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Aim: The aim of our study is to investigate the ability of online educational videos [tutorials] to increase customer trust and explore the factors driving it.

Method: The study conducted is a content analysis of music production software tutorials posted on YouTube. All examined tutorials and their characteristics, were coded based on the developed coding frame specifically tracking trust-inducing factors. The results were then analysed to understand how trust is built through online video tutorials.

Result & Conclusions: New technologies have increased the possible ways in which humans interact and as a result require new as well as old ways to establish trust. The findings of this paper suggest that trust should be divided into three main categories of trust drivers, exchange factors, design factors and motivational factors. The results indicate that tutorials can, and should, include drivers that build these categories. While we found varying degrees on how well implemented these were, we found that design factors were generally more prominent and found opportunities for tutorials to improve on the exchange side.

Suggestions for future research: Future research could try to measure the factors driving trust and the amount of trust perceived by the customer. We also propose that additional research can explore whether video tutorials actually induce different types of trust and not just trust driving factors.

Contribution of the thesis: Our study has contributed to the existing knowledge regarding trust in online video tutorials in several ways. It has been able to confirm existing theory on a previously unstudied market. We have arrived at a new categorisation for the factors driving trust, dividing them into exchange factors, design factors and motivational factors. We have also identified opportunities for the firms to improve their videos by adding more trust inducing elements.
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3
1.0 Introduction

In this introductory chapter we will provide a background to our subject of interest, as well as the technological and societal developments that have lead to this new situation that marketers today find themselves. This background information will then lead to our problem discussion that will be concluded with the aim and research question of our study.

1.1 Marketing Evolution

Marketers’ situation and opportunities have changed considerably during the last decades. With considerable technological advances, new tools and communication channels have been introduced and the marketing environment has changed. The techniques of old, where advertising was produced from a standardized formula and in a linear fashion (Schultz, 1996), are no longer sufficient. Consumers today have grown more critical towards advertising and the premises on how marketing is received are new (Kitchen & Proctor, 2015). Marketers can no longer solely rely on these traditional outbound marketing techniques of intrusively pushing offerings onto customers (Schultz & Schultz, 1998; Opreana & Vinerean, 2015). Schultz and Schultz (1998) argue that the advances of information technology has increased interactivity, which has changed and is still changing the marketplace, successively relocating the control from the companies to the consumers. The new environment has brought with it a new type of dialogue and an increased exchange between the buyer and seller (Schultz & Schultz, 1998; Lusch & Vargo, 2009; Blazevic & Lievens, 2008). The change also emphasises the co-creation and a relationship between company and customer (Lusch & Vargo, 2009).

1.2 Relationship Marketing and Trust

In this new environment Bleoju, Capatina, Rancati and Lesca (2016), echoed by Holliman and Rowley (2014), suggest that marketers need to switch its old opportunistic focus on the short term toward a more vigilant behaviour with a long-term perspective. This switch also means that companies need to move away from the view of a one-off transaction and develop a relationship with the consumer (Dowell, Heffernan & Morrison, 2013; Holliman & Rowley, 2014), hence the concept of relationship marketing has gained increased popularity among marketing researchers (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). A relationship is dependent on numerous transactions and marketers have become more concerned with managing customer relationships and creating a social exchange of value (ibid.; Fournier, 1998).

Central to relationship marketing is the concept of trust. Research has found that trust is one of the key factors for developing a good relationship, and it is essential for successful relationship marketing outcomes (Dowell et al., 2013). As trust is such an essential part of building relationships, firms need to become more concerned with developing sustainable principles and methods for developing trust.
1.3 New Online Tendencies

The advance of the Internet, and consequently also online marketing, has lead to the emergence of a whole new spectrum of ways to conduct marketing. Online advertising and marketing has developed into several different forms, which emphasise relationship building, such as content marketing and social media marketing (Nosrati, Karimi, Mohammadi, & Malekian, 2013; Oprenæ & Vinerean, 2015; Valos, Habibi, Casidy, Driesener and Maplestone, 2016). Among these numerous ways of online marketing, the video format has started to play an increasingly important role. This is evident from the report put together by Cisco (2015), which predicts that the global consumer online video traffic will be 80 per cent of all consumer Internet traffic by 2019. By creating valuable (as in useful or emotionally engaging) video content companies can induce trust and attract potential and existing customers in an organic way (Oprenæ & Vinerean, 2015; Rahimina & Hassanzadeh, 2013; Huang, Bolchini & Jones, 2011).

Online videos are as mentioned an increasingly popular tool for marketers, by which they try to reach customers (Teixera, 2013; Water & Jones, 2011). The video format allows the consumer to simultaneously experience the three V’s of communication: verbal, vocal & visual. In combination the three V’s have been found to be most effective for helping recipients remember key messages (Waters & Jones, 2011). Waters and Jones (2011) state that combining the imagery with the correct words and the right tone of the speaker can form lasting impressions in the viewer.

Videos can build the brand and consumer relationship in many ways. It puts a human face on the organization, engages its customers and enhances the impression of the organization’s products and services (Waters & Jones, 2011; Teixera, 2013). It has been found that valuable online video content, in combination with a good distribution strategy, is an effective way for companies to build their brand, increase trust and support existing offerings and promotions (Teixera, 2013; Oprenæ & Vinerean, 2015; Rahimina & Hassanzadeh, 2013; Valos et al., 2016). According to Waters and Jones (2011) it may even be the most powerful method an organisation can use to create a strong mental impression in the public’s mind.

Although videos themselves are a powerful tool, their impact depends on what channels they are distributed on. Waters and Jones (2011) found that by using social media platforms, firms can reach a larger number of consumers than through their own website alone. As a means for reaching customers, social media platforms are thus, due to the massive and increasing amount of online traffic, gaining popularity among marketers (Waters & Jones, 2011; Ferguson, 2008). As many as seven out of ten consumers view brands in a more positive light after watching interesting video content produced by the brands (Trimble, 2015, 30 July), which is an undisputable reason for firms to engage in video marketing strategies. Among the popularly used social media channels is the video sharing platform YouTube which, apart from Facebook, is the world’s most frequently visited website, receiving more than one billion unique visitors every month (Trimble, 2015, 30 July; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015).

Garrett (2016) suggests that online educational resources are becoming increasingly important, among these resources we find video tutorials. According to Martin and Martin (2015) tutorial videos are about meeting the customer at their time of need. This format has
thus been embraced by various institutions, such as libraries, universities, schools, software firms and so forth (Martin & Martin, 2015; Huang, Bolchini & Jones, 2011; Waters & Jones, 2011). A reason for their popularity is that tutorials, when well made and based on educational pedagogy, can provide a valuable and enriching experience (Martin & Martin, 2015).

1.4 Problem Discussion

Organizations are using different strategies for distributing videos on YouTube. In their study Waters and Jones (2011) found that organizations are using videos of different formats to reach customers. The most prominent examples were videos with a purpose to educate, inform or entertain viewers (ibid.). Research has shown that creative and entertaining online videos sometimes go viral and thus create a significant impact on consumer engagement (Teixera, 2013). This type of video content can be a great tool for marketers as they can be created within a limited budget and reach and engage many consumers (ibid.). In addition to this Waters and Jones (2011) showed that videos of educational and informational content are also good drivers within a relationship-marketing concept.

There are many different types of video formats that firms can produce for marketing and customer relationship purposes and many of these have been studied. Still we found that gaps do exist in the knowledge and literature, especially regarding certain types of videos. Consistent in the economic literature is the focus on how online entertainment or informational videos have been used from a relationship marketing perspective. When examining existing research we came to discover that less attention has however been directed to the use of tutorials. We find this to be a clear gap in the business economic literature, as Waters and Jones (2015) note that consumers increasingly visit YouTube for other purposes than entertainment. Garrett (2016) suggests that educational resources, such as online video tutorials, are gaining importance for both formal and informal learning. This is backed by Purcell (2010) who states that between the years 2007 and 2009 the number of adult Internet users watching educational videos almost doubled from 22 per cent to 38 per cent of the users.

In conclusion much research has shown how the use of video marketing engages customers and increase trust, as well as they give many other benefits. While we note that the common theme among video advertising on social media platforms is of entertainment or informational purposes, we have found less studies regarding the effectiveness of tutorials, or educational videos, from a relationship marketing, or more specifically consumer trust, perspective. Little focus has been put on the potential of educational resources to have trust inducing effects.

1.5 The Aim of the Study

The aim of our study is to investigate the ability of online educational videos [tutorials] to increase customer trust and explore the factors driving it.
1.6 Research Questions

Following the previous discussion, with respect to the existing gaps in marketing literature and the aim of our study, we want to find the answer to the following research questions.

RQ1: What factors in the tutorials can be inferred to have a trust inducing effect on the consumer?

RQ2: How can these trust factors be categorised and how do they operate?

1.7 Limitations

In this study we analyse and compare video tutorials posted on YouTube by music production software companies to gain uniformity in our results. The analysed tutorials are limited to 12 in number and spread among four different organisations. We choose the three most viewed YouTube-videos, in tutorial format, from each firm. As we conduct a content analysis we are evaluating their impact on trust from a viewer perspective. The mentioned limitations have been made in consideration to our limited time and budget, but were chosen to keep the study (reliable), scientific, interesting and generalizable.

Lastly we want to denote that the firms we chose to analyse also engage in other marketing and service related activities apart from creating video tutorials. There is likely other content that these companies share that may induce consumer trust and builds customer relationships. Due to the main objective of our research we chose to exclude these. It is important to remember that our study will not provide the complete picture as to how companies build trust and customer relationships, as it is only focusing on how trust can be created through online tutorial videos.

1.8 Disposition

To conclude this chapter we present the disposition of our study giving an explanation of the content and the order in which it is presented.

Chapter 1
The first chapter explores the developments within the field of marketing. We begin with looking at marketing and its evolution from a more general perspective and eventually reach a more specific description of the niche we want to explore deeper. By exploring the gaps in the current scientific frontier we formulate our aim and research questions that will guide our study on trust.

Chapter 2
In the second chapter we present existing literature and theories related to our subject of study. This chapter explores the theoretical background to the most relevant prevailing theories on trust, online marketing and video tutorials. Through this theoretical chapter we build a base for the framework that will guide our gathering of empirical data.
Chapter 3
The methodology chapter presents our choice of methodology and discusses its implications. As the study is a qualitative content analysis we have strived to convey elaborate and transparent information into the coding process, so as to gain replicable results. In this chapter we also present the selection process for the firms and the tutorial videos that were analysed in our study, it also presents the coding frame developed for the collection of data.

Chapter 4
In chapter four we present the empirical data gathered through our content analysis. The results are presented first in a firm-by-firm format, where the results of the content analysis of each firm’s tutorial videos are summarised. Finally we present the total results of all videos, presented in a summarising table.

Chapter 5
The fifth chapter is dedicated to the analysis of the empirical data from chapter 4. In the same manner we first conduct a firm wise analysis and proceed with a general analysis of the firms common results.

Chapter 6
Chapter six concludes our study by presenting our analysis and findings in a more compact format by linking them to the aim and research questions. The chapter also links to earlier research and offers new theoretical, as well as practical, contributions. Finally, the chapter concludes by reflecting on the study in a critical manner and ends with suggestions for future research.
2.0 Literature Review

In the following chapter we provide a theoretical background to the subjects treated in this paper. We will commence by discussing underlying marketing concepts and follow with information regarding the tools and industry to be studied.

2.1 Relationship Marketing

Grönroos (1994, p.9) defines that the purpose of marketing is “to establish, maintain, and enhance relationships with customers and other partners at a profit, so that the objectives of both parties are met. This is achieved by mutual exchange and fulfilment of promises.” As the new marketing environment focuses more on intangible aspects, encompassed by the service-dominant logic, firms have an increasing need to embrace this view and shift their focus towards building long-term relationship with their customers (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Bleoju et al., 2016). Morgan and Hunt (1994, p.34) refer to relationship marketing as “all marketing activities directed towards establishing, developing, and maintaining successful relational exchanges”. The authors further argue that relationship marketing is needed for competitive success due to the changing dynamic in the global marketplace. Thus marketing today has an interactive focus in which relationship building and management are vital cornerstones (Grönroos, 1994). Grönroos (1994) suggests that establishing relationships with customers can be divided into two parts: attracting the customer and building the relationship with him. This is in line with Fournier (1998) who argues that relationships constitute of numerous exchanges between known parties, which evolve in response to the interactions, and the fluctuations in the contextual environment. As all relationships build on trust it is a vital component for successful long-term exchanges between organisation and customer.

2.2 Trust

Trust is one of the key factors for developing a good relationship and it is essential for successful relationship marketing outcomes (Dowell et al., 2013; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015). Dowell et al. (2013, p. 447) explicitly put it: “Trust is a key relationship commodity”. There seems to be a general consensus that trust, in its essence is essential for human life and society and has a multilevel structure and complicated nature (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015).

Rousseau et al. (1998, p.395) defines trust as “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another”. A view that is echoed by Morgan and Hunt (1994) who conceptualize trust to as when one party has confidence in the other’s integrity and reliability. We second these definitions, and will proceed with Rousseau et al. (1998) as a base definition for our research.

