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Abstract

This study examines several attributes of celebrity spokespersons in advertising. More specifically, credibility, attractiveness, expertise and identification with the celebrity are examined with regard to attitudes toward the ads and future interest in the product or service. The hypotheses imply that celebrity endorsers’ credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification with the viewers enhance the attitudes toward the ads and future interest in the product or service. Results showed that perceived expertise and identification had significant effects on both attitudes toward the ads and future interest in the product or service. Increased credibility had significant effects on future interest about the product of service but not on attitudes toward the ads, while increased attractiveness had significant effects on attitudes toward the ads but not on future interest about the product or service. Implications of advertising strategy and limitations of this research were discussed.
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1. Introduction

Celebrity endorsement in advertising has been and will continue to be a hot topic among researchers (Bow and Landreth, 2001; Kahle and Homer, 1985; Kamins and Gupta, 1994; Kamins, 1990; Ohanian, 1990). Marketers and advertisers share the belief that a communicator’s character has a significant effect on the persuasiveness of the message (Ohanian, 1990). Several studies showed that celebrities made advertisements believable (Kamins, 1990) and enhanced message recall (Friedman and Friedman, 1979). One of the strategies that advertisers were now pursuing to distinguish their products from competing products involves the use of a celebrity spokesperson (Kamins, Brand, Hoeke and Moe, 1989). Atkin, Hocking and Block (1984) found that the use of a celebrity in beer advertising led to more favorable ratings and more positive product evaluations.

A celebrity is defined as “an individual who is known to the public (i.e., actor, sports figure, entertainer, etc.) for his or her achievements in areas other than that of the product class endorsed” (Friedman and Friedman, 1979). Freiden (1984) examined four types of endorsers, know as celebrity, CEO, expert and typical consumer, and found that celebrity endorsers receive a higher score on several dimensions than the other three types. Previous studies focused on different dimensions that cause this effectiveness, and they
can be form into several main categories: credibility, attractiveness, expertise, identification, and negative information.

Most of the existing studies investigated credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification of celebrity endorsers separately, and they concluded that credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification would enhance the advertising effectiveness. Ohanian’s research (1990) focused on celebrity endorsers’ perceived expertise, trustworthiness and attractiveness to examine the effectiveness of celebrity advertising, but it needs to be extended to include more dimensions. Basil’s study (1996) included identification as a mediator of celebrity effects. The author indicated that in future research identification should also be compared with other possible explanations of celebrity effects. Further, a close examination into comparing viewers’ ratings of several celebrities on their attitude and behavior change would be helpful to understand the sequencing of attitude and behavior change (Basil, 1996).

This study attempts to compare celebrity spokespersons’ credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification on attitudes toward the ads and future interest by conducting an experiment. By comparing these four possible explanations, this study will provide evidence for advertisers and marketers to select celebrity spokespersons for commercial purpose. With the expectation that some kinds of celerity spokespersons will produce more favorable reactions, the prediction is made that credibility, attractiveness, expertise,
and identification will lead to more favorable attitudes toward the ads and higher level of future interests in the product or service. This expectation is consistent with the existing research. Most importantly, it will have a comparison of the credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification and see to what degree they affect the attitudes toward the ads and future interest.

This study will try to fill into academic literature with a more inclusive test to examine celebrity spokespersons’ credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification on attitudes toward the ads and future interests in the product or service. The findings of this study are expected to be consistent with the previous research, and expand their implications to a broader area which includes spokespersons’ perceived credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Research on Celebrity Endorsement

Studies on celebrity endorsement address the effectiveness of celebrity advertising mainly by measuring celebrity endorsers’ perceived credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification (Bower and Landreth, 2001; Basil, 1996; Debono and Telesca, 1990; Kahle and Homer, 1985; Kamins and Gupta, 1994; Kamins, 1990; Kamins, Brand, Hoeke and Moe, 1989; Ohanian, 1990; Till and Shimp, 1998). The use of a celebrity spokesperson is on the rise (Kamins, Brand, Hoeke, and Moe, 1989). According to a report by Sherman (1985), individuals in the advertising field were said to agree that celebrities are being sought out to endorse products as never before. Past empirical research has shown celebrities to be well liked and oftentimes attractive, thought not always credible and effective spokespersons (Atkin and Block, 1984; Freiden, 1984; Friedman, Kamins, Brand, Hoeke and Moe, 1989; Termini, Friedman and Washington, 1976). The reason celebrity spokespersons are commonly used in advertising is that they are believed to help enhance the effectiveness of advertising.

