilboa (2003), where there are positive and negative effects when something is given to us in real time. In the case of home shopping, the positive effects are we are getting everything we need to know about the product at that time for us to make an informed decision about buying the product. Provided that everything was truthful, there will be a product coming that will help us. However, the negative here would be buyer’s remorse for taking action on buying the item too soon. The numbers do not reflect concerns about buyer’s remorse and real time concerns. Live apparently has a dramatic effect for real time concerns on a positive level.

Sense of real time was the most important factor according to the regression tests. For attitude towards the presentation, there was a feel with limited time, action on the

buyer's part needed to be done soon because people could feel that is the only real time they could buy the item. This time frame the presentation gave was a real life window of opportunity for the shopper to take advantage of. For the product itself, this can tie into the urgency factor because there are only so many units that could be sold before they are gone. Since the product is available now, there is no guarantee that the product would be available in the next hour, or the hour after that. When people see the product on television, it would be just like seeing something at a display window in a department store. If the store has it, especially if it is on sale, then it is best to buy it now before the display disappears or if the price goes up in price. This could possibly drive people to buy a product if these time factors do not work in their favor.

Spontaneity was addressed with research question seven. This research question asked if live TV product sells generate a greater feeling of perceived spontaneity between the host and guest presenter than the recorded and edited presentation. The answer was yes based on the data presented from T-tests showing a significant difference between the two variables (.000 for all questions). Going back to points expressed by Lundell (2009), it was expressed how what is seen can be impartial, objective, balanced, and versatile when scripts for live shows are done correctly. Spontaneity helps take away any potential chance of things being scripted and therefore not real to the viewer. Lundell (2009) mentions how these events can bring us together as they happen and in this instance bring the viewer to buy the item.

Spontaneity in regression shows it was only important in attitude towards presentation for recorded and purchase intent for both variables overall. With live there is always a chance of natural or unscripted situations taking place during the presentation



and with the product itself. With recorded, with so much potential rehearsing, this lessens any potential errors but also lessons anything last minute which could take place. Spontaneity is needed to make the presentation have a natural feel and give a sense of a positive accident (where there is an accident while shooting the presentation, but the results of the accident works in favor of the presentation). With this unscripted type of action, the presentation demonstrates (although not in the right way) that the product can work. This could make an impact on purchase intent which makes this factor important to both variables

Research question nine inquired if live TV product sells generate a greater feeling of perceived interactivity between the host/guest and the buyer than the recorded and edited presentation? As with all the other factors, the results from T-tests show a significant difference and therefore, yes there is a greater feeling (.000 for all items). According to Kjus, (2009) the interactivity between the audience and advertiser is so strong that marketing strategies that are beneficial are made. It could be assumed that marketing strategies of previous appearances of the product and interactivity made the presentation get stronger and stronger with each subsequent appearance. This leads to strong numbers for live interactivity. Also Kjus (2009) points out how this type of interactivity gives value to the presentation and keeps the sell free from problems. With this in mind, with interactivity involved with live, if the caller says positive things about the product, there is a good chance the product is actually that good. Product testimonials from actual customers have proven to work well to get new customers to buy the product in question.

However, regression shows that this is not an important factor for the attitude towards the presentation. This could be due to some skepticism among the test subjects. For all they know, the caller could have made the call on the presentation from inside the building. Plus, there is also a chance the caller may be so overexcited during the presentation that it could be hindered because the viewer may think the caller is acting and hurting the presentation. Interactivity is important with the actual product for live and both overall. This makes sense because when people call in, they are talking about how great the product is. Testimonials about the actual product would help to a certain degree from both famous and non-famous people. Interactivity's importance could perhaps be enhanced by creating a chat line that can be placed live on television for people to see comments on the product. This also could help show that the customer's voice is important and sway programmer's future decisions on the product.