Trust is built on several independent, as well as, interdependent factors. Morgan and Hunt (1994) found when examining the literature that trust is built on the perceived reliability and high integrity of the other party. These attributes are built on qualities such as consistency, competency, honesty, fairness, responsibility and benevolence (ibid.). Trust is built on the actions of one party, through the content of what is provided, and also by the intentions and efforts of the provider (Porter & Donthu, 2008). Dowell et al. (2013), although being
primarily focused on business-to-business relationships, provide a good conceptual model for understanding the underlying drivers that create trust:

![Model of Trust](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Trust</th>
<th>Competency/ability trust</th>
<th>Contractual/ integrity trust</th>
<th>Goodwill/ benevolence trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance</td>
<td>1. Honesty</td>
<td>1. Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expertise</td>
<td>2. Integral actions</td>
<td>2. Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication</td>
<td>3. Candid responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1. Model of Trust (Dowell et al., 2013, p.442)

The model gives a clear overview of what creates trust. It was first intended to explain the relationship in business-to-business trust formation. As both business-to-business and business-to-consumer contexts involve human interaction and feelings, we believe that the model may be just as applicable in a business-to-consumer context. To gain a deeper understanding of each element, we will turn to each category in turn.

**Competency Trust**

The first part of competency trust is related to performance. A firm establishes performance trust by the ability to deliver on its promises and its ability to handle and pull-through on post-sale support (Dowell et al., 2013). Expertise trust is gained by having customer knowledge, an understanding of what are the customer needs and what the customer is going through. It comprises product as well as industry knowledge, showing experience with factors and variables of the specific market (ibid). Finally communication trust involves being easily contactable and having an open exchange of information between supplier and buyer (ibid).

**Integrity Trust**

We perceive that another party has integrity if we can believe that the other party consistently acts and relies on acceptable principles of behaviour (Porter & Donthu, 2008). To establish integrity trust there should be a truthful relationship between the parties (ibid.). A firm should therefore be transparent in its communication. Dowell et al. (2013) found the importance of telling the truth to the best of one’s knowledge and that one should be prepared to admit when lacking complete knowledge in complex situations. Aside from communicating, it is also important to let your actions reflect honesty. This is what Dowell et al. (2013) calls integral action. It is vital that a firm’s behaviour is congruent with its promises (ibid.). To this we could add responsibility, or what Porter and Donthu (2008) calls judgement, meaning the ability to make decisions that favours the interest of both parties in a relationship. Finally, candid response relates to the ability to be up-front and frank with one’s partner (Dowell et al., 2013). Relating to this category is also the importance of promptness, taking too long to respond may easily be received with distrust (ibid.).
Benevolence Trust

Benevolence relates to willingness of one party to, beyond one’s own winning, benefit another (Porter & Donthu, 2008). In regards to benevolence trust Dowell et al. (ibid) found two drivers. Discretionary activities are used to show the other party how one is ready to go further and is engaged in the other party for more than just closing sales or orders (ibid). Discretionary activities may include business as well as non-business related. Of importance is also having a friendly attitude as it help build benevolence trust (ibid).

2.3 Outcomes of trust

Trust from a social perspective fosters a sense of moral obligation of the customer towards the firm (Porter & Donthu, 2008). When a firm shows benevolence, it induces the customer to reciprocate in some way towards the firm to restore his or her equity in the relationship (ibid.). This motivates the customer to behave in a loyal manner towards the firm and be supportive by buying products or engage in other value creating activities such as co-creation in product development (ibid.).

Trust can also be viewed from a rational perspective, where trust reduces the customer’s need to act in a self-protective manner (Porter & Donthu, 2008). Trust also serves as a solution to solve problems where there is uncertainty or risk (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015). Trust thus encourages the customer to be less risk-averse, for example becoming more likely to share valuable personal information (Porter & Donthu, 2008).

2.4 Trust in The Online Environment

Researchers, such as Porter and Donthu (2008) and Eastlick, Lotz and Warrington (2006) have established the importance of trust online, stating that fostering trust with customers is an essential component of any successful Internet-based marketing strategy. Content marketing is a popular tool in this environment and involves creating and sharing valuable content through different types of media, among them videos, to attract customers (Nosrati et al., 2013). Porter and Donthu (2008) found that the effort to provide quality content have positive effects on the customer’s beliefs about the provider and have significant trust-building effects.

The definitions of trust are formulated with the supposition that the trustee is another human being (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015). As the Internet in itself is inanimate the use of the concept trust in the online context has not always been obvious. However, the concept of trust in modern society and in online circumstances has come to be associated to the objects’ creators, namely the persons behind the service, product or webpage (ibid). The main factors for creating trust online have by Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015) been identified as design features in combination with customer relationships.

Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015) assumes Sztompka’s (2012) onset of the three levels of trust when evaluating trust online. According to this onset the first level of trust is based on the initial perception of the object of trust. On this level, which lays the foundation for future trust or lack of trust, external characteristics are of crucial significance (ibid.). The second level of trust concerns contextual conditions and status characteristics of the trustee (ibid.). On this level the anonymity or non-transparency of the Internet can be considered a trust-
impeding factor. Lastly, the third level of trust is related to the assessment of the object of trust based on reliable and objective information (ibid.). Unlike the first two levels, the third level of trust is not based on emotions, but on rational judgment (ibid.). Following this succession Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015) suggest that in online environments the design features, such as colour, graphics, corporate design and high-quality illustrations, is responsible for the visual factor and the main tool for generating trust at the first level. Further relationship marketing strategies generate trust at the second and third levels, covering the reputational and contextual factors necessary for achieving trust (ibid.).

The main reason for users’ lack of trust is according to Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015) an unfavourable first impression based on the visual perception of the resources. To avoid an unfavourable first impression the design should facilitate the users with convenience, ease of perception and positive emotions (ibid.). Apart from this the reputational and contextual factors, as well as the rational assessment of data, are crucial for the trust creation process (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015). These factors facilitate the completion of the trust-generation process by transforming the first impression into qualitative characteristics such as goodwill and information transparency (ibid.).

2.5 Social Media

Kaplan and Haenlein (2010, p.61), defines social media as “a group of internet-based applications, that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content”. These platforms include for example, social networking tools (e.g. Facebook, Twitter), professional networking sites (e.g. LinkedIn), media sharing sites (e.g. YouTube, Instagram), commerce communities (e.g. Amazon) and blogs and discussion forums (Valos et al., 2016). Social media has due to the increased use of computers and mobile devices gained a central position in today’s society. Since we spend so much time on the Internet and the social networks, these channels have also quickly converted into important marketing tools (Nosrati et al. 2013; Valos et al., 2016, Opreana & Vinerean, 2015). Valos et al. (2016) bring forth that social media, due to its interactive nature and by allowing collaboration as well as efficient information collection, is becoming integral to marketing strategy. Social media has also been acknowledged to be an effective medium for building relationships with customers (ibid). To provide value in the virtual community, firms need to make the effort to create quality content for the users and foster interaction and embeddedness among the members (Porter & Donthu, 2008).

2.6 Online Videos

If a picture can say more than a thousand words, imagine what a video could do. Today videos are used widely online with the purpose to provide entertainment, training, marketing materials, as well as other types of information (Huang, Bolchini & Jones, 2011). Although scholars have advocated the usage of videos as part of the overall organizational communication plans, the organizational blueprints and strategies of producing videos for web distribution is still on a developing stage (Waters & Jones, 2011). Fully understanding and developing these strategies is vital, since creating valuable online content and using smart distribution strategies, is an effective way for companies to build brand, increase trust and support existing offerings and promotions within a limited budget (Teixera, 2013; Opreana & Vinerean, 2015, Rahimina & Hassanzadeh, 2013; Valos et al., 2016).
An advantage of using videos is that they, when well made, provide a highly positive first impression of the brand and in continuation influence how the consumer values the subsequent experiences (Huang, Bolchini & Jones, 2011). An explanation for this is that videos have the power to engage not only the viewers’ minds, but also their hearts (ibid.). Waters and Jones (2011) found that all types of organisations (non-profit, for-profit and governmental) are increasingly using social media channels, such as YouTube, to spread their organizational news and videos. It has been proven that videos in organised communication campaigns enable non-profit organisations to strengthen their relationship to the external stakeholders and that it builds their identity (Waters & Jones, 2011). This could very well be considered applicable on other types of organisations as well.

There are several different purposes for online videos. They can be used as a tool to educate and create awareness, for public service announcements and advertising, as well as they can for promoting companies’ success stories and for fundraising (Waters & Jones, 2011). Further, having conversations with those who view and comment on the videos on these social media channels can increase the organisations reputational yield (ibid.). Videos as such are a one-way communication form from the organization to its customers, but publishing videos on social media channels enables and encourages, thanks to features like comment fields and like- and dislike buttons, a legitimate two-way interaction (ibid.). Having videos posted on social media channels enable opportunities for conversation and interaction between the organisation and its customers, as well as it also is a tool where firms can track consumer behaviour by analysing viewing patterns (ibid.).

2.7 Video Tutorials

Tutorials are, when properly made, an effective and cost effective way to reach out to the customers in their moment of need (Martin & Martin, 2015), while simultaneously serving the purpose of product demonstration. Video tutorials constitute a niche market where both makers and users of software are operating as active players (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). Having understood the power of video tutorials many technology and software companies are successively replacing their paper-based tutorials with video tutorials (ibid.). There are according to Martin and Martin (2015) five main tools for making tutorials, and these are screencasts, slidecasts, live action video, animation and interactivity.

Organizations engage in many different activities to provide a service to their customers. For software firms, tutorials are a common tool to educate their clientele at their time of need (Martin & Martin, 2015; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). As with any form of exchange between company and consumer, actions may produce secondary effects. This is recognised by relationship marketing theory, as relationships evolve and fluctuate in response to numerous exchanges between parties (Fournier, 1998), increasing the need to establish trust.
There are several advantages with using video based tutorials, among them are their affordability and their effectiveness, as they make use of the three V’s of communication, verbal, vocal and visual, simultaneously (Waters & Jones, 2011; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015) and provide precise representation of task execution (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). As video tutorials present the interface identically as the user will see it while working with the software and give a dynamic representation showing moment-by-moment changes, there is a congruence between a recorded demonstration and real task execution which can be beneficial for learning (ibid). These factors combined result in a high level of accomplished task execution by the users (ibid). Several studies have revealed positive effects of video tutorial related to learning (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015, Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). Further Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2015) found that over 70 per cent the users indicated having been in a positive mood during training, which can lead to positive associations with the program and the brand.

However, the positive results depend on the quality of the content and design of video tutorial itself (Waters & Jones, 2011; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). To ensure better quality in tutorial videos regarding software training Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) developed a model of eight guidelines for the design of the instructional videos. These guidelines focus on the design of video tutorials and concentrate on sets of instructions that support learning and retention of software skills. These guidelines are; 1) provide easy access, 2) use animation with narration, 3) Enable functional interactivity, 4) Preview the task, 5) Provide procedural rather than conceptual information, 6) Make tasks clear and simple, 7) Keep videos short, and lastly 8) Strengthen demonstration with practice. These are depicted in Figure 2.2.
Table 2.2. Guidelines for Software Tutorials Proposed by Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 1: Provide easy access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 1.1: Craft the title carefully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 2: Use animation with narration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 2.1: Be faithful to the actual interface in the animation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 2.2: Use a spoken human voice for the narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 2.3: Action and voice must be in sync</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 3: Enable functional interactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 3.1: Pace the video carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 3.2: Enable user control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 4: Preview the task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 4.1: Promote the goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 4.2: Use a conversational style to enhance perceptions of task relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 4.3: Introduce new concepts by showing their use in context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 5: Provide procedural rather than conceptual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 6: Make tasks clear and simple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 6.1: Follow the user’s mental plan in describing an action sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 6.2: Draw attention to the interconnection of user actions and system reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline 6.3: Use highlighting to guide attention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline 7: Keep videos short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Guideline 8: Strengthen demonstration with practice |

2.8 YouTube

YouTube is an online video sharing website and is currently the biggest video sharing and streaming website (Chang & Lewis, 2011), receiving more than one billion unique viewers per month (Trimble, 2015 30 July; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). Videos can be streamed on demand, meaning that users can access uploaded content when it best suits them (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). The platform hosts a wide variety of videos, with varying lengths and content (Garrett, 2016). YouTube provides a good platform to study, as it, according to Garrett (2016), is the foremost destination for tutorial users. The characteristics and size of YouTube also make it probable to be generally representative for the overall Internet population (Garret, 2016).
The popularity of different videos follows a very skewed distribution, with the top 10% of videos accounting for 80% of the views (Garrett, 2016). According to Garrett (2016) learners often struggle to find high-quality material when browsing the web, making the informal learning process harder. YouTube’s search algorithm seems, however, to be tuned to help videos of less popular content to get more views, maybe this is the reason 47% of video uploaders have reached over 1000 views (Ding et al., 2011). This may prove positive for uploaders of high-quality tutorials. Although they may not have the general population watching their videos, they may still be able to reach those who specifically need their content.

2.9 Theoretical model

Combining the existing knowledge, we find that existing models for trust do have some differing characteristics when applied to real-life situations or online. We have found that a lot of research seems to be focusing on online trust on design features and sometimes disregard the transactional and communicative aspects. Our idea, however, based on the above literature review, is that trust is in the end developed as a result of human interaction between the creator and the visitor, which we find support for in Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015). As a result, we developed a new conceptual model that includes both aspects, and will be used as a basis for our data collection.