Advertising effectiveness has been predominately measured by attitudes toward the ads and purchase intention in previous literature (Biehal, Stephens and Curlo; 1992; Craciun and Madden, 2002; Davis, 1995; Gresham and Shimp, 1985; Spears and Singh, 2004), which are discussed in the following paragraphs. Attitudes toward the ads mainly focus
on the advertisements themselves but not other intention issues. Therefore, it can be measured directly by asking people’s attitudes toward a specific advertisement. However, because purchase intention relies on much more information than the advertisements themselves and celebrity spokesperson, this study is going to measure the advertising effectiveness with regard to attitudes toward the ads and future interest of the product or service in the ad.

2.2 Attitudes toward the Ads

Attitudes are a popular research topic in advertising and marketing studies for at least two reasons: First, they are useful in predicting consumer behavior (Michell and Olaon, 1981), and second, several theoretical frameworks for the study of attitudes are available from social psychology researchers (Eagly and Chaiken, 1999), thereby facilitating research on this pivotal construct.

When applied to advertising, attitudes toward the ads have been defined as a “predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure situation” (MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch, 1986). Attitudes toward the ads may contain both affective reactions (e.g., advertisements-created feelings of happiness), and evaluations (e.g., of an advertisement’s credibility or informativeness) (Baker and Lutz, 2000).
Research shows that attitudes toward the ads are affected by brand or nonbrand processing set (Biehal, Stephen and Curlo, 1992; Hastak and Olson, 1989; Madden, Allen and Twible, 1988; Gardner, 1985; Homer, 1990). A study about attitudes toward the ads and brand choice by Biehal et. al (1992) investigated the applicability of two contrasting perspectives – the first was the indirect effects model, where attitudes toward the ads had an impact on attitudes toward the brand, and attitudes toward brand affects intentions; the second was that both attitudes toward the ads and attitudes toward the brand had direct, separate influence on intentions. Results supported the presence of an independent effect of attitudes toward the ads on brand choice and also suggested that subjects formed attitude toward advertisements during choice without prompting (Biehal et. al, 1992).

A central issue for advertising theory and research is one of determining the mediational process by which the attitudes toward the ads construct influences consumers’ attitudes and behavior intentions (Gresham and Shimp, 1985). Mackenzie and Lutz (1989) had proposed four alternative mechanisms: 1) classical conditioning, 2) cognitive response, 3) reciprocal causation, and 4) no relationship. They are presented in Figure 1.
2.3 Purchase Intention

Purchase intentions are personal action tendencies relating to the brand (Bagozzi, Baumgartner and Yi, 1989; Ostrom, 1969). Intentions are distinct from attitudes (Spears and Singh, 2004). Whereas attitudes are summary evaluations, intentions represent “the person’s motivation in the sense of his or her conscious plan to exert effort to carry out a behavior” (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Spears and Singh, 2004). Thus, a concise definition of purchase intentions is: purchase intentions are an individual’s conscious plan to make an effort to purchase a brand (Spears and Singh, 2004).
The dual mediation model proposed by MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1989) posited a direct causation from attitudes toward the ads to attitude toward brand, as well as a direct causal link between attitudes toward the ads and purchase intention. Subsequent research (Brown and Stayman, 1992; MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch, 1989) found strong support for the “attitudes toward the ads -> attitudes toward the brand -> purchase intention” relationships. Craciun and Madden (2002) took a look into how attitudes toward the ads influences brand attitudes and purchase intentions. In their research design, subjects were first asked to provide ratings for two popular beer brands and then they were exposed to one of the two Budweiser advertisements that contained either a strong affective cue and no benefit information or weak affective cue and benefit information. After viewing the advertisements, subjects provided evaluations of the ad, ratings of the brand and answered additional questions concerning their familiarity with beer and their product consumption habits. The researchers found that purchase intention is influenced by the brand specific associations (BSA) component of a brand, but not by general brand impressions (GBI) (Craciun and Madden, 2002).