### Limitations

There were some limitations to this study. There was considerable difficulty trying to recruit test subjects through classes. There were ten other instructors that were asked if they could spare the fifteen minutes of class time needed to perform the study and was told "no". Had the other instructors stated "yes", there would have been probably more than 400 subjects in the study instead of what was presented here.

Another limitation was the time frame to collect the data. It took two weeks to collect all the data from the classes where the instructors said "yes". The data was also collected during the summer semester of school and therefore, the semester is considerably shorter than the standard fall and spring semesters found at major universities. If the data collection was done in the fall or spring semester, then the

collection time would have been probably two weeks to a month, which would have been more than adequate to collect the information.

Since the study was set to a shorter time frame than normal, there was no time to perform a pre-test of the questionnaire on subjects. This would have been ideal to sort out which questions were good and what may have been necessary to discard. However, once the questionnaire was fully developed, and the time of the semester was examined, it was discovered that the pre-test stage would have to be skipped if the time line for the study was to have been met.

Also, there was also a chance that duplication of data may have been involved due to certain students taking multiple courses during the summer and those subjects would have possibly taken the study twice. However, steps were taken to insure this would not happen, by the researchers asking if the subjects are taking courses where the study already took place. If the potential test subjects said “yes”, they were automatically excluded from the study. Also, if any subjects did not say “yes”, but the researcher recognized them from previous classes where the study took place, then the researcher excused them.

There was only one product used for this study and this product was not targeted to students. This product used for the presentation cannot be generalized. This product is mainly used for people that are more kitchen savvy and wanting to stretch their food dollar by using this particular product. If the product was geared more for students such as computers, monitors, study equipment, etc., then there would be a good chance the results towards the actual product and likelihood of buying the product would have been higher. Another problem in terms of product would be pricing. There are clearly

products that are affordably priced for students but the problem is once more they are not generalized for everyone to buy. These items are priced to a niche group. There were other products that could have been used for this study, but with the live environment, programming can change, prices can change, products can be changed out at the last minute and there were limited amount of hours for the researcher to work with.

## Chapter 6: Conclusion

The purpose for this study was to investigate the strengths in live home shopping and discover if recorded presentations still have a place in regular television programming. For the home shopping channels around the world, based upon the numbers here, it is important to make sure credibility is investigated before the product airs. Unless the product is in fact selling out with no possible return of it, urgency should be kept at a minimum for live. Authenticity appears to be a minor factor, but must be bolstered in order to avoid further litigation from outside parties including dissatisfied customers. Entertainment is important provided it does not distract from the presentation itself. If there is more interactivity between the seller and buyer, there will certainly be a positive impact on the sell. More phone calls, e-mails, and other interactive devices are needed for this to be accomplished. As long as it is reemphasized the presentation is live, there should be no “real time concerns”, but based on viewing presentations in the course of this study, this statement is rarely heard. There needs to be more if the consumer is to realize that they can have this product right now as the host speaks.

Since there was a time lapse between the literature and today, it was necessary to see if these factors are important now as they were then and also see if factors that were not important then are important now. To varying degrees, they all are, but the regression analysis show they may not be in the future and for home shopping on television to remain as they are now, it would be best to research and find ways to think ahead. By using college students, which would be the future home shoppers of America possibly,

this was one way to start by looking at your future niche audiences. If researchers had access to what would be sold or possibly sold soon, various tests can be conducted to find out if these products would be utilized in the future and if so, how often would the potential customers think so?

In spite of the differences between live and recorded for the main factors investigated, home shopping still has a long way to go to have a level of success that this electronic retail entity may desire. The attitude towards the presentation was strong for live but the actual product and the potential to buy the item has issues. Maybe it has to do with the product itself? If home shopping is the only outlet for certain products, this will certainly raise some skepticism as to why people may not be interested in the product. If the product was available in other outlets, for home shopping to compete, there must be a good deal that will get the viewers to buy.