For this model we decided to divide trust into two main categories: One concerning characteristics and factors typical to the internet, and the second concerning factors in regards to the exchange between parties, which normally is contributed to real-life encounters, but not necessarily exclusive to it. Exchange factors concern the communication and exchanges between company and consumer, which according to the authors Dowell et al. (2013), Porter and Donthu (2008) and Morgan and Hunt (1994), is an essential part of building trust. Design focuses on the impressions produced by visual and other design features, that are important to invoke feelings of trust in an online environment (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016). The
exchange factors have been characterised through the trust model of Dowell et al. (2013), discussed previously in this chapter (2.2). Design Factors have, in the same way, been included based on the works of Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2016). We will primarily be using the guidelines for tutorial development proposed by Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) to include the design features important for making good video tutorials. In summary, the model categorises the overall factors that shape and influence trust.
3.0 Methodology

In the following section we will describe the methodology we have assumed for our study. Content analysis requires an elaborate methodology. An important step is to clearly define the research methods, as transparency is essential to obtain replicable results. This chapter will take you through an explanation of content analysis and why we have chosen this approach. We will also discuss the data selection process as well as the tools used for analysing the results.

3.1 Content Analysis

As the aim of our study is to explore how online video tutorials on YouTube may induce consumer trust, we found content analysis to be an appropriate approach. Content analysis is used to describe the meaning of an obtained material (Schreier, 2012) and to make abductive inferences from the content to phenomena outside it (Krippendorff, 2004). Content analysis is a flexible, objective and systematic, research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from content to the contexts of their use (Bryman & Bell, 2013; Krippendorff, 2004; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Content analysis can be applied to many different sources of content, such as texts, pictures and videos (Bryman & Bell, 2013; Krippendorff, 2004; Schreier, 2012).

As content analysis is effective for capturing subtle meanings (Schreier, 2012), we argue that content analysis is an appropriate approach. Increasing trust may not be the primary objective of the tutorial creator; therefore it is not implicit in the content of the videos. Trust is influenced by many factors in the exchange between two parties; it is thus likely that tutorials may have trust inducing factors. Content analysis is for this reason a suitable method as it contains tools to explore and infer phenomena that cannot be observed directly from the content, it seeks to answer questions that go outside of the text (Krippendorff, 2004).

3.1.1 Type of Research

We will use a mixed research design as content analysis is of both a qualitative and a quantitative nature. Our focus will be on making qualitative inferences, although aspects of quantitative research will be necessary as well. This may sound contradictory, but as Krippendorff (2004) argues, a distinction may not necessarily be beneficial regarding content analysis, as it is both qualitative (the reading of text) and quantitative (the coding and conversion to numbers) in nature. Our analysis will be of what Hsieh and Shannon (2005) calls a directed approach. This because prior research and theory will be used to guide our coding process, as well as the analysis and discussion of our findings. We are aware of the fact that new categories or measures may be discovered and set during the coding process, as previous content analysis have not to our knowledge been done on video tutorials to understand their influence on trust. This context to our method summarizes well, the criteria for a directed approach as explained by Hsieh and Shannon (2005).
3.1.2 Focus on Music Production Software Firms

In our study we want to take a closer look into how software firms creating music production software market themselves with the help of online tutorial videos. We chose to focus on these firms, as they are a niche market that actively engages in creating and distributing tutorials, but have not received much focus in previous research. We believe that the tutorials may be an important tool for interacting with and maintaining their customers, but where the trust aspect has not yet been explored. The music software companies develop and supply software-based audio signal processing tools such as virtual instruments, plug-ins, compressors, limiters, equalizers and a number of other sound effects and music production tools. We have chosen to base our study on four different companies that develop music production software and these are iZotope, Sugar Bytes, Waves Audio and D16 Group. We decided on these four companies as they through our searches appeared to be among the most popular ones and they also had active YouTube-profiles. The four companies are slightly varied in size, but all are known developers of music production software. Waves Audio is the one of the four with the most subscribers on YouTube reaching 147 188 followers, second is iZotope with 35 044 and then Sugar Bytes with 6 864, lastly we have D16 Group with 1 724 followers (YouTube, n.d.A; YouTube, n.d.B; YouTube, n.d.C; YouTube, n.d.D).

The sharing of tutorials has become a commonly used method for software firms to give support to their existing customers (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2031; Garrett, 2016), but they may also be helpful for possible customer in their pre-purchase process. We want to take a closer look into how these music production software firms make use of tutorials in their overall marketing strategy and how they are used for maintaining customer relationships.

3.2 Data Collection & Process

In the following chapter we will explain the methods and strategies used regarding the data selection and the coding of the material.

3.2.1 Selection Criteria

Regarding the video selection we decided to analyse the three most viewed online tutorials on the YouTube channels of the firms iZotope, Waves Audio, D16 Group and Sugar Bytes. By choosing three different videos from each firm we aim to achieve a sufficiently representative, as well as manageable, sample to work with during our ten week research period. Although we chose to focus our study on music production software firms, we believe the logic and results to be applicable onto other software markets that make use of tutorials. The reason for this is that the format of a good and informative tutorial should be generally applicable (the same) for all types of procedural information aiming to instruct in the usage of any type of software.

We based our selection on the most viewed tutorial videos on the firms YouTube channels, with a length ranging from one to ten minutes, to make the analysable material manageable. We chose this approach as the most popular videos have been online during a sufficient time to reach a high number of views, as well as interactions in form of comments and likes. The duration was set to this range to make the material manageable and to keep the video structure similar across the firms. We also ensured that the videos had a clear tutorial format as many
other forms of videos, such as webinars, teasers and product presentations, are also published on these firms YouTube channels.

### 3.2.2 Video Selection

We applied a systematic and identical course of action when selecting the videos. As a first step we opened the firm’s YouTube-channel, then we selected the tab “videos” to get an overview of their uploaded videos. Then we chose to filter the videos to order the “most popular” ones at the top of the list. In systematic order we then went through the videos from the most popular one onwards making sure that the video stated “Tutorial” in the video’s title or that it clearly followed a tutorial video’s structure. After doing the same selection process for the YouTube-channels for all four firms we compiled the following list of videos.

**Table 3.1 Selected Tutorial Videos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial Video Selection</th>
<th>iZotope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Harmonizing Vocals with iZotope's Nectar® 2 <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TGIvjyyYhM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TGIvjyyYhM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10 Steps to a Quick Master iZotope Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Overview of iZotope Alloy 2: Essential Mixing Tools <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ewce7pHOLM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ewce7pHOLM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Intro to mixing vocals with Waves plugins <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7e0SFs1M8U">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7e0SFs1M8U</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Top Mixing Engineer Tony Maserati on Multiband Compression for Vocals <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2s3yU14xpJ8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2s3yU14xpJ8</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Waves Tune Tips &amp; Tricks <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NETb8Rz6JBQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NETb8Rz6JBQ</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Bytes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Consequence Pattern Basics <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WSiOQVM3HQo">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WSiOQVM3HQo</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>TURNADO Mainpage Tutorial <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jgTJLDkPXfY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jgTJLDkPXfY</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sugar Bytes GUITARIST Nirvana Tutorial <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPkfioH7Ugc">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPkfioH7Ugc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16 Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Phoscyon - Getting started <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L-YtVJZVyyM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L-YtVJZVyyM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3 Coding Process

To avoid assessment bias in our coding frame, we have followed the eight recommendations of the “Weber protocol” (Bryman & Bell, 2013). These recommendations include 1) a definition of the variables that will be registered, 2) a definition of the coding categories, 3) a test of the coding on a part of the material, 4) an evaluation of the validity and reliability of the results of the test, 5) revision of the coding rules, 6) return to step 3 until satisfactory reliability is achieved, 7) coding of the entire material, and finally 8) an evaluation of the achieved reliability or accuracy.

During our work we started off by building up a first coding frame based on our integrated trust and design model. We followed up by carefully defining all the chosen codes with individual descriptions. As we moved on to the step of testing our coding frame we noticed that some of the chosen codes were not suitable for the medium we were studying, thus the codes that through testing were found inappropriate were eliminated. One of these was for example “enable user control”. As all examined videos were YouTube videos all videos automatically enabled the users control to play, pause and skip forwards or reverse as wanted, thus this code was excluded. During this process we also noticed the necessity of adding a few new codes that we initially hadn’t thought of, for example “does the video provide extra tips that can be useful for the user” was added after the first test coding. After the second test coding we evaluated the reliability of this updated coding frame as good and the coding process of the whole material was conducted. The complete coding template is provided in the appendix.

After having coded all the videos separately we once again evaluated the reliability of the results by comparing our separate results with one another. This was made to see if we had perceived the tutorials, as well as the different codes, in the same manner and thus achieve as consistent and reliable results as possible.

3.2.4 Coding Parameters

In the coding process we will be using the eight guidelines for video tutorial creation, developed by Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013), as a framework when designing our coding frame. We find these guidelines to be reliable for evaluating the quality and design of the videos since they have summarized key notions of acknowledged theories in the fields of both educational psychology and instructional design (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). To further capture the trust inducing factors of the tutorials we have drawn inspiration from Dowell et al. s’ (2013) trust model when creating the coding frame.

During the coding trial we found many of the existing theories of Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013), as well as Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015), to be very helpful for developing reliable coding parameters. The initial trial was heavily reliant on the theoretical model we provided at the end of the theory chapter. Some exclusions were made due to the
inherent characteristics that are general for all YouTube tutorials, and the exclusions were following: Timing and customer needs aspects; as YouTube videos can be watched on demand, it is likely that customers will turn to the videos at the time of their need and for what is needed. User control: As we chose to only examine YouTube videos the same options for playing, pausing, fast-forwarding and replaying the video were available in all the videos. Thus we concluded this parameter to be unnecessary for our analysis.

We also decided to exclude that last parameter from Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) about providing exercises for the viewers to practice on, as we felt that this parameter was not applicable to the context of our study. Viewers watching these tutorials are likely watching the video to learn more or solve an already surfaced problem.

3.2.5 Coding Frame

Following we will present and describe the coding frame that was created for our content analysis study.

![Figure 3.2 Coding Frame of Trust Inducing Factors in Video Tutorials](image-url)
In total there are 36 different codes in our coding frame, 21 codes concerning the design category and 15 for exchange related codes.

Definitions:
We will proceed with definitions of the coding frame to make the study replicable. Schreier (2012) states that categories and subcategories should be defined. Main categories need only generalized definition, while subcategories should be defined in a more precise manner (ibid.). It is important to note that some categories are of similar nature and others, while not mutually exclusive, are of a nature where one code may result in another to be non-existent. One example of this is if the tutorial chooses a presentational style instead of a conversational one.

Design Factors
1. Is easy access to the video provided?
To be helpful for the users an instructional video must be easy to find. Regarding YouTube-videos an easy access depends mainly on how well the title coincides with keyword searches.

1.1 Is the title crafted carefully?
The title of the video plays a critical role for ensuring easy access. A good title contains a verb and an object, telling the user what task the video explains how to perform (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013).

2. Is animation used with narration?
The common format of tutorials is a recorded demonstration; with a screen capture animation and explaining narration. This code determines if this kind of presentation is used.

2.1 Is the video faithful to the actual interface?
The interface depicted in the video should be identical to the interface that the users themselves face when using the program (Van der Meij, & Van der Meij, 2013). This code defines if the screen image seen of the software is identical to what the users would be facing.

2.2 Is spoken human voice used for narration?
Is the voice used for the narration a human or a computer-generated voice? According to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) a human voice is preferable. This code defines if a human is narrating in the video or computer narration or text is used instead.

2.3 Are action and voice in sync?
This code shows if the narration is on time with the actions shown in the video. To achieve best results in regards to learning the speaker’s explanation should be in synch with the demonstration of the actions (Van der Meij, & Van der Meij, 2013). In cases where text, instead of narration, is used the code applies in same way on how well the instructions are synced with the actions depicted in the video.

3. Is the pace in the video good?
The video should have an appropriate tempo for the viewer to be able to follow along and learn. It should not be so fast that viewers find it difficult to follow and understand. It should not either be too slow, making the viewer lose focus or interest. A conversational tempo should be used without rushing the instructions extending natural breaks with an extra two to five second pause (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013).
4. Is there a preview of the task?
Is there a preview shown in the beginning of the video of the task to be performed? Or is the topic at hand introduced in any way. A preview can also be formed as a quick tour of the main screen components (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). By giving a quick introduction learning and the user’s understanding of the goal can be enhanced.

4.1 Is the goal promoted?
This code defines if the goal, meaning the task that the tutorial aims to explain, is kept clear to the viewer during the video. Promoting the goal is important for driving the motivation and attention of the viewer, as well as it ensures a clear task focus throughout the tutorial.

4.2 Is conversational style used in the narration?
Conversational style will be coded if the narrator uses a laid-back tone, discussing and walking-through the steps he takes. For example “I want to do this, therefore I click that, or use this control. According to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) the narration in tutorials should preferably be personal rather than formal. Conversational style also enhances the task relevance (ibid.).