In this study, future interests in the product or service will be measured by using questions regarding the advertisements and celebrity spokespersons. Purchase intention and future interests are related, but future interest is more objective and doesn’t involve people’s consideration of their financial situation and personal interests. Therefore, future interests will be adopted as one of the dependent variables.
2.4 Credibility

A number of empirical investigations have examined the effectiveness of using credible spokespersons to enhance the persuasiveness of messages (Applbaum and Anatol, 1972; Ohanian, 1990). Several researchers in the field of speech communication have uncovered the perceptual structure of source credibility (Applbaum and Anatol, 1972). This study is going to measure the credibility of the celebrity endorser from the viewers’ perspective.

In developing scales to measure the effectiveness of celebrity endorsers, a number of researchers have expanded the number of dimensions encompassing the source-credibility construct (DeSarbo and Harshman, 1985; Simpson and Kahler, 1980-81; Wilding and Bauer, 1968; Wynn, 1987). Hovland and his associates (1953) popularized the term “source credibility” and used it to describe a communicator’s positive characteristics which affect the receiver’s acceptance of a message.

The source-credibility model proposed by Hovland and his associates in 1953 concluded that two factors – expertise and trustworthiness – underscore the concept of source credibility. Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953) defined expertise as “the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions,” and trustworthiness as “the
degree of confidence in the communicator’s intent to communicate the assertions he considers most valid.”

However, past empirical research has shown celebrities to be well liked and attractive, though not always credible to be effective spokespersons (Atkin and Block, 1983; Freiden, 1984; Friedman, Termini and Washington, 1977). Kamins, Brand, Hoeke and Moe (1989) examined credibility using a two-sided execution to increase a viewer’s perception of advertiser credibility by including a discussion of a limitation of the advertised products and services. This study examined a strategy designed to enhance the credibility of a celebrity spokesperson through the use of a two-sided appeal. The two-sided format is compared to the traditional one-sided format that only claims positive aspects of a celebrity. According to their results, the two-sided communication elicited significantly higher advertising credibility and effectiveness ratings, higher evaluation of the sponsor in terms of perceived overall quality of service, and greater intention to use the advertised service, which suggested that the use of a celebrity appeal in a two-sided form was an effective advertising strategy.

Research also shows that in spite of the effectiveness of using celebrity endorsers, there are still negative effects. A study conducted by Till and Shimp (1998) used fictitious celebrities as well as real celebrities to examine the negative effects of celebrity endorsers. They hypothesized that subsequent negative information about the celebrity lowers brand
evaluations if the link between real celebrity and a brand is strongly associative (Till and Shimp, 1998).

Based on the review of source-credibility literature, credible sources are hypothesized to be more persuasive than are less credible sources (Ohanian, 1990). My hypotheses based on credibility are:

H1a: Celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more credible will produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less credible.

H1b: Celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more credible will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less credible.

2.5 Attractiveness

Physical attractiveness has been an important topic of research in social science (Bersheid and Walster, 1974) and attitude change research. It has been measured in terms of attractive, classy, handsome/beautiful, elegant, and sexy in previous literature (Ohanian, 1990). The elements of highly attractive models (HAMs) beauty include a beautiful facial
appearance (Richins, 1991) as well as thinness (Mishkind, Striegel-Moore, Silberstein and Rodin, 1986). Contrary to these icons of flawlessness, “normal” attractiveness is defined by Bower and Landreth (2002) in their study as a more average or moderate weight, height, and facial beauty, that is, more representative of a “real” woman. HAMs tend to be associated with the “what is beautiful is good” stereotype, in that beautiful people are believed to have more positive life outcomes, whereas HAMs are considered to be somewhat attractive, and are perceived to be normal people to whom more positive life outcomes are not attributed (Bower and Landreth, 2001).