Another potential reason for the disinterest in the product may be how similar the product in the presentation is to products that are sold in regular stores. One may ask themselves “why should I buy from this channel if other stores are selling products that are close to the description of what is seen on TV?” Also, another concern is if the product out in stores has not done what has been claimed, that may play against the product that is airing on television. These types of issues may need to be researched and addressed by the merchandisers and mentioned if these concerns are true to pull away from the disappointing similar products.

As for the differences between live and recorded, it is clear that live is a dominant way to sell on television. A considerable amount of money is made by using this type of outlet. If millions are to be made, this raises the question of why channels still use

infomercials to sell products outside of making some quick revenue for themselves. With live being stronger than recorded, would it not make sense for channels to do their presentations live as well? If channels follow a similar template as home shopping related networks, would they not bring in similar revenue? With the numbers being what they are for recorded presentations, would this not be a signal for regular channels to question using them? Most local channels have the facilities to do live presentations of their own. Granted it would require additional spending for a crew and other unforeseen expenses, but one hour could generate anywhere from \$30,000 to \$300,000 depending on the product that is being sold.

Future research can determine if live presentations on regular channels are viable solutions. Other research can be looked at would be what other factors are key to the success or failure of electronic retail including selling methods for the Internet since this is another major outlet to sell products. One could find ways to interview the leaders of the home shopping industry and compare their answers to the answers of actual home shoppers to see if what the industry is doing is really in the best interests of the consumers. More research can certainly be done on the individual factors that have been investigated here. There has to be more sub-categories of each factor that can be scrutinized. The studies proposed can be exponential in nature. Credibility can produce some sub-areas, while entertainment can produce considerably more sub-areas that need to be looked at separately. One last piece of research should be inquiring with those between the age of twenty to thirty and ask what products should be shown on home shopping so the future customer base can be maintained for years if not decades to come.

Home shopping has been with us since the 1970s. Clearly the numbers indicate that things have steadily improved. It could be due to better products, better presentations, or better leadership in the ranks. These networks need to maintain the strength of credibility while at the same time paying closer attention to authenticity, involvement, and interactivity. This could be done by showing disclaimers regarding legal statements of the product or more pushes to have callers call or type positive reviews of the product. For now, home shopping remains strong, but this entity needs to tread carefully if they expect to maintain profits instead of relying on the cash cow.



## References

- Althaus, Scott L. (2010). The forgotten role of the global newsreel industry in the long transition from text to television. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 15(2), 193-218.
- Aaker, David A, & Bruzzone, Donald E. (1981). Viewer perceptions of prime-time television advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 21(5), 15-25.
- Bourdon, Jerome. (2000). Live television is still alive: On television as an unfulfilled promise. *Media, Culture & Society*, 22, 531-556.
- Busselle, Rick W. (2001). Television exposure, perceived realism, and exemplar accessibility in the social judgment process. *Media Psychology*, 10, 43-67.
- Busselle, Rick W., & Shrum, L.J. (2003). Media exposure and exemplar Accessibility. *Media Psychology*, 5, 255-282.
- Central Hudson Gas and Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission, 447 U.S. 557, (1980).
- Cook, Judi P. (2000). Consumer culture and television home shopping programming: An examination of the sales discourse. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3(4), 373-391.
- Feary, Vaughana M. (1992). Taking the right of freedom of commercial communication seriously. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11 (1), 47-59.
- Gilboa, Eytan. (2003). Television news and U.S. foreign policy: Constraints of real-time coverage. *Press/Politics*, 8(4), 97-113.
- Graves, Philip. (2010). *Consumer.ology: The Market Research Myth, the Truth about Consumers and the Psychology of Shopping*, Brealey-Nicholas Publishing.
- Gudelunas, David. (2006). Shopping with friends: Audience perspectives on television shopping. *Popular Communication*, 4(4), 229-252.
- Hogan, Kevin. (2006). *Covert Persuasion: Psychological Tactics and Tricks to Win the Game*, Wiley, John & Sons, Inc.