4.3 Does the narrator use a presentational style?
A presentational style relies on displaying and presenting as opposed to the conversational style. It is best described as an example “By using this feature, you can add these effects.” A presentational style might be perceived by the viewer to have a distinctly selling attitude, thus leading to less trustworthy perceptions of the content and the firm.

Code 4.2 and 4.3 are not mutually exclusive, both styles may be adapted within the same video.

4.4 Are new concepts introduced by showing their use in the context?
Educational research promotes the use just-in-time information, which reduces the load on the user’s working memory (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). Giving prerequisite instructions, such as introducing specific software features or new concepts, at the point when it’s actually needed to complete the task, can facilitate learning.

5. Is procedural information provided?
According to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) all information given in the tutorial should be procedural and geared towards the goal of a successful and immediate accomplishment of the task. An example formula for procedural information can be stated as: “To achieve y you need to do step x+z”.

5.1 Is conceptual information provided?
This code determines if conceptual and less task focused information is given in the video instead of clear step-by-step instructions to complete a specified task. An example of conceptual information is: “With y you can get x+z effects”

The codes 5 and 5.1 are not necessarily mutually exclusive, thus both types of information can be found in different parts of the video.

6. Are tasks made clear and simple?
Are simple, prototypical explanations used for instructing the user on how to achieve the task? The instructions should be formulated so that a user with no or little previous knowledge of the software could replicate the demonstrated actions.

6.1 *Is the user’s mental plan followed in describing an action sequence?*
Does the video explain the required actions step by step in a logical order so that these can easily be understood and replicated by the user? This code relates to whether the video will be easy to follow and learn from, or if it is confusing. According to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) the instructions need to follow the natural sequence in which the user physically and mentally executes a task.

6.2 *Is interconnection between user action and system reaction explained?*
Does the video explain the different effects and reactions of the program for each action taken in a good way? This code defines if the outcomes of the different actions are made clear to the viewer.

6.3 *Is highlighting used to guide attention*
This code defines if highlighting, in form of markings in distinct colours, arrows, or zooming in on a specific detail is used for directing the viewer’s attention. Highlighting should grab the viewer’s attention.

7. *Is the length of the video appropriate in regards to the task explained?*
Is enough time spent to explain the task thoroughly, without spending more time than necessary on insignificant details or other content? Is the length appropriate to keep the interest of the viewer?

8. *Is the sound quality good?*
Is the sound quality of both the music and narration good, so that the viewer easily can hear and understand the content? If the sound quality in the video tutorial is poor, the viewers understanding, interest as well as concentration will suffer. In our coding we considered a good sound quality to consist of a clear sound signal without any distortion or other disturbing sounds. The volume should also have a sufficient volume range so that the viewer can turn the volume up or down sufficiently.

9. *Is the image quality good?*
Is the image in the video of good quality so that the video image and the shown tasks are clear to the viewer? The image quality should be sharp and clear throughout the video, so that even smaller details are viewable. The image should further stay sharp and well defined even when video is viewed in full screen-mode. If the video’s image quality is poor the tutorial fails to show neither the actions performed nor the exact features of the software in a clear enough manner. This can result in the viewer missing out on important details or not understanding the instructions that the narrator is trying to transmit.
Exchange Factors

Competency Trust

Competency trust is built on the perceived knowledge and the ability to understand the customer. It is subdivided into three drivers, performance, expertise and communication. Each driver was represented by the following codes:

1.1.1. Does the video explain the task as claimed?
It is important that the tutorial actually addresses the task at hand. This means that the tutorial should explain the steps needed to achieve the task stated by the headline, video description or narrator.

1.1.2. Does the video provide good post-sale support?
Does the video provide useful help and guidance to the customers, enabling them to fully make use of the software? Are tasks and issues, that customers may need guidance for after the initial purchase, addressed?

1.1.3. Does the video provide good pre-sale support?
This code refers to if the video promotes the company’s product in a good way. Viewers may watch the tutorial to get a feel for the product that the video is demonstrating. Thus the tutorial also acts as an aid for purchase decision-making.

1.2.1. Is product knowledge displayed?
Is the product used and displayed in a helpful way to the audience. Does the company provide a tutorial that transmits a deep understanding of the program and its features, thus showing its full potential in use.

1.2.2. Are industry professionals featured?
Does the video feature known musicians and producers respected within the music industry? By having recognized producers and celebrities presenting the product the professional use of the software is displayed. This type of endorsement may also, thanks to the positive feelings felt towards the person, lead to higher appreciation of the brand and its products (Keller, 2013).

1.3.1. Is feedback requested?
This code explores whether feedback from the viewers is actively requested in the video, or in the video description. By requesting feedback the firm can detect where there might be room for improvement in their tutorials and detect subjects that might need to be covered by their videos tutorials.

1.3.2. Does the company respond to comments?
This code checks if the company is responding to comments directed to the company in the comment section. As each video can have numerous of comments we decided to only take into account the comments and replies that are visible in the feed directly below the video without clicking on “show more”. By replying to the comments the firm shows that they are responsive and actively monitoring what their existing, or potential customers, want to communicate.

1.3.3. Does the company engage with customers in the comment section?
This code explores if the company is engaged in the discussions that might start as a result of the video, and if the comments are of an interactive nature. By interactive we mean that the company writes answers, or contributes to the discussion in more ways than simply answering the question by referring to their support or Q&A page. This code shows a higher level of personal interaction from the firm’s side.
Integrity Trust:
We perceive that another party has integrity if we can believe that the other party consistently acts and relies on acceptable principles of behavior (Porter & Donthu, 2008). Integrity trust consists of three drivers, honesty, integral actions & candid responses.

2.1.1. Does the video induce a feeling of integrity and honesty?
This code is a somewhat subjective factor. It is difficult to abstract or quantify feelings, but it should be possible to interpret a somewhat reliable generalizable perception. For each video, if both researchers perceive the video in the same way, this feature will be included in the table otherwise it will be excluded.

2.1.2. Is the speaker’s face shown at any point in the video?
This explores whether the speaker’s face was shown at any point in the video. Showing the faces of the people behind the product or service can create an atmosphere of emotional closeness and personal communication, thus contributing to the users’ perception of trust (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016). This can be done by adding a webcam feed to the video, through a picture, or by shooting the video from the room in which the presenter is seated.

2.1.3. Is the organization’s logo shown?
This code defines if the organization’s logo is shown at any point in the video. By showing the logo the officiality of the tutorial is demonstrated, as well as the company brand is promoted.

2.2.1. Does the firm live up to the promises regarding the video?
Defines if the video truly is useful for in fact learning the task promoted in the title or description of the tutorial video. When a user searches for a tutorial video the underlying need is specific and concrete; the user searches for an answer for an existing question or problem. If the tutorial fails to give a solution to that existing problem, it does not serve its purpose and the firm thus fails to live up to its promises and the expectations of the user.

3. Benevolence Trust:
Benevolence relates to willingness of one party to go beyond one’s own winning, to the benefit of another (Porter & Donthu, 2008). Benefit trust relates to the drivers attitude and activities.

3.1.1. Is the company engaged with the customers beyond closing sales?
Does the company show that it is interested in the customer in other ways than just for making profit? A company can for example be interested in spreading useful tips and knowledge on music production to promote the creation of high quality music, not just selling music software.

3.1.2. Does the video, or the comments, provide extra tips unrelated to their software that can be useful to the user?
This code relates to if the company gives extra tips that the viewer may gain from. An example would be how the narrator recommends a good microphone to use when recording directly to your computer, or other practical elements to consider when mixing or producing music. These tips should always be related to the task addressed in the video to avoid confusion and conflict with the codes D:4 and D:5.

3.2.1. Is there a friendly attitude?
This code is also of a subjective character and relates to if the researchers find the video to produce a feeling of friendliness and closeness. This code is mainly depending on the
perceptions of the narrator, by having a less formal and relaxed character the level of perceived friendliness rises.

3.3 Reliability & Validity

To ensure a higher validity in the results of our study we chose to triangulate. Triangulation is an approach where several observers, theoretical perspectives, methodologies or data sources are used to achieve a higher reliability in the results (Bryman & Bell, 2013). This method is used in an increasing manner in both qualitative and quantitative studies to verify obtained results (ibid.). In our case we will triangulate by using dual observers, combining our results with other established theories of trust, and by using a research design of a qualitative and quantitative nature. By first analysing the material independently, and then going through and compiling our results together, we think that we can reach a comprehensive content analysis of the material. Further by applying this method we think that we can avoid researcher bias and achieve better replicability and more reliable results.

3.4 Analysis Method

Our analysis will be mainly qualitative and we will use a method called abductive inferences to derive new observations. Abductive inferences means making empirical connections and applying other knowledge to the context of established facts to derive inferential answers that are not directly observable (Krippendorff, 2004). For example, in this research we will search for answers to our stated research questions, by applying knowledge of established theories and research on trust while analysing video tutorials who’s seemingly main purpose is to educate its viewers. We will use and combine the separate codes to try to piece together the whole puzzle, exploring phenomena that may not be directly observable, but can be understood by looking at it's separate pieces combined with relevant already understood theory.

Aside from abductive inferences, we have also chosen to use our own impressions and feelings to better understand the trust shaping process. The reason for this choice is because of the limited capability of content analysis to actually measure the perceived trust in the customers. This may lead to a portion of researcher bias as we cannot exclude our own thoughts, but to limit this impact we will explicitly state when we reference to our own feelings.
4.0 Empirical Study

In the following chapter we will be presenting the empirical data achieved from coding the twelve video tutorials with the basis of our coding frame. The results will be presented firm by firm, as well as in a summarizing table, to give an overview with a few comments in written text.

4.1 Tutorial Information

When initiating the coding process of the material we found it to be important to add some more information concerning the tutorial videos, to give a more complete picture of them. For each video we noted down the date when the video was published, how many views it had reached, as well as how many likes, respectively dislikes, each video had gotten from the viewers at the time of our coding. This data is presented in the below table.

Table 4.1 Presentation of The Tutorials and Viewer Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firms &amp; Tutorials</th>
<th>Published</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Dislikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iZotope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Harmonizing Vocals with iZotope's Nectar® 2</td>
<td>17/10/2013</td>
<td>130 240</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10 Steps to a Quick Master iZotope Ozone</td>
<td>25/03/2015</td>
<td>136 695</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overview of iZotope Alloy 2: Essential Mixing Tools</td>
<td>13/8/2012</td>
<td>125 381</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intro to mixing vocals with Waves plugins</td>
<td>27/05/2008</td>
<td>452 190</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top Mixing Engineer Tony Maserati on Multiband Compression for Vocals</td>
<td>15/01/2014</td>
<td>382 021</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Bytes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Consequence Pattern Basics</td>
<td>13/10/2009</td>
<td>60 900</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TURNADO Mainpage Tutorial</td>
<td>27/05/2011</td>
<td>54 456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sugar Bytes GUITARIST Nirvana Tutorial</td>
<td>26/11/2010</td>
<td>53 255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16 Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Phoscyon - Getting started</td>
<td>17/03/2010</td>
<td>64 180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. LuSH-101 - Basic usage - Getting started</td>
<td>18/10/2012</td>
<td>40 885</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Antresol - Promo tutorial</td>
<td>19/06/2015</td>
<td>10 930</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Presentation of The Data

Following we will put forward the achieved empirical data. First in a firm-by-firm presentation to then conclude with a comparative summary between the firms.

4.2.1 iZotope

iZotope is one of the bigger YouTube channels that we sorted through with 35 622 subscribers. The three videos of iZotope were published between the years 2012 and 2015. Each video had a number of views that exceeded 120 000, but were less than 150 000. The examined tutorials date from August in 2012, October 2013 and March 2015.

4.2 Table of Results iZotope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS iZOTOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the video easy to access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Is the title well crafted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is animation used with narration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Is the video faithful to the actual interface?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Is spoken human voice used for narration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Are action and voice in sync?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the pace of the video good?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there a preview of the task?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Is the goal promoted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Is conversational style used in the narration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Does the narrator use a presentational style?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Are new concepts introduced by showing their use in the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is procedural information provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Is conceptual information provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are tasks made clear and simple?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Is the user’s mental plan followed in describing an action sequence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Is interconnection between user action and system reaction explained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Is highlighting used to guide attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exchange Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Does the video explain the task as claimed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Does the video provide good post-sale support?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Does the video provide good pre-sale support?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Is product knowledge displayed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Are industry professionals featured?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Is feedback requested?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Does the company respond to comments?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Does the company engage with customers in the comment section?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Does the video induce a feeling of integrity &amp; honesty?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Is the speaker’s face shown at any point in the video?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Is the organization’s logo shown?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Does the firm live up to the promises regarding the video?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Is the company engaged with the customers beyond closing sales?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Does the video provide extra tips that can be useful to the user?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Is there a friendly attitude?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coding of iZotope videos turned out to show roughly the same factors for each video. Each video contained 30, 30 and 31 codes, which means that more than 80 per cent the coding frame was covered. This was the highest score recorded in our research. None of the three videos lacked more than 2 codes from the design category. Many codes on the exchange side were recorded, but the codes were less frequent and more diverging than on the design side.

iZotope had the highest amount of interaction in the comments field, and was somewhat engaged in the conversations there. The video’s all had over 120 000 viewers and they generated a good amount of likes, with a low ratio of dislikes.