The source-attractiveness model has its origin in social psychological research and is a component of the “source valence” model of McGuire (McGuire, 1985). The attractiveness model contends that the effectiveness of a message conveyed by a celebrity depends on source’s “familiarity”, “likeability”, “similarity”, and “attractiveness” to the respondent (Ohanian, 1990). In an exhaustive review, Joseph (1982) concluded that attractiveness (versus unattractiveness) communicators were consistently liked more and had a positive impact on products with which they are associated. Joseph’s findings were consistent with others that reported that increasing the communicator’s attractiveness enhanced positive attitude change (Simon, Berkowitz and Moyer, 1970; Kahle and Homer, 1985).
A review in the area of attractiveness provides evidence that the construct of attractiveness is not uni-dimensional and there are many dimensions to operationalize attractiveness. For example, the construct has been defined both in terms of facial and physical attractiveness (Baker and Churchill, 1977; Caballero and Solomon, 1984; Patzer, 1983). Physical attractiveness has been operationalized in terms of model attractiveness (Baker and Churchill, 1977; Kahle and Homer, 1985), chicness (Mills and Aronson, 1965), sexiness (Steadman, 1969), or sexualness and likeability (Maddux and Rogers, 1980).

Most studies have shown that a physically attractive source facilitates attitude change (Baker and Gilbert, 1977; Chaiken, 1979; Horai, Naccari and Fatoullah, 1974; Joseph, 1982; Mills and Aronson, 1965; Mills and Harvey, 1972; Petty, and Cacioppo and Schumann, 1983). But not all research has found that physical attractiveness increases attitude change. In Kahle and Homer’s study (1985), three factors were manipulated in an advertisement for disposable razors: celebrity-source physical attractiveness, celebrity-source likeability, and participant product involvement. Attitudes and purchase intentions changed due to celebrity-source attractiveness. Results showed only one significant difference on this measure: a main effect for attractiveness. The likeability difference was not significant, but the sex*involvement interaction revealed that in low-involvement conditions the difference between men and women was marginally
greater than the male – female difference among high-involvement conditions (Kahle and Homer, 1985).

Another study conducted by DeBono and Telesca (1990) examined the influence of source physical attractiveness on advertising effectiveness. Results suggested that high self-monitors might have been systematically processing the physically attractive source’s message and low self-monitors might have been more heuristically processing messages (DeBono and Telesca, 1990). The authors also suggested that to understand the impact of a physically attractive source on the persuasiveness of an advertisement, it was essential to account for the functional underpinnings of the target audience’s attitudes. It appeared as though attitude functions were related to individuals’ reactions to, and subsequent processing of, messages from a physically attractive source (DeBono and Telesca, 1990). Results were proposed in the following three aspects:

High self-monitors who listened to the physically attractive source formed more positive attitudes toward the product when strong arguments were delivered than when weak arguments were delivered. By contrast, low self-monitors appeared to have more heuristically processed the physically attractive source’s message as they tended to form relatively favorable attitudes toward the product regardless of the quality of the argument delivered (DeBono and Telesca, 1990). Cognitive response analysis indicated that high self-monitors listed a significantly higher proportion of favorable thoughts in response to
the strong arguments than to the weak ones only when the source was physically attractive, while results of low self-monitors revealed no significant effects, as the authors predicted, that the thoughts low self-monitors had while listening to the message were unaffected by either the source or argument quality (DeBono and Telesca, 1990). In the recall analysis, the authors indicated that high self-monitors were able to recall significantly more of the physically attractive source’s message while the amount of messages low self-monitors could recall was not significantly influenced by either the attractiveness of the source or the strength of the arguments delivered (DeBono and Telesca, 1990).

The above literature suggests that physically attractive endorsers generally enhance evaluation and facilitate attitude change in celebrity advertising. The following hypotheses based on attractiveness are:

H2a: Celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more attractive will produce more favorable attitude toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less attractive.