- Kiousis, Spiro. (2001). Public trust or mistrust? Perceptions of media credibility in the information age. *Mass Communication & Society*, 4(4), 381-403.
- Kjus, Yngvar. (2009). Everyone needs idols: Reality television and transformations in media structure, production, and output. *European Journal of Communication*, 24(3), 287-304.
- LaFollette, Marcel C. (2002). A survey of science content in U.S. television broadcasting, 1940s through 1950s: The exploratory years. *Science Communication*, 24(1), 34-71.
- Lee, Hyunmin., Park, Sun-A., Lee, Young Ah., & Cameron, Glen T. (2010). Assessment of motion media on believability and credibility: An exploratory study. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 310-312.
- Levine, Elana. (2008). Distinguishing television: The changing meanings of television liveness. *Media, Culture & Society*, 30(3), 393-409.
- Lundell, Ana K. (2009). The design and scripting of 'unscripted' talk: liveness versus control in a TV broadcast interview. *Media, Culture & Society*, 30(2), 271-288.
- Mitra, Anu., Raymond, Mary Anne., & Hopkins, Christopher D. (2008). Can consumers recognize misleading advertising content in a media rich online environment? *Psychology & Marketing*, 25 (7), 655-674.
- Morgan, Fred W., & Stoltman, Jeffrey J. (1997). Advertising and product liability litigation. *Journal of Advertising*, 26 (2), 63-75.
- Oyedeji, Tayo A. (2007). The relation between the customer-based brand equity of media outlets and their media channel credibility: An exploratory study. *International Journal on Media Management*, 9(3), 116-125.
- Pratkanis, Anthony., & Aronson, Elliott. (2001). *Age of Propaganda: The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion*, Holt, Henry, and Company, Inc.
- Simonson, Alexander., & Holbrook, Morris B. (1993). Permissible puffery versus actionable warranty in advertising and sales talk: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 12 (2), 216-233.
- Singh, Mandeep., Balasubramanian, Siva K., & Chakraborty, Goutam. (2000). A comparative analysis of three communication formats: advertising, infomercial, and direct experience. *Journal of Advertising*, 29(4), 59-75.

Snoejier, Roland., de Vreese, Claes H., & Semetko, Holli A. (2002). Research note: The effects of live television reporting on recall and appreciation of political news. *European Journal of Communication*, 17(1), 85-101.

Talsky v. Department of Registration and Education III. Dec. 550, 68 III 2d 579, 370 N.E. 2d 173, (1977).

White, Michele. (2006). Television and internet differences by design. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 12(3), 341-355.

## Appendices

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter

DIVISION OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND COMPLIANCE  
 Institutional Review Boards, FWA No. 00001669  
 12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., MDC035 • Tampa, FL 33612-4799  
 (813) 974-5638 • FAX (813) 974-5618

June 5, 2012

Christopher Novak, B.S.  
 Mass Communication  
 11122 Lakeside Vista Drive  
 Riverview, FL 33569

RE: **Exempt Certification** for IRB#: Pro00007796

Title: Live Versus Recorded. What is more effective for television shopping.

Dear Mr. Novak:

On 6/4/2012 the Institutional Review Board (IRB) determined that your research meets USF requirements and Federal Exemption criteria as outlined in the federal regulations at 45CFR46.101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

As the principal investigator for this study, it is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted as outlined in your application and consistent with the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report and with USF IRB policies and procedures. Please note that changes to this protocol may disqualify it from exempt status. Please note that you are responsible for notifying the IRB prior to implementing any changes to the currently approved protocol.