All tutorial videos of iZotope contained the codes: (design) 1, 1.1, 2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3, 4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8, 9, and (exchange) 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1 & 3.2.1.
In the design category, most codes were found present in each video. The first code to diverge was D:4.2, which relates to if narration is done in a conversational style. Only video 2 was found to fulfil this criterion. There were some other diverging results, among design factors video 1 and 2 contained code D:5, if procedural information was provided, while video video 3 did not. Code D:5.1, related to if conceptual information was provided, was found in the videos 2 and 3.

Concerning the exchange factors video 1 and 3 contained code if the company responded to comments E:1.3.2 and if the company engaged with the customers in the comments section E:1.3.3. Video 1 and 2 contained the code if the company engaged with the customer beyond closing sales E:3.1.1, and video 2 and 3 both contained the code if useful tips were provided E:3.1.2.

There were also some codes that were not found in any of the videos, namely E:1.2.2; if industry professionals are featured, E:1.3.1; if feedback is requested, and lastly E:2.1.2 if the speaker’s face is shown in the video.

4.2.2 Waves

Waves is one of the four firms with the largest amount of followers on their YouTube channel, with a total of 147 188 subscribers. Their popularity is also reflected in the number of views that each of their videos have, which span from close to 296 000 to 450 000 views. The examined tutorials date in May 2008, January 2014 and June 2010.

4.3 Table of Results Waves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS WAVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the video easy to access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Is the title well crafted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is animation used with narration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Is the video faithful to the actual interface?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Is spoken human voice used for narration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Are action and voice in sync?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the pace of the video good?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there a preview of the task?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Is the goal promoted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Is conversational style used in the narration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Does the narrator use a presentational style?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are new concepts introduced by showing their use in the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is procedural information provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is conceptual information provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are tasks made clear and simple?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the user’s mental plan followed in describing an action sequence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is interconnection between user action and system reaction explained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is highlighting used to guide attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the length of the video appropriate in regards to the task explained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the sound quality good?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the image quality good?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exchange Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the video explain the task as claimed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the video provide good post-sale support?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the video provide good pre-sale support?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is product knowledge displayed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are industry professionals featured?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is feedback requested?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company respond to comments?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company engage with customers in the comment section?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the video induce a feeling of integrity &amp; honesty?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the speaker’s face shown at any point in the video?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the organization’s logo shown?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the firm live up to the promises regarding the video?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the company engaged with the customers beyond closing sales?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the video provide extra tips that can be useful to the user?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a friendly attitude?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the studied Waves-tutorials fulfilled a large number of the criteria we were looking for,
namely the design factor codes 1, 2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3, 4.1, 6.2, 7, 8 and the exchange factor codes 1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1.

Diverging results were found on fifteen of the codes. First, only video 4 and 5 fulfilled the criteria of having a well crafted title (D:1.1). Video 5 was the only video to include a preview of the task (D:4). Video 5 and 6 were found to use a conversational style (D:4.2) and video 4 and 6 used a presentational style (D:4.3). Video 5 and 6 fulfilled introducing new concepts and showing their use in the context (D:4.4). Video 6 was alone in providing procedural information (D:5), while video 4 and 5 used conceptual information (D:5.1). Only video 6 made tasks clear and simple (D:6). Video 5 and 6 fulfilled following the user’s mental plan in describing an action sequence (D:6.1). Video 4 and 6 used highlighting to guide attention (D:6.3) and lastly video 5 and 6 were found to have good image quality (D:9). Regarding the exchange factors, video 5 was the only one to depict industry professional (E:1.2.2). The firm only responded to comments (E:1.3.2) in video 6. Video 5 and 6 were both found to include the organization’s logo (E:2.1.3) and both lived up to their promises regarding the video (E:2.2.1).

The criteria that were not fulfilled by any of the Waves videos were the codes if feedback was requested (E:1.3.1) and if the company engaged with the customers in the comment section (E:1.3.3).

4.2.3 Sugar Bytes

Sugar Bytes is the firm with, in comparison, a smaller number of followers on their channel. They have 6 864 registered subscribers and the number of views on the examined tutorials ranged from a bit over 53 000 to almost 61 000. The interaction with the like- and dislike option was very limited, only the first video had 26 likes and the rest none and the dislike function wasn’t used on any of the videos. The examined videos date from October 2009, November 2012 to May 2011.

4.4 Table of Results Sugar Bytes

<p>| RESULTS SUGAR BYTES |
|---------------------|-----|
| <strong>Design Factors</strong>  | <strong>SUM</strong> |
| 1. Is the video easy to access? | 3   |
| 1.1 Is the title well crafted? | 3   |
| 2. Is animation used with narration? | 3   |
| 2.1 Is the video faithful to the actual interface? | 3   |
| 2.2 Is spoken human voice used for narration? | 3   |
| 2.3 Are action and voice in sync? | 3   |
| 3. Is the pace of the video good? | 3   |
| 4. Is there a preview of the task? | 3   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Is the goal promoted?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Is conversational style used in the narration?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Does the narrator use a presentational style?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Are new concepts introduced by showing their use in the context</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Is procedural information provided?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Is conceptual information provided?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Are tasks made clear and simple?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Is the user’s mental plan followed in describing an action sequence?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Is interconnection between user action and system reaction explained?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Is highlighting used to guide attention</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Is the length of the video appropriate in regards to the task explained?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Is the sound quality good?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Is the image quality good?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exchange Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Does the video explain the task as claimed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Does the video provide good post-sale support?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Does the video provide good pre-sale support?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Is product knowledge displayed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Are industry professionals featured?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Is feedback requested?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Does the company respond to comments?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Does the company engage with customers in the comment section?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Does the video induce a feeling of integrity &amp; honesty?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Is the speaker’s face shown at any point in the video?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Is the organization’s logo shown?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Does the firm live up to the promises regarding the video?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Is the company engaged with the customers beyond closing sales?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2 Does the video provide extra tips that can be useful to the user? 0
3.2.1 Is there a friendly attitude? 2

All videos fulfilled 21 of the criteria that we were looking for. These were the design factor
codes 1, 1.1, 2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3, 4.3, 6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8, 9 and the exchange factor codes
1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.3, 2.2.1.

Differences in the results were found regarding some of the examined factors. The design
factors if there was a preview of the task (D:4), if the goal was promoted (D:4.1) and if
procedural information is provided (D:5) were only found in videos 7 and 9. Further the code
if conceptual information was provided (D:5.1) was found in the videos 7 and 8. Regarding
the exchange factors, the codes if the video induced a feeling of integrity and honesty
(E:2.1.1) was only found in video 7 and the code if the company engaged with the customer
beyond closing sales (E:3.1.1) was only found in video 9. Lastly if there was a friendly
attitude (E:3.2.1) was found in the videos 7 and 8.

None of the Sugar Bytes videos were found to contain a total of 7 of the chosen codes,
namely the design factor if the narrator used a conversational style (D:4.2) and the exchange
factors if an industry professional was featured (E:1.2.2), if feedback was requested (E:1.3.1),
if the company responded to comments (E:1.3.2), if the company engaged with the customers
in the comment section (E:1.3.3), if the speaker’s face was shown in the video (E:2.1.2) and if
the video provided useful tips (E:3.1.2).

4.2.4 D16 Group

D16 Group has 1 752 subscribers and the analysed videos had approximately 11 000 (video
12), 41 000 (video 11) and 64 000 (video 12) views. The first video received no likes/dislikes;
the other two had a few. In contrast to the videos of the other firms, D16 Group received a
high amount of dislikes compared to likes. Video 11 contained less likes than dislikes (82/92),
and video 12 had only the double amount of likes compared to dislikes (20/10). The examined
tutorials date from March in 2010, October 2012 and June 2015.

4.5 Table of Results D16 Group

<p>| RESULTS D16 GROUP |
|-------------------|--------|
| <strong>Design Factors</strong> | <strong>SUM</strong> |
| 1. Is the video easy to access? | 3 |
| 1.1 Is the title well crafted? | 3 |
| 2. Is animation used with narration? | 1 |
| 2.1 Is the video faithful to the actual interface? | 3 |
| 2.2 Is spoken human voice used for narration? | 1 |
| 2.3 Are action and voice in sync? | 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is the pace of the video good?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is there a preview of the task?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Is the goal promoted?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Is conversational style used in the narration?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Does the narrator use a presentational style?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Are new concepts introduced by showing their use in the context</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is procedural information provided?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Is conceptual information provided?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are tasks made clear and simple?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Is the user’s mental plan followed in describing an action sequence?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Is interconnection between user action and system reaction explained?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Is highlighting used to guide attention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is the length of the video appropriate in regards to the task explained?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is the sound quality good?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is the image quality good?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exchange Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Does the video explain the task as claimed?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Does the video provide good post-sale support?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Does the video provide good pre-sale support?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Is product knowledge displayed?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Are industry professionals featured?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Is feedback requested?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Does the company respond to comments?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Does the company engage with customers in the comment section?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Does the video induce a feeling of integrity &amp; honesty?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Is the speaker’s face shown at any point in the video?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Is the organization’s logo shown?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the D16 Group videos, we found the codes (design) 1, 1.1., 2.1, 9, (exchange) 1.2.1, and 2.3.1, to be present in all videos. But there were many codes, which found diverging results in the company's videos. Video 10 was the only video to contain codes if actions and voice were in sync (D:2.3), if the pace was good (D:3), if the length of the video was appropriate to the task (D:7), and if the video provided good pre-sales support (E:1.1.3). Video 11 was the only video containing if the goal was promoted (E:4.1) and if conceptual information was provided (D:5.1), while video 12 was the only one with if the user’s mental plan was followed (D:6.1) and if highlighting was used (D:6.3).

Video 10 and 11 both fulfilled the codes if animation was used with narration (D:2), if a human voice was used for narration (D:2.2), if presentational style was used (D:4.3), if new concepts were introduced by showing their use in the context (D:4.4), if the video explained the task as claimed (E:1.1.1), and if the firm lived up to their promises (E:2.2.1). Video 10 and 12 also each fulfilled the code if procedural information was provided (D:5), if interconnection was made between user action and system reaction (D:6.2) and if the video provided good post-sale support (E:1.1.2).

There were also a high amount of codes that were not found in any of the three videos, namely: if there was a preview of the task (D:4), if the narrator used a conversational style (D:4.2), if tasks were made simple and clear (D:6), if an industry professional was featured (E:1.2.2), if feedback was requested (E:1.3.1), if the company responded to comments (E:1.3.2), if the company engaged with the customers in the comment section (E:1.3.3), if the video induced a feeling of honesty and integrity (E:2.1.1), if the speaker’s face was shown in the video (E:2.1.2), if the company engaged with the customer beyond closing sales (E:3.1.1), if the video provided extra tips (E:3.1.2), and if there was a friendly attitude (E:3.2.1).

### 4.3 Combined Results

After the coding the results were cross-analysed and put together in a summarizing table. The complete results of the different videos are presented in the below table column per column, each firm marked with a separate colour. Codes that were present in the video were marked with the number 1, while codes not found were marked with 0. In the last uncoloured cell of each column is the total number of codes found in the specific video. The maximum number of codes was 36. Each firm has a summary of the total results of their three tutorials, and there is also a summary for all of the videos marked with a bright green colour on the far right of the table. The code that each cell corresponds to is specified in the first uncoloured column on the left hand side of the table.
The table indicates varying degrees of inclusion among the firms, iZotope and Waves coding many, Waves slightly less and D16 significantly less. Design factors were found to be more consistently coded, and only four codes were found in all videos, three design codes and one exchange code (D:1 “Is the title crafted well?”, D:2.1 “Is the video faithful to the actual
interface?”, D:8 “Is the sound quality good?” & E:1.2.1 “Is product knowledge displayed”). Only one code was missing in all of the twelve videos, E:1.3.1 which investigated if feedback was requested in the video.

4.3.1 Comparative Summary

Of all studied firms iZotope had the highest number of confirmed codes 30, 30 and 31 in their videos. Waves had the next highest number with 23, 29 and 30 codes found. Following Sugar Bytes had reached 24, 26 and 27 codes per video and lastly D16 Group had the least number of found codes 11, 16 and 19. This division between the firms also represent how the firm’s tutorials, and trust perception, was perceived by us researchers.

The Waves tutorials had the highest number of views in total demonstrating a large audience of the published tutorials. These videos also had a large amount of interactions in form of comments and likes. iZotope in turn reached the highest amount of likes relative to their amount of followers and views.
5.0 Analysis

In the following chapter we will present our analysis of the empirical data achieved from the conducted content analysis. First we will analyse the results of the firms separately and then perform a general analysis looking at the codes and videos together.

5.1 Case by Case Analysis

In this first section we will analyse the firm specific results of the content analysis.

5.1.1 iZotope

Overall iZotope captured many of the codes, often uniformly across the videos. The apparent appearance of many of the trust drivers coupled with higher interaction of the viewers indicates that it is possible to build online tutorials to have a trust influencing effect on the viewer. The results also show that both design, as well as exchange factors, can be conveyed in this format. The results from the iZotope videos may also indicate that design factors contribute slightly more to the perception of trust in video tutorials.