H2b: Celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more attractive will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less attractive.
2.6 Match-up

Research findings reveal that the physical attractiveness of the source does not always enhance attitude and purchase intention (Baker and Churchill, 1977; Caballero and Pride, 1984; Cooper, Darley and Henderson, 1974; Holahan and Stephan, 1981; Maddox and Rogers, 1980; Norman, 1976). A match-up hypothesis proposed by Kahle and Homer (1985) implied that the physical attractiveness of a celebrity endorser might only enhance both product- and ad-related evaluations if the product’s characteristics “match-up” with the image conveyed by the celebrity. It was found that for an attractiveness-related product, the use of a physically attractive celebrity significantly enhances measures of spokesperson credibility and attitude toward an advertisement, compared to the use of a physically unattractive celebrity. Alternatively, physically attractive celebrities were found to have no effect on dependent measures (e.g., attitude toward an advertisement) relative to the physically unattractive celebrity for an attractiveness-unrelated product (Kahle and Homer, 1985).

Kamins (1990), further investigated the “match-up” hypothesis in celebrity advertising, and hypothesized that 1) an increase in the physical attractiveness of a celebrity spokesperson should have a significantly positive impact on ad- and product- based evaluation for a product which is attractiveness-related and that 2) an increase in the
physical attractiveness of a celebrity spokesperson should have no significant impact on ad- and product- based evaluations for a product which is attractiveness unrelated. Results showed an interaction between celebrity attractiveness and product type, which supported both hypotheses. Findings of this study suggested that characteristics of a spokesperson interact with the nature of the product advertised (consistent with the research of Friedman and Friedman, 1979).

Kamins and Gupta (1994) tested the match-up hypothesis regarding the choice of a celebrity spokesperson by examining the fit or congruence between image type and the product advertised from an identification and internalization viewpoint. The authors indicated that past research in marketing has taken a rather limited look at congruence (or matching), typically in the context of the examination of other issues related to celebrity advertising (Kamins and Gupta, 1994). McCracken (1989) spoke to the issue of congruence by suggesting that the effectiveness of the endorser depends, in part, upon the meanings he/she brings to the endorsement process. A three-stage process was suggested that involves 1) the formation of a celebrity image, 2) transfer of meaning from celebrity to the product, and 3) finally from the product to the consumer (McCracken, 1989). This suggested again that the image of the celebrity must fit or be congruent with the product (Kamins and Gupta, 1994).
Kamins and Gupta (1994) expected both the type of spokesperson and congruence of spokesperson with the product being endorsed to have significant effects on advertisement evaluation. In this study, dependent measures were advertiser and spokesperson believability, spokesperson attractiveness, attitude toward the product, attitude toward the advertisement, and purchase intention. Results showed that for the celebrity versus non-celebrity spokesperson comparison, a high degree of congruence between product and celebrity image led to enhanced spokesperson believability and attractiveness as well as a significantly more favorable attitude and purchase intention toward the product, and further suggested the need for a careful consideration of the celebrity and product match-up (Kamins and Gupta, 1994).

Bower and Landreth (2002) made a comparison between HAMs and NAMs, and concluded that HAMs are not the most effective choice for all categories of attractiveness-relevant products, which was contrary to past research by Kahle and Homer (1985), and Kamins (1990). This study also explored the method by which the match between model attractiveness and product type influenced advertising effectiveness (Bower and Landreth, 2002). Results suggested that a match-up between a model and a product improved advertisement effectiveness not necessarily through the elicitation of product arguments from model appearance, but instead, by heightening perceptions of the model’s expertise about the product (Bower and Landreth, 2002).
Attractiveness-relevant product types are introduced into the match-up literature to delineate not only those that are best paired with HAMs, but also those that may be paired with NAMs (Bower and Landreth, 2002). A major distinction that can be drawn between types of attractiveness-relevant products is whether the product is associated with a potentially problematic area of life and appearance (Bloch and Richins, 1992). One group is called problem-solving product that serves to fix or hide beauty liabilities or flaws such as acne or dandruff (Bower and Landreth, 2002). The other group called enhancing product serves a more aesthetic purpose by enhancing beauty (e.g., jewelry, lipstick, and perfume) instead of masking defects (Bower and Landreth, 2002). Prior research suggested that the match-up between product type and model beauty might be more important than the model’s attractiveness alone and that a NAM might sometimes be more effective (Kahle and Homer, 1985; Kamins, 1990). Bower and Landreth (2002) indicated that consumers may not perceive the HAMs as suffering from mundane problems whereas the less attractive model’s more realistic appearance might have made her a more credible spokesperson.