The Institutional Review Board will maintain your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter or for three years after a Final Progress Report is received, whichever is longer. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond five years, you will need to submit a new application. When your study is completed, either prior to, or at the end of the five-year period, you must submit a Final Report to close this study.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Appendix A: (Continued)

Sincerely,

*John A. Schinka, Ph.D.*

John A. Schinka, Ph.D., Chairperson  
USF Institutional Review Board

Appendix B: Questionnaire

## Questionnaire:

1. The presentation was trustworthy. (honest, reliable)
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
2. The presentation was authentic.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
3. The presentation was intimate.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
4. The presentation gave a sense of urgency to purchase the item.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
5. The presentation contained sufficient product information.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
6. This presentation was pleasurable to watch.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
7. The presentation made me feel the need to purchase the product immediately.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
8. The presentation was natural.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
9. The presentation enabled two-way conversation between the host/guest and the buyer.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
10. The presentation was similar to other live presentations I've seen on television.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
11. The presentation was believable.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |

*Appendix B (Continued)*

12. The presentation's information was precise.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
13. The presentation was engaging.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
14. The presentation was convincing me to buy the item right now.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
15. The presentation was giving an informative demonstration.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
16. The presentation was interesting to watch.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
17. I felt like buying the product while watching the presentation.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
18. The presentation appeared to be unscripted.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
19. The presentation had responsive conversation between host/guest and the buyer.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
20. The presentation was a typical live sales presentation on television.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
21. The presentation was truthful.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
22. The presentation was making claims were genuine.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |
23. The presentation was personally relevant.
- |                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NEUTRAL | AGREE | STRONGLY AGREE |



Appendix B (Continued)

24. The presentation was prompting me to take action to buy the item.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

25. The presentation was instructive.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

26. The presentation was entertaining overall.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

27. The presentation made me want to act before time runs out.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

28. The presentation was spontaneous.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

29. There were interactions between host/guest and the buyer.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

30. It was clear to me that the presentation was a live broadcast.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

31. Overall, your assessment of the sales PRESENTATION is:

Good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Bad
Like	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Dislike
Positive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Negative
Favorable	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Unfavorable

32. Overall, your assessment of the PRODUCT in the presentation is:

Good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Bad
Like	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Dislike
Positive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Negative
Favorable	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Unfavorable

*Appendix B (Continued)*

33. How likely would you purchase the product in the presentation?  
 5                      4                      3                      2                      1  
 Very likely              Likely              Somewhat likely              Unlikely              Very unlikely

34. What is your gender?  
 MALE    FEMALE

35. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

36. What is your ethnic origin (CIRCLE ONE)  
 Caucasion                      American Indian                      Other  
 African-American                      Asian  
 Latin                      Middle Eastern

The following questions replaced questions 10, 20, and 30 respectively for the “recorded” sessions.

10. The presentation was similar to other pre-recorded presentations seen on television.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
 STRONGLY DISAGREE              DISAGREE              NEUTRAL              AGREE              STRONGLY AGREE

20. The presentation was a typical pre-recorded sales presentation on television.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
 STRONGLY DISAGREE              DISAGREE              NEUTRAL              AGREE              STRONGLY AGREE

30. It was clear to me that the presentation was a pre-recorded broadcast.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
 STRONGLY DISAGREE              DISAGREE              NEUTRAL              AGREE              STRONGLY AGREE

Appendix C: Instructions to Test Participants

GOOD DAY TO YOU ALL.

I AM A RESEARCHER FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA AND WE WILL BE PERFORMING A STUDY CALLED “LIVE VS. RECORDED” WHICH IS IRB #7796. AT THIS TIME. IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY, PLEASE LET ME KNOW IMMEDIATELY SO YOU CAN BE EXCUSED AT THIS TIME. IF YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT CONFIDENTIALITY, I WILL HAND YOU A QUESTIONNAIRE AND INFORMED CONSENT SEPARATELY. BY DOING SO, THERE WILL BE NO PHYSICAL LINK BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR ANSWERS. YOU WILL TURN THEM BOTH IN SEPARATELY. THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL BE ENTERED IN A STATISTICAL PROGRAM FOR ANALYSIS. PLEASE BE SURE YOU HAVE SIGNED YOUR INFORMED CONSENT FORM BEFORE WE BEGIN THIS PRESENTATION.

FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE REMAINED, THANK YOU,

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY YOU ARE ABOUT TO PARTICIPATE IN WILL DETERMINE WHAT IS A STRONGER METHOD FOR SELLING PRODUCTS ON TELEVISION-EITHER LIVE OR PRE-RECORDED.

I WILL BE SHOWING YOU A PRESENTATION THAT IS (SHOWN **LIVE OR PRE-RECORDED**) FROM A TELEVISION SHOPPING NETWORK.

THE LIVE PRESENTATION IS BEING SHOT IN REAL TIME AND BEING BROADCAST FROM THE STUDIO BEING SHOT IN ONE TAKE.

THE PRE-RECORDED PRESENTATION IS BEING SHOT TO TAPE OR DISK IN MULTIPLE TAKES, THEN EDITED, AND PLAYED BACK LATER AT ANY TIME

In order to insure the results required with this study, I must ask all of you to please turn off your lap tops and cell phones for your attention to this presentation is necessary to retrieve the results desired for this research.

When the presentation is complete, I would like to ask all of you to please answer every question that is presented on the questionnaire.

Please keep in mind that the presentation you are about to view is part of A SHOW THAT IS one to SEVEN hours in length.

Please do not skip any questions and answer honestly. Thank you.

IF YOU HAVE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS YOU ARE FREE TO CONTACT ME, CHRISTOPHER NOVAK, AT 813-546-0172. THANK YOU AGAIN.

*Appendix D: Slides/Description of Key Points of Presentation*



**Figure C1.** Introduction. The start of the presentation mentions the number of boxes and explanation that you cannot wear out their effectiveness.



**Figure C2.** Comparisons. There are explanations that these items are proudly made in the USA and BPA free. Comparison if one uses the product and what happens to the food if one does not.

*Appendix D (Continued)*



**Figure C3.** Stacks and counters. The show host is explaining she has all 56 pieces in her hands and goes on to explain how the set looks like with the tops on and further emphasize how stackable they are. An item counter is added soon after.



**Figure C4.** Carrots and freshness. The guest says that “this is funny if it wasn’t my money”. The guest goes on to emphasize what can happen to carrots if they are not placed in the Green Boxes to maintain freshness for long periods of time.

*Appendix D (Continued)*



**Figure C5.** Breaking carrots. The guest is breaking the carrots that were stored in the Green Boxes to demonstrate how they still remain fresh all this time. The sound of the carrots breaking can be heard here.



**Figure C6.** Three weeks old. The guest is showing the inside color of the carrot. The guest explains that these carrots are three weeks old and still fresh after all this time.

*Appendix D (Continued)*



**Figure C7.** Lettuce and sound demonstrations. Lettuce that was stored in the Green Boxes was broken. The sounds to demonstrate freshness were overheard once more.



**Figure C8.** Reusable and lasting quality. At this point the host explains how the containers in her hands are reusable again and again. The host then implies that regular containers do not have the lasting quality that the Green Boxes do.

*Appendix D (Continued)*



**Figure C9.** Pepper freshness. The guest is demonstrating the freshness of peppers by pushing her finger hard into the pepper in her hand. The host inquires about how expensive peppers are.



**Figure C10.** Refrigerator demonstration. The guest then shows how one can easily fit all the containers into the refrigerator. The guest further explains how they are translucent so one can see what is in the containers without opening them.



*Appendix D (Continued)*



**Figure C11.** Countdown clock. The host now points out that there is a countdown clock on the bottom of the screen indicating how much time one has to buy the product before she moves to the next item to sell in the show.



**Figure C12.** Taking a phone call. At this point in the presentation, there is a phone caller who has just bought the product and wants to say hello to the guest.

*Appendix D (Continued)*



**Figure C13.** More appearances. The phone caller asks if the guest will be presenting any other items on the network and states that she misses the guest and hopes the guest will make more appearances on the network.

The was the ending point of the presentation the test subjects viewed.