An interesting note is that video 3 was perceived to be a skilfully produced video, but it did not convey a pure tutorial feeling. The video fulfilled all codes on the design spectrum, except using a conversational style (D:4.2) and providing procedural information (D:5). It is likely that the lack of these codes decreased the tutorial feeling of the video. Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) suggests that a conversational style (D:4.2) and procedural information (D:5) is highly recommended in order to create a good and educational tutorial. Our conclusion is that combined lack of these factors (D:4.2 and D:5) in video 3, combined with the appearing of presentational style (D:4.3) and conceptual information (D:5.1) makes it more of a non-instructive presentation, rather than an educational tutorial. The other two videos coded a bit different on the design spectrum and both were more “true” to the tutorial nature. That video 3 did not live up to its educational value, as it was perceived to be more of a presentation trying to sell the software instead of being an instructional tutorial. This may decrease the overall trust impression of the firm, as it does not teach and encourage the viewer to achieve a higher level of proficiency with the software.

iZotope was the firm that gave the most trustworthy impression when the data was summed up. The perceived high quality and trustworthiness of the videos were consistent with the amount of codes they gathered. The videos’ high quality combined with a good interface design seems to have had strong effect on the perception of the company and their software. Video 2 stood out as it had a female narrator, which in the sample we used was uncommon. This is not something that can be connected to the coding frame, but by using the female voice the video stood out, as it was something different compared to the rest of the videos.

5.1.2 Waves

The Waves videos captured a large part of the coding frame, most of the confirmed codes being design codes. The tutorials had a personal feel using human narration and the narrator was also filmed in all of the tutorials. This gave a trustworthy perception of the company, although the tutorial videos were not perceived to be exceptionally produced.
All videos were of similar format, but video 4 turned out to contain several codes less compared to the other two. It fulfilled only 23 codes, compared to 29 (video 5) and 31 (video 6). On the design side, video 4 was the only video that did not use a conversational style (D:4.2) and did not follow the user’s mental plan by explaining the action process (D:4.4). It also failed to introduce new concepts in their context (D:6.1). The image quality was also judged to lack in quality (D:9). All these factors considered together points in the direction that the tutorial lacked some vital components for building a good instructional video. Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) suggest that a conversational style is important in videos to increase the instructional value to viewers. The four factors taken together add to each other in decreasing the educational value, as it makes it difficult for the viewer to follow and understand the process. Missing code D:6.1 also means that the video, by not being sufficiently educational, may be perceived to be less useful, which should have a negative effect on trust. The video itself was however perceived to induce a feeling of integrity and trust (E:2.1.1.), perhaps showing that tutorials can have positive effects on consumer trust even if lacking in an educational sense. It is likely, as we have noted, that trust is influenced and built on several different main factors. The video may thus have an influence on trust from an exchange perspective, even if it did not educate and consequently not motivate the viewer in an educational manner.

Video 4 was the only video that did not display an organizational logo (E:2.2.1), this is surprising as it was prominent in all other videos and is something that is not difficult to embed in the video production process. Visual factors and identity are, by removing some of the anonymity associated with Internet content, important to establish trust in an online environment (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015).

Video 5 was the only one not using a presentational style (4.3), the video was instead narrated exclusively with a conversational tone. This helped the video’s educational value, as it was otherwise missing important features such as providing procedural information (D:5) or using highlighting to guide attention (D:6.3). A conversational style adds to a personalized feeling (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013), increasing genuinity and the influence on trust (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016). Video 4 was the only video to include a known industry professional (E:1.2.3). As it is a common human phenomenon to aspire to use the same products as famous people we admire, we confirm that this code is an important driver of trust. This is consistent with existing literature stating that famous persons help shape the perception of a brand as well as draw attention to it (Keller, 2013). The mentioned video has also received an increased amount of likes, a decreased amount of dislikes and the video had a higher amount of engagement from the viewers, indicating that using celebrities may be a strong attributor for increasing trust.

Video 6 was the only video to provide procedural (D:5) information, and it was also the only video successful in making the tasks simple and clear (D:6). This can be related to the findings of Van der Meij & Van der Meij (2013), which state that procedural information is important for making a tutorial easy to follow and learn from. An interesting observation however, was that despite easier instructions, the overall trust-feeling was lowered by the perceived bad design of the software interface, once again indicating the powerful impact of design characteristics (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015). Lastly video 6 was the only video where the company responded to comments (E:1.3.2), and none showed engagement in conversations (E:1.3.3). Research has shown that interaction with customers has many benefits for a company, including strengthening trust (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Lusch & Vargo,
That the company is not heavily involved in the conversations may very well be negative for the overall trust impression on the consumer.

5.1.3 Sugar Bytes

Sugar Bytes tutorial videos fulfilled 24, 26 and 27 of the criteria that we were looking for. Most of these were, as for the other firms, design factor codes. Regarding the exchange factors the results were very similar across the videos. All of the tutorials scored between 7 and 8 exchange codes, most of them being the same ones. These results indicate that Sugar Bytes tutorials, although having good results concerning the design factors, were not as engaging as they could be, thus diminishing the overall perception of trust towards the firm.

Differences among the studied videos were found regarding some of the examined factors. The design factor codes referring to if a preview was made of the task (D:4); if the goal was promoted (D:4.1); and if procedural information was provided (D:5) were only found in videos 7 and 9. These codes are important for the viewer’s understanding of the task and for facilitating a clear message throughout the video (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015), which in turn promotes trust.

Video 7 and 8 coded for conceptual information (D:5.1), but video 7 also coded to have procedural information (D:5), while video 9 only coded for procedural. According to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2013) procedural information is preferable in tutorials, which indicates that video 7 and 9 should create a more favourable trust impression than video 8.

The exchange factor 2.1.1, referring to if the video induced integrity and honesty, was only found in video 7, which also was the one of Sugar Bytes tutorials with the highest number of confirmed design and exchange codes in total. This is an interesting occurrence as video 9 had almost the same score as video 7, only having one factor less confirmed regarding the exchange factors. Being so close regarding the number of found codes leads us to think that it is not only about how many of these features that are found in each video, but the interrelation, or possible a hierarchy, between these factors that is decisive.

The code showing if the company is engaged with the customer beyond closing sales (3.1.1) was only found in video 9, which also was the only video that purely provided procedural information. Yet this video was not found to have a friendly attitude (code 3.2.1), which both of the two other videos 7 and 8 did. In relation to this none of the Sugar Bytes videos used a conversational style in the narration, nor was the narrator’s face shown, which we found to be something that drew down the general perception of the videos. The lack of a personal imprint, including the lack of interaction, maintained a distance between the speaker and viewer, making the impression of the firm impersonal. By showing more personal characteristics in the narration, and by transmitting the real people behind the brand the perception would have been more genuine and trust inducing, as has been shown by Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2016). A closer personal bond could have been achieved that moves past the regular buyer - seller relationship, reaching higher levels of trust and becoming more emotionally engaging.

Regarding the lack of interaction in the comments section it has to be stated that these videos did not have any comments to reply to, or they had very few comments that were not questions. The lack of interaction, and thus the non accomplishment of the to this associated
exchange codes (1.3.2 and 1.3.3), cannot fully be considered as neglectance of the firm, even if the firm should have been able to find ways to engage their viewers by example asking for feedback (E:1.3.1) within the video. As other authors have noted, trust is increased by engaging and communicating with the customer (Dowell et al., 2013; Porter & Donthu, 2008; Valos et al., 2016).

Lastly we want to point out that a woman’s voice was used for narration in one of Sugar Bytes tutorial videos (video 9), which we found to be positive. The tone of the voice, which was monotone and robotic, diminished however the positive and personal feelings that could have been achieved and the voice did not convey a trustworthy impression.

5.1.4 D16 Group

D16 Group’s tutorials had the least number of codes confirmed, namely 11, 16 and 19 codes in the analysed tutorials. D16 Group is also the smallest of the examined firms in terms of followers as well as the number of views of each tutorial video. More simple tutorials might to some point be understandable for a smaller firm, but not entirely justified. Tutorials are in general very simple and affordable to produce (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013) and can with simple means concerning their design, considerably enhance the image and perception of the software and the firm.

D16 Group had several factors that resulted unfavourable for them. The lack of narration in videos 10 and 11 lead to an impersonal and untrustworthy impression of the firm. These two videos featured instead and on-screen text explaining the steps, which according to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2015) doesn’t enhance learning to the same extent as instructions with narration do. Further the instructions provided in all three videos were unclear making the videos hard to follow and understand. The D16 Group tutorials were also the ones that overall had the highest ratio of dislikes of all the studied firms. In one of the videos there were only slightly more likes than dislikes, and in another the number of dislikes even surpassed the amount of likes. This was a phenomenon that was not seen in any of the other firms and it underscores the importance of a well-produced tutorial video in order to induce trust in the viewer.

Although all the examined D16 Group videos fulfilled the factors of good sound and image quality, they were not successful in transmitting the content. Nor did they provide helpful advice or a clear message to the users, thus missing much of their purpose. This can be explained by the fact that none of the videos fulfilled the design criteria to promote the goal (D:4) or making tasks clear and simple (D:6). Further none of the videos used a conversational style in the narration (D:4.2), partly due to the fact that narration was not used in two of the videos. The lack of a conversational type of narration lead to an inconsistent impression of the firm leading to lower levels of trust. Positive impressions are heavily dependent on the quality of the content, and the design of the video (Waters & Jones, 2011; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013), which is validated by the analysis of these tutorial videos.

Apart from the criteria of using animation with narration, and the use of human voice, two of three of the tutorial videos did not live up to a number of other important design factors. These were introducing new concepts by showing their use in the context (D:4.4), providing procedural information (D:5) and lastly if interconnection between action and system reaction
was made (D:6.2). These factors are all important for the comprehension of the tutorial content and the unfulfillment of these factors in the videos further lessened the impression of the firm.

The fact that so many design factors were not present in the tutorials, may have contributed to the low amount exchange factors. Only three exchange codes were fulfilled by two of three tutorials, namely if the tutorials served as pre-sales support (E:1.1.3), and if product knowledge (E:1.2.1) and the company logo (E:2.1.3) was displayed. These factors, although important, did not by themselves give the sufficient trust inducing impact. Video 10 only managed to reach two exchange factors in total, namely that product knowledge was demonstrated and that the company logo was displayed. The video failed to demonstrate and live up to many basic requirements for a good tutorial video.

The D16 Group tutorials gave a feeling of lack of dedication, as well as they felt distant and impersonal. Instead of being produced to truly answer to the users needs the tutorials felt put together carelessly and thus failed to live up to many basic expectations of a good and useful tutorial, ultimately failing to induce trust.

5.2 General Analysis

Having studied and analysed the individual results of each firm we now continue to analyse these as a whole to illustrate general tendencies among the firms, comparing similarities and differences between them.

5.2.1 Similarities

We will now focus on the codes that were similar for the majority of videos. For this we decided to look at the codes that were found in at least 10 of the 12 videos. Following is a discussion on the generally attained codes:

All videos from all firms fulfilled the codes D:1, D:2.1, D:8 and E:1.2.1, meaning that all tutorials were easily accessed, were faithful for the real software interface, had a good sound quality and demonstrated product knowledge. Although all videos confirmed these factors, their total scores, and the perception of the videos trustworthiness, varied greatly. It is evident that trust is not built on single factors, but relies on the influence of several different factors in congruence to build trust. Further as all the videos performed so well on these codes, there is a possibility that they have become basic components taken for granted by the viewer, thus making their positive impact on trust smaller. Following this logic, in cases where these factors are not fulfilled in the video, the negative impact on trust would be even greater. In other words, the marginal cost of excluding these factors may be far higher than the marginal benefit of including them, turning them into essential factors in the design of tutorials.

Design Factors:
Among the design factors we were looking at codes that, not only have trust increasing effects, but what constitutes a good tutorial. Trust is gained by living up to promises by showing benevolence (Dowell et al., 2013). It is therefore important that the tutorials are well produced and that they show commitment to fulfil the needs of their customers beyond closing sales.
All videos were found to provide easy access (D:1), this is an important factor if firms want to be easily found on the web by existing as well as new customers. The amount of information available on the Internet is growing exponentially (Schultz & Schultz, 1998; Opreana & Vinerean, 2015) putting increasing pressure on the firms to provide easily accessible content. Providing easy access coincides well with a carefully crafted title (D:1.1). A good title serves to make a first impression and as well as it is a filter for the viewer when browsing for videos. It is important that the video lives up to the promises of the title to attain and keep credibility, which Morgan and Hunt (1994) argues is an essential part of trust.

One of the most basic features of a good video tutorial is that it combines animation with narration (D:2) for effectively explaining how to perform a task (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). This is anchored in a key tenet from dual coding theory and multimedia learning theory, which states that people learn better from a carefully coordinated combination of words and pictures than from words alone (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). This code was also confirmed in the majority of the tutorials demonstrating the widely adopted use of this feature within the industry of music production tutorials.

A code that is closely related to the feature if narration is used in the video, is what kind of voice is used for this narration (D:2.2). It has been found that learning is enhanced with a standard accented human voice rather than a machine-like voice, as it is perceived as more natural and attractive by the listener (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). Our findings are in accordance with these theories confirming that a natural and dynamic narration is beneficial to evoke positive feelings in the viewer. Most of the videos fulfilled this criterion of using a human voice for narration, but the tone of the narrator varied greatly among the videos. These variations lead to differing perceptions of the narrator, and thus consequently also the firm, showing those personality characteristics influences trust. This is in accordance with Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova (2016) who state that transmitting the real personal characteristics is beneficial to induce trust.