Some of the research investigating model-product type match-ups has assessed match-up effectiveness by measuring spokesperson credibility (Kamins, 1990). Two components of spokesperson credibility are source expertise and trustworthiness (Bow and Landreth, 2002). Expertise refers to the perceived ability of a source to make valid claims (Bow and Landreth, 2002). There is evidence to suggest that NAMs may be perceived as more
trustworthy than HAMs because of consumers’ perceived similarity between themselves and the NAMs (Bow and Landreth, 2002).

Given the importance of match-up between celebrity spokespersons and products or services they endorse, the following hypotheses based on match-up or celebrity spokespersons’ expertise are:

H3a: According to the match-up hypothesis, celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse will produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse.

H3b: According to the match-up hypothesis, celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse.

2.7 Identification

Research findings and literature suggests that identification may be a determinant of the viewers’ perception of the spokesperson (Basil, 1996). It is suggested that a spokesperson
with whom the audience identifies insures the greatest likelihood of achieving lasting 
attitude or behavior change (Basil, 1996). Kenneth Burke (1950) proposed that the basis 
of communication effectiveness was an audience member’s identification with a fictional 
character. Burke’s Dramatism theory suggests that identification depends on 
“connections” between the character and audience member. Herbert Kelman (1961), in 
his theory of opinion change, proposed that there were three processes of social influence 
– compliance, identification, and internalization. Kelman (1961) proposed that 
identification occurs when an individual adopts an attitude or behavior from another 
individual while the attitude or behavior was associated with a satisfying self-defining 
relationship with that person. According to Kelman, identification is based on either 
classical identification or reciprocal role relationship, and identification leads to people’s 
attempts of being like others. Social Learning theory (1977), proposed by Albert 
Bandura, is well known in psychology and mass communication. This theory predicts 
how likely a person is to enact a modeled behavior. Later in 1986, this theory was 
widened into Social-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura’s theory, a 
person’s identification with a model determines the likelihood of enacting a behavior. 
The more similar people perceive themselves as a model, the more likely they are to 
enact the behavior of that model. In the case of celebrity, this theory suggests that a 
person who identifies with a celebrity is more likely to behave as that celebrity does.
In the study that introduces identification as a mediator of celebrity effects, Basil (1996) applied the identification effect to the area of HIV prevention campaigns. The author hypothesized that the effects of identification with a celebrity would mediate the adoption of attitudinal and behavior positions advocated that celebrity. The study tested identification through the young adults’ identification with Magic Johnson, their AIDS-related concern, perceived risk, and behavior. Results showed that identification with Magic Johnson was significantly related to personal concern and intention to change high-risk sexual behavior but was not a significant predictor of perceived risk or intention to get a blood test.

In the discussion part of Basil’s study (1996), the author indicated that although this study showed the effect of identification, it had not compared identification with the other possible explanations of celebrity effects. Further, what remains is to compare viewers’ ratings of several celebrities on their attitude and behavior change (Basil, 1996).

To test how identification affects advertising effectiveness, my next hypotheses based on identification are as followed:

H4a: Celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents identify will produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents do not identify.
H4b: Celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents identify will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service than those celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents do not identify.
3. Pretest

3.1 Description

To identify appropriate celebrities for the study, a pretest was conducted. This pretest was designed in a way that all the celebrities that were qualified for the experiment would differ from credibility, attractiveness, and identification. Nine male celebrities and seven female celebrities from the US were selected according to a previous study examining attractiveness and admiration (Basil, 1996). Because the study was conducted in Canada, seven male celebrities and five female celebrities from Canada were added. These were also selected based on attractiveness. Celebrities from both countries had similar mean age and similar proportion of professions. The consideration of gender and age is to minimize their effects on people’s perception of admiration.