It is also vital that the tutorial is true to the actual interface; Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2015) state that graphics are better assimilated and remembered if there is an exact resemblance between the real interface and the graphical representation. Further it has been confirmed that the most realistic animation yields the highest learning outcome (ibid.). This code (D:2.1) was confirmed in all of the studied videos. Combined with this, the majority of videos also used highlighting to guide attention (D:6.3). This is effective for helping the viewer to follow the steps explained by the narrator and substantially increases understanding (ibid.). As the majority of these software are complex, highlighting becomes crucial for distinguishing the knob, tab, fader or other parameter that is used at each moment. The firms demonstrate an understanding for the importance and usefulness of highlighting, although its use in some studied videos could have been more elaborated.

In continuation the majority of the videos accomplished good pacing (D:3). In general all videos had a pedagogical pace that enabled understanding of the task for people with varying levels of prior knowledge. Thus people with varying degrees of experience are able to make use of the same tutorial videos. The positive effects of a correct pacing are that the viewers through successfully understanding the task boost their motivation and result in positive feelings of task accomplishment (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). We found that as positive feelings are evoked, and when the video successfully motivates the viewer to do the task explained, trust should be significantly increased.
We also found that most videos were successful in promoting the goal (D:4.1) and following the user’s mental plan in describing an action sequence (D:6.1). This demonstrates an understanding for, and implementation of, pedagogical strategies, which facilitates comprehension of the task (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). Clearly defining the goal, as well as presenting the information in a logical order, makes the tutorials easy to follow and understand (ibid.) and drives the viewers motivation.

Finally, most of the analysed videos accomplished to explain the interconnection between user action and the system reaction of the software (D:6.2). This feature can be connected to the goal of successfully explaining the goal and functions of the software. The fact that all the firms performed well on this feature, as well as D:6.1, can be explained by their necessity to successfully transmit the functional features of the software in order to sell the product better and to live up to users’ expectations.

**Exchange Factors:**

The first exchange factor that was confirmed in the majority of the videos was if the video managed to successfully explain the task as claimed in the title (E:1.1.1). By being able to explain tasks in a clear and easily accessible way, positive and trust inducing effects can be achieved (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). This factor represents the videos ability to live up to its promises. Failing to do this has clear negative effects on the firm’s trustworthiness and reputation (Dowell et al. 2013; Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

Most videos were also found to provide good post-sale as well as pre-sale support (E:1.1.2 & E:1.1.3). By delivering valuable information, the tutorial gives good support for existing customers wishing to understand the product’s features better, while simultaneously showing potential customers the possibilities of the product. This code establishes both competency as well as benevolence trust for the firm, as relevant knowledge is essential to provide good support. It also shows a willingness to engage and solve problems for the customer after the initial transaction.

Nearly all of the videos displayed the organization's logo at some point of the tutorial (E:2.1.3). As humans are of their nature risk-averse, especially in the online-environment, credibility must by different means be demonstrated (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Showing the organization’s logo is one of the means that the firms can use to confirm the authenticity and reliability of the published tutorial. In addition to this visualising the firm’s logo relates to basic marketing activities to promote the company and increase brand awareness (Keller, 2013).

### 5.2.2 Less Than 25 % of The Videos Recorded

As the coding frame was created, mostly building on existing theories regarding trust, we think it may be interesting to look at the factors not present in most of the videos. Is there a pattern why tutorials fail to display these characteristics? Are they not possible to achieve through this medium? We will investigate this further by looking at the codes present in less than 25 % of the videos:
Design Factors
In the design category, only one code was found missing in 75% of the videos. That one code was not prevalent in the majority of cases is interesting. Our conclusion is that it is due to the nature of Internet content. Design factors are the easiest to include, and most intuitive parameters to work with, when creating tutorials, thus they get more focus as a result.

The missing code relates to if conversational style (D:4.2) was used for instructing. Conversational style has been found to increase the educational value of a tutorial, while simultaneously invoking a more personal feel to the video (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). That most videos were lacking a conversational tone should be addressed, as it should be an easy change to make to increase the tutorials educational value. As a presentational style was far more prevalent in the videos it leads us to assume that firms may have a habit of using the tutorial as a marketing tool, wishing to promote their products in best possible light. That firms choose this option, knowingly or unknowingly, is something we regard as erroneous thinking, leading to counterproductive results. Even if presentational style may be the preferred option when marketing a product, the goal and aim of the tutorial should be its educational value. As suggested by Dowell et al. (2013) firms that engage in activities outside of the actual sales, is perceived to be of a benevolent nature and increases trust. Customers that find the tutorial to be a good source of information and learning are likely to feel more trust towards the company despite, or thanks to, the lack of marketing effort by the firm.

Exchange Factors
Exchange factors were much less prevalent in the videos. This may be because they are not intuitive in the same sense that the design factors are, and therefore something, which firms fail to embrace. Many of these factors were however shown to be possible to include and should greatly influence and improve the exchange side of trust by displaying competency, integrity and benevolence.

Waves was the only firm to feature an industry celebrity (E:1.2.2) in one of their tutorials. Since only one video featured an industry celebrity few generalizable conclusions can be drawn, but what can be stated is that this video achieved a clearly increased reach and interaction, in comparison to the other tutorials. The Waves tutorial featured a well known music producer and had more than double the amount of views than the second most viewed tutorial, and about three times as many views as the remaining tutorial videos. Further the number of recorded likes was higher than on any other of the studied tutorials. This indicates that the viewers received the video extra favourably and more people chose to watch it. Featuring a celebrity is a way for a firm to induce trust, as it naturally implies increased competence and benevolence in the eyes of the customer.

A surprising discovery was that none of the studied videos solicited feedback from the audience and it demonstrates a considerable shortcoming in the tutorials of all firms. Not asking for feedback may be a mistake, as it diminishes the engagement with the customer and maintains the video as a one-way communication form. It is likely that the company could improve their videos, and simultaneously engage viewers in a dialogue, if they actively sought and used feedback. Waters & Jones (2011) suggest that features, such as the use of comment sections, can turn videos into a successful two-way interaction and that engaging in conversation with the viewers’ increases the reputational yield of the firm. Although we cannot conclude that feedback is not requested in music production tutorials as a rule, our research should give basis for that it is not requested frequently enough. Encouraging feedback demonstrates openness towards the users and a willingness to serve their needs,
which according to Waters & Jones (2015) enables for a higher level of trust, when managed correctly.

There was a limited occurrence of the codes E:1.3.2 and E:1.3.3, relating to each company’s engagement in the comments field. Engagement and co-creation is an important aspect in and for relationship and trust building (Lusch & Vargo, 2008; Porter & Donthu, 2008; Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Waters & Jones, 2011), but our findings indicate that this is something that has not been entirely embraced. iZotope was the only firm to record engagement in the comment section and Waves was found to respond to comments in one of the three videos. By looking at our small sample, we found that many of the comments raised certain needs or questions that were not dealt with in the tutorial. These were questions and requests that the firms easily could have responded to, favouring customer interaction and thus leading to an increased trustworthiness (Porter & Donthu, 2008; Dowell et al., 2013).

It is not always easy for a company to address every potential problem that their customer may encounter in one video. This is another reason for why it is important that the company engages in a conversation with their customer to further understand additional needs and to create content that is appropriate for them. As Blazevic & Lievens (2008), Brodie, Ilic, Juric & Hollebeek (2011), Lusch & Vargo (2004) and Porter & Donthu (2008) stated, engaging in dialogue allows for co-creation between company and customer, which not only increases trust and relationship, but also enables further enhancements to the company’s offering.

Finally most of the studied tutorials did not show the speaker’s face (E:2.1.2). The code was only found in three videos, all of them from Waves. It seems that, while the other firms did not consider this option as much, it was something that Waves worked very mindfully with. By showing the narrator the videos gained a personal and sincere feeling, which Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2016) suggest increases trust emotions in the viewer.

5.2.3 Observations

As the consumer is not directly involved in a real life encounter with the company, it is important that the design of the website, software and content that the consumer encounters induces a positive and trustworthy feeling. While some of these factors, may not be perceived to be trust-generating, they interrelate in a way to create an impression on the viewer. Good design and high quality content are powerful for invoking positive feeling and trust in the consumer (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015; Porter & Donthu, 2008; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). Our content analysis indicates that many factors are important to create this impression. It is not only important that design in itself displays quality and invokes positive feelings, but the tutorial should also clearly fulfil its purpose. To induce trust a tutorial should be a good source for valuable education and instruction and it is important that factors constituting a good tutorial (like narration, highlighting, pace) are fulfilled (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013; Waters & Jones, 2011). Distributing a tutorial shows benevolence in that the company is willing to provide extra value apart from closing sales, and that it is a continuing commitment to show engagement with the consumer. If the video is then well produced, and fulfils its purpose, it displays competency and invokes positive associations, and feelings of trust.

We also find that it was not purely the design or layout of the tutorial that mattered for achieving trust, but also the amount of personality characteristics featured, such as tone of the
voice, perceived attitude, way of speech, seeing the face of the speaker etc. The more a real person, with personal characteristics, was perceived in the video the more feelings of trust were noted towards the firm. This also includes the amount of interaction demonstrated by the firm, further strengthening the human factor. For higher levels of trust the personality characteristics should also be combined with human interactions, such as responsiveness to questions and comments. These findings validate earlier research, which claims that personality characteristics produce a more genuine feeling increasing trust (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016). Personality characteristics should thus not be neglected, but be seen as important components in building the exchange side of trust. An example that confirms this statement is the case of iZotope, which was the firm that interacted the most in the comments fields of their tutorial videos. This was something that seems to have notably increased the perception of reliability, as well as trust towards the firm, following that the video also received a higher amount of engagement from its viewers. iZotope was thus the only firm that successfully demonstrated and maintained a two-way communication with their users, making a greater effort to attend to their users and assist them in their further needs.

These results also indicate that it is possible to include exchange factors in the tutorial video format and that they do matter from a trust perspective. The codes confirmed in the majority of videos show that the firms have managed to include factors that build on competency, benevolence and integrity trust. Our analysis also indicates that design factors greatly influence the perception of trust in online environments. The perception of the firm’s trustworthiness was influenced by the quality of the interface used in the videos, the design quality and their pedagogical value, to an extent much higher than we expected prior to the study.

Further observations
As we have analysed the results, looking at the trust influencing factors, we came to realise that, a categorisation of trust factors into only exchange and design factors may not be sufficient. When analysing the videos we found that the proficiency by which the videos were able to increase the level of understanding in the viewer, could very well increase motivation and positive emotions, ultimately increasing the perception and trust towards the firm. An example of this is video 2, which was one of two videos with the highest amount of confirmed codes. The video managed to convey valuable and educational information, making tasks and the software seem easy while simultaneously providing valuable tips for mastering audio. This video generated significant positive engagement in the comment section and seemed to have motivational effects on the viewers.

To successfully understand the task as a viewer, to then being able to duplicate it in the program, lead to positive motivation (Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2015). This motivational boost, driving a will and enthusiasm to use the program, seems to be an important feature for completing the trust circle and a valuable relationship builder. Promoting the product by instructing a successful usage is a vital component of the tutorials. It is of importance for the firms to assist their customers and provide them with as enjoyable experiences as possible with their products, in order to obtain customer satisfaction and loyalty. By being able to teach and motivate the customers this sensation of accomplishment, which according to Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2015) is a powerful driver of positive perceptions, should also result in a feeling of trust towards the firm. Our analysis is that it will be beneficial to include motivational factors as a separate category to make the understanding of factors that induce and influence trust easier. With motivational factors alongside exchange factors and design factors we add another dimension to the way trust can be built through video tutorials.
Providing emotionally engaging, educational and motivational content; through factors that can be related to the exchange between parties; and through design features and attributes. While we divide these factors into separate categories we find them to be closely interrelated and influential on each other. Design factors may for example enhance the ability to educate and motivate the viewer, making the factors not only independently influencing trust, but also leveraging each other to create a greater impression.

5.3 Presenting a New Theoretic Model

Throughout our analysis we have found empirical data that fit well with the existing theories on trust, and thus validates the theoretical model we chose to base our study on. Aside from validating other research, we have also distinguished new influential factors and thus come to the conclusion that further categorization of the factors driving trust in online video tutorials would be beneficial. We claim that by categorising and picturing the factors that drive trust, one can easier understand and define the main themes that have trust building effects. Thus people wishing to understand how trust can be built through online video tutorials can use this model as a framework to guide their thinking regarding trust. While each category is presented as independent there seems to be some interdependency between them. Each category is likely to be influenced by the proficiency of the other two. An example of this would be how a video with strong educational content would display competency, as well as good content design.

With this in mind, we will conclude our analysis by providing an updated and more elaborate model for understanding trust and its influencing factors concerning video tutorials. Our final model pictures the relationship between the three categories we found to influence trust. The model conceptualizes how trust is influenced, in video tutorials, by; the impression created by design features, how well it educates, motivates and engages the customer, and through the exchange and communication that is established between company and customer.
This model pictures trust and the factors that we found to have trust inducing and influencing effects in the tutorials. There are three main categories. Exchange factors relating to how trust is shaped through the exchange between parties as presented by Dowell et al. (2013) as well as personality traits. Design factors that represent how trust is developed by different design features (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016; Van der Meij & Van der Meij, 2013). Lastly the motivational factors generate trust when the content of the tutorial is of encouraging, engaging and educational value. These factors are in turn represented by subcategories and themes that relate to their main category.
6.0 Conclusion

In this final chapter we present the final conclusions and contribution of our study. We also discuss implications and suggest areas for future research.

6.1 Answers to Research Questions

RQ1: What factors in tutorials can be inferred to have trust inducing effect on the customer?

We found that the different elements in, and attributes of, video tutorials can influence trust in several ways. As the Internet in many ways has changed the landscape for how people and organizations can interact, we find it important to distinguish which factors are of importance to achieve a trustful relationship online.

Our results indicate that factors related to design play a key role in shaping trust for the viewer of video tutorials. The way the video is produced, the quality of the video and the quality of the interface being used, all influence the perception of trust towards the firm. This was also suggested by Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2016), who stated that user’s lack of trust is often a result of unfavourable first visual impressions in the online environment. We also found that how well the tutorial fulfilled its instructional and educational purpose, influenced how trustworthy and professional the firm was perceived to be. If the tutorial fulfilled the necessary components for making a good tutorial, such as visual factors, procedural information, conversational style and good pace, it increased the perceptions of trust. If the tutorial did not fulfil its purpose or was badly produced, trust respectively decreased. Thus, concerning tutorials, its pedagogical properties and its ability to instruct also has an important role to play concerning trust.

We found that the tutorials were not only able to include different design factors, but the videos also included several exchange factors. The exchange factors were prominent, but more varying between the different videos. For this reason we think that attributes related to exchange may not be as intuitive to consider when creating a tutorial, but our results indicate that they are of great importance as well. We found that exchange or communicational drivers are important for establishing an identity, or personality, for the firm through the people representing it. This statement is also backed by writings by Dowell et al. (2013), Kuzheleva-Sagan and Suchkova (2015) as well as Waters and Jones (2011). Videos portraying a real, more human, identity induced greater amount of trust in the viewer. Videos showing the face of the narrator, asking for feedback and engaging with the viewers in the comment section, were factors found to improve the perception of the video and the firm. A factor that was not included in any but one tutorial, namely including a known industry celebrity, indicated significant trust building effect. The effect of this factor was noticeable and should thus not be neglected. By connecting the established celebrity to the brand it increases the credibility of the software and gives a personal feeling to the video. Exchange attributes also contribute by establishing and showing competency, integrity and benevolence towards the viewer, which are important components when building trust (Dowell et al., 2013). Additionally, our analysis suggests that firms can increase trust and achieve more personal interaction by opening up for communication with the viewers. This can be achieved via active interaction in the comments fields, and by addressing and involving the viewers directly in the tutorial video, as suggested by Schultz and Schultz, 1998, Lusch and Vargo, 2009 and Blazevic and Lievens, 2008.
RQ2: How can those factors be categorised and how do they operate?

During the final process of our study we found the need to divide the trust driving factors into three main categories. These categories were partly derived using existing theories regarding trust in different contexts, but also through the findings of our own study. We use the term exchange factors to categorise trust that has mostly been studied in real life settings, where trust is built through the on-going exchanges and interactions between parties (Dowell et al., 2013; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Porter & Donthu, 2008). This includes the factors like asking for feedback, replying to users comments and questions, thus maintaining healthy customer relationships based on an open interaction.

We categorized design factors for defining trust perceived from visual impressions and the audio-visual attributes of the tutorial. These were derived from, and based on theories on trust in online environments (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016; Waters & Jones, 2011). Regarding the factors like design and execution, related to the visual and auditive perception of the content and its quality, were shown to play an important role in invoking trust.

Our analysis also discovered some factors, which were not initially categorized separately, to have a trust inducing effect in regards to video tutorials. These are what we have chosen to call motivational factors and are connected to the content of the video and its ability to instruct, motivate and lead to successful task execution. By being educative and by driving reactions such as enthusiasm and motivation, the positive feelings connected to the tutorial video and the software used, resulted in a higher tendency to feel trust towards the firm. These factors were at the start of our study found in both the design and the exchange category of the coding frame, but when analysing our data we realized that due to the characteristics of video tutorials the motivational factors should be presented separately. We distinguished that to better understand how trust is derived in video tutorials the trust driving factors should be explained and presented by dividing them into these three main categories: design factors, exchange factors and motivational factors.

So how do these factors operate or interrelate? The design factors constitute a first impression of the tutorial, the product featured and the firm (Huang, Bolchini & Jones, 2011; Waters & Jones, 2011). Apart from giving the important visual first impression the design factors enable and make out the basis for the emergence of trust (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015). Further the exchange factors can through their occurrence add to this base of trust by demonstrating personal traits (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016), and by communicating with the viewer (Dowell et al., 2013). This enables the viewer to emotionally connect and relate to the person in the tutorial, a representative of the firm and the product. By relating to the person in the tutorial the viewer also consciously or subconsciously relates and connects to the brand, thus being more prone to trust the brand (Waters & Jones, 2011; Teixera, 2013). In this way the exchange factors further build on and solidify the initial trust achieved by the design factors. Then we have the motivational factors, which we mean can further drive the perceived trust. Having already achieved a basis for trust through the design attributes of the tutorial, we believe that the exchange factors, as well as the motivational factors further build on this trust making it more profound.
6.2 Theoretical Contribution of the Study

Although video tutorials have been the subject of studies previously we found a gap in the knowledge concerning their impact on consumer trust. Our study has contributed to existing literature and knowledge by addressing this gap and exploring the video tutorials ability to increase trust and the factors driving it. The study has shed light over the niche market of music production tutorials and in what manner they can influence trust. Thus the study has been able to identify an additional medium for firms to build customer relationships. It has explored and synthesized factors that influence the perception of trust through video tutorials, and categorized trust into three different themes to better explain the elements that shape it.

Our analysis contributed by looking at factors that can be used to drive trust through online video tutorials. As the Internet and the tutorials that are made available through YouTube can be very dynamic in nature, we found that many factors were possible within the format. We found that the interactive nature of the comment sections as well as the videos allowed for many kinds of trust driving factors, many of which are found in real life settings (Dowell et al. 2013). Trust was also driven by the videos ability to convey a personal and human personality. We found further, in accordance with research about the web, that design features and attributes contributed greatly in shaping trust (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016; Waters & Jones, 2011). There were also evidence that trust was driven by factors that allowed the video to reach the viewers by engaging, educating and motivating them.

Our analysis has added to existing models of trust (Dowell et al., 2013; Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2016) by identifying, dividing and naming new main categories for factors on which trust is built. We find that the numerous ways on which companies and consumers can interact, thanks to the technological advances of our present times, allow for different means on how trust can be communicated. With the current reality of real life and online encounters intermingled, companies need to be aware of the new and old means of inducing trust. With this in mind, backed by the findings of our study, we propose a conceptualization of trust into three distinct, yet interrelated, categories; factors of exchange, design and motivation. These categories capture the essence of how trustworthiness may be communicated in video tutorials, each category with varying degrees of influence depending on the context and medium.

We argue that the work of Dowell et al. (2013), dividing trust into competency, integrity and benevolence, should be categorised into factors of exchange. These drivers are well suited, and developed for real life interactions between parties, but are also applicable and important in online settings as these also are a result of an on-going exchange. We also found that the theoretical and practical guidelines of Van der Meij & Van der Meij (2013) for making good tutorials were important to convey a feeling of trustworthiness. These coincide well with the research on trust in the online environment where design plays a central role in shaping trust (Kuzheleva-Sagan & Suchkova, 2015; Waters & Jones, 2011). The design factors were found to greatly impact the perception of trust. Additionally we discovered the added potential influence of motivational factors. When the tutorials we studied achieved a high level of educational value, increasing learning outcomes and successfully displaying the interaction and effects between user action and system reaction, we found a higher predisposition towards the firm. These findings can be related to theories on motivation and instructional videos studied by authors such as Van der Meij and Van der Meij (2015) and Martin and Martin (2015).
6.3 Practical Contributions

Our study has been able to conclude that many design and exchange features do have significant impact on trust towards a firm. Simultaneously as our study could conclude that the firms performed well on many of these trust-inducing codes, we also detected recurring flaws resulting in lost potential in terms of inducing trust and improving the customer relationship. Our findings thus provide simple and easily applied solutions to how these tutorials can be designed in the future to be more trust-inducing and better answer to the needs of the customers. The solutions we propose consist of a number of practical advice for the firms and tutorial creators. We will list practical implications in a checklist format, to make it easier to read and apply:

**Design Factors**
- Put effort into the design
  - Use appropriate highlighting to guide the viewer
  - Make sure the sound and video quality is high

- Display Celebrities
  - Feature known musicians in the tutorials for celebrity endorsement.

**Exchange Factors**
- The tutorial should, if possible, display human characteristics by conveying the true personalities of the people behind the firm. This can be achieved through various means, among them:
  - Using a friendly and relaxed tone in the narration.
  - Using conversational and personal speaking style in narration.
  - Displaying the narrator on the screen, occasionally or as a continuous feed in a smaller frame within the video.

- Firm’s producing tutorial videos should find ways to engage with viewers
  - Ask for feedback by the end of the tutorial to engage with the viewer and display sincerity in serving the customer’s need.
  - Be active in responding to comments, and engage in the ensuing conversations.
  - Look for unmet needs expressed by the community to address in the future.

**Motivational Factors**
- The tutorial should be clear on it’s purpose and avoid including other (unnecessary) components.
  - Videos should be of instructional and educational value.
  - Avoid a selling tone or attitude.

- The tutorial should constitute useful help for the viewer
  - Address real issues that the users may encounter
  - Provide useful tips and tricks
6.4 Reflection of The Study

Although our study has lead to observations that establish the trust inducing elements in music software tutorials, and its impact on the customer relationships, we wish to point out some limitations of our study. First, we wish to bring forth the limited sample size that was chosen considering the limited time that we had to complete the study. With more time we would have liked to sample a larger amount of tutorial videos from several different music software firms, to be able to obtain a bigger sample and thus a more representable and generalizable result.

Further regarding the selection of the tutorial videos examined, it could have been of value to set up a maximum time frame for when the tutorial videos should have been published. By setting up a time frame, from for example the year 2013 to 2016, the videos might have been more equivalent and homogeneous compared to each other. The advancements of technology, as well as the increased knowledge and practice in tutorial making, have been notable over the years. It may be that the aesthetic and technological differences in the videos, due to their age, to some extent lead to the different perception and classification of the older tutorials compared to the recent ones.

As YouTube in many ways is interactive by its nature, there may be more contributors sharing educational videos on the same subject. Blazevic and Lievens (2008) discusses customer cooperation and co-creation of value, meaning that in some cases users turn to other users with better knowledge for help. For this research we had to exclude the videos that were not produced by the firms even though we acknowledge that they may in many ways have effects on the community.

Despite these limitations we believe the results of our study to give an indicative picture of the trust inducing properties of video tutorials and their marketing power. Our study provides an increased understanding of the potentialities of using video tutorials to build, increase and influence trust towards the firm in the viewer.

6.5 Future Research

Much research is being done concerning trust and consumer relationship. Our inclination, as we started this study, and which still stands, is that trust plays an important role in our lives. This we hold to be true in many contexts, in interaction between persons, companies, as well as the interaction between them. As our world has and is seeing immense technological change, we believe it is important to understand how these changes affect our perception of trust; how the nature and character of trust changes in this new environment.

This work examined trust within the realm of online video tutorials, distributed through the social media platform YouTube. Our findings contribute to the understanding of factors that are important and viable within this context. As we do not yet know of other studies investigating trust within a related context and perspective, we find there is room for further studies within the area. Our study only looked at a small sample of videos and firms within one industry, additional research could be done within the industry but also within other industries. Additional studies here would be beneficial to further validate the conclusions of our study, and add to its generalizability.
We find that it would be beneficial to continue adding research towards the area of trust. Our analysis was able to study trust and different factors driving it, but the tools of a content analysis does not enable a direct measurement of the actual trust perceived and experienced by the customers. Other qualitative research designs would enable deeper understanding into the actual experiences, thoughts and feelings of consumers, as well as thoughts coming from the content creators. Quantitative studies would also be beneficial to get a more complete picture of online tutorials and the drivers of trust found in them. Quantitative studies could by measuring the level of trust contribute to the validation of these theories.

Through our content analysis were able to analyse many different trust driving factors in video tutorials and we could also categorize these factors into separate categories. Looking at the empirical data, however, we are getting a sense that this categorisation may not only concern trust driving factors, but may indeed be regarded as three different kind of trust, in the same way Dowell et al. (2013) categorises total trust into competency trust, integrity trust and benevolence trust. While we find that there are suggestions to this within the data, we feel that further investigation is needed to make valid claims about it. New research could therefore explore whether the factors actually drive three kinds of trust; exchange trust, design trust and motivational trust.

Finally, further research into the trust parameters may add to and develop the current framework, gain better understanding of each driver’s importance and also discover additional drivers. Research should also deeper investigate the potential hierarchical relationships between the different trust drivers.
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Appendix

Template used when coding the videos, present codes were marked 1 and not present codes 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Design Factors</th>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>