Pretest questions examined the credibility, attractiveness, identification, and expertise of celebrities. These questions were drawn from Ohanian’s study (1990) to measure celebrity endorsers’ perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness and Basil’s study (1996) on identification. Ohanian (1990) developed five items for attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertise separately. See Appendix E. Two items in each dimension that had a relatively higher reliability score were selected into the pretest questions in this study. Three identification questions came from Basil’s research (1996) on identification measurements (Appendix G).
The picture of each celebrity appeared on top of a page, followed by ten questions. The first nine questions asked the students to indicate their level of agreement on nine statements using 7-point Likert scale (from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree), which covered three dimensions: 1) credibility, 2) physical attractiveness, and 3) identification. In the questionnaire, the nine questions were randomly placed. The last question asked people what areas they considered the celebrity to be an expert. Demographic questions at the end of the questionnaire asked people’s use of media, and gender and age.

3.2 Sample

A total of 40 people from a university in western Canada were given a booklet containing 28 celebrities. The respondents were aged 18 to 50, and the mean age was 23. Among the respondents, 21 (52.5%) were male, and 19 (47.5%) were female. The majority of the respondents were college students. Subjects were required to indicate their degree of media use. In a seven-point Likert scale, people reported a mean score of 4.55 for print media, 4.75 for television news, and 3.95 for newspaper and magazines. Respondents were offered $3 for completing a survey of celebrities. They were asked to read an informed consent first, and sign “I understand” in the inform consent. They got the survey booklet of all 28 celebrities. For each, they answered 10 questions. At the end, they filled out the demographic information. Each student that completed the
questionnaire was given three dollars as an incentive. 40 questionnaires were distributed and all were returned.

3.3 Results

The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ measuring the scales of credibility, attractiveness, and identification were examined, and the mean scores were 893, .931, and .854 respectively. Next, scores for each measure were averaged which were listed in appendix B. Therefore, each celebrity had three scores concerning credibility, attractiveness, and identification.

As a result of this pretest, eight celebrities are chosen as the subject of the study. There are three items that will be measured in this study: 1) credibility, 2) physical attractiveness, and 3) identification. These eight celebrities are: Neve Campbell (HHH), Shania Twain (HHL), Rudolph Guiliani (HLH), Rosie O’Donnell (HLL), Nathan Lane (LLH), Roch Voisine (LHL), The Rock (LHH), and George Bush (LLL)\textsuperscript{1}. Accordingly, these eight celebrities were chosen because they differed maximally on the dimensions of credibility, attractiveness and identification. Each celebrity was then assigned accordingly into each cell that is labeled by low/high credibility, low/high physical attractiveness, and low/high identification separately. There were three items that were measured in this study: 1) credibility, 2) attractiveness, and 3) identification. The last

\textsuperscript{1} HHL stands for high in credibility, high in attractiveness, and low in identification.
question indicates the areas that a specific celebrity could be considered as an expert. The answers provided the areas in which celebrity had expertise, and were used to develop the match-up ads for the final experiment.
4. **Experiment**

4.1 **Ads Design**

From these eight celebrities, sixteen advertisements were prepared for the experiment. Eight of them were designed to match the expertise of the eight celebrity spokespersons, and then products and celebrity spokespersons were mixed so that in the other eight advertisements, the products type and the celebrity spokespersons type were not matched. These eight products included clubs, TV program, movie, fragrance, and politics. All these products were considered to be low-involvement products. The original advertisements and celebrity pictures came from the Internet. For most of these ads, the celebrity and content were added to the basic ad.

4.2 **Data Collection**

The main study consisted of 50 people from a university in the western Canada. Twenty-seven of the subjects (54%) were female, and twenty-three of them (46%) were male. The age of the respondents ranged from 18 to 53, and the average age was 26 years. The years that the subjects were in this university ranged from 0 to 10, and the average year was 2.5. The respondents were from Canada (58%), China (30%), England (2%), Europe (2%), Japan (2%), and other countries or districts (6%). Their program in this university included Management, Arts, History, Education, Physics, etc. Respondents
were given an informed consent before they participated in the experiment telling them the purpose of the study and were asked to sign “I understand” in the informed consent, but they did not sign their name. Respondents that agreed to participate in the experiment were given the questionnaire booklet. They viewed one advertisement and the corresponding questions regarding the advertisement. They did the same for the eight advertisements, and then filled out the demographic questions at the end.

The study consisted of a 2 (celebrity credibility) * 2 (celebrity attractiveness) * 2 (celebrity identification) * 2 (match-up) between- and within-subjects experimental design. There were two different versions of the questionnaires. In both versions, the first four ads and questions are portrait, while the last four are landscape, but all are randomly organized so that order will not influence the results. Each of the subjects viewed eight celebrities paired with eight products - four of them matched and four did not match. In the other version of the questionnaire, the matched ads and unmatched ads are exchanged so that the four matched ads were not matched in the other version, and vise versa.

4.3 Measures

Ohanian’s (1990) scale was used to assess the celebrity endorsers’ credibility, attractiveness, and expertise. Items were chosen according to the item reliability of the scale. To measure credibility, “dependable” and “trustworthiness” were selected, with the
Cronbach’s α of .874. To measure attractiveness, “attractive” and “handsome/beautiful” were selected, with the Cronbach’s α of .925. To measure expertise, “expert” and “knowledgeable” were selected, with the Cronbach’s α of .912. These questions were stated using seven-point Likert scale. Two questions regarding celebrity endorsers’ identification were selected from Basil’s (1996) research on identification study of celebrity effects. The Cronbach’s α for celebrity’s identification was .727.

Based on studies addressing advertising effectiveness (Biehal, Stephens and Curlo, 1992; Craciun, Stephens and Madden, 2002; Gresham and Shimp, 1985; Spears and Singh, 2004), ad evaluations and products evaluations were used to assess the effectiveness. Subjects evaluated the ads using a seven-point semantic differential scale with endpoints of bad/good, negative/positive, and unfavorable/favorable, which was derived from Davis’s (1995) research on attitudes towards the ads. The Cronbach’s α for the ads evaluation construct was .962. Subjects evaluated products using a seven-point Likert scale which contained two questions (Appendix H) asking them to indicate their future interest about the products. The Cronbach’s α for future interests was .95.
5. Results

5.1 ANOVA Analysis for Attitudes toward the Ads

ANOVA examined the results by categorizing the celebrities into high/low credibility, high/low attractiveness, high/low identification, and matched/unmatched, which was determined by the results of the pretest. Hypotheses predicted that credibility, attractiveness, match up and identification will significantly affect the attitudes toward the ads. Results showed that the effect of attractiveness (p<.001) and match-up (p<.001) were significant for attitudes toward the ads, but credibility and identification were not significant. Though “expertise” and “match-up” were operationalized differently, there was no conceptual difference between match-up in the ANOVA analysis and expertise in the hypotheses. ANOVA also revealed a significant interaction between attractiveness and identification (p=.045). The adjusted $r^2$ was .113 for individual independent variables, and .122 for interaction effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.812</td>
<td>1.843</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.075</td>
<td>16.476</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.539</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match-Up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.781</td>
<td>33.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness*Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.378</td>
<td>4.051</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Attitudes toward the Ads)
5.2 ANOVA Analysis for Future Interest

Hypotheses predicted that credibility, attractiveness, expertise and identification will significantly affect the future interest in the product or service. Results showed that the effect of match-up (p=.009) was significant for future interest, but credibility, attractiveness and identification were not significant. The ANOVA also revealed a significant interaction between attractiveness and identification (p=.001). The adjusted $r^2$ was .019 for individual independent variables, and .046 for the interaction effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Future Interest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.302</td>
<td>3.503</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match-Up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.136</td>
<td>7.171</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness*Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.120</td>
<td>10.885</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 The Zero-Order Correlation between Each of the Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

The correlation between each of the independent variables and dependent variables were examined. The correlation table presented as follows, and r for each independent variables and dependent variables were significant. The results indicated that each of the independent variables (credibility, attractiveness, expertise, and identification) were
significantly correlated with each of the dependent variables (attitudes toward the ads and future interest in a product or service). Correlation coefficients ranged from .311 to .604 (p values less than 0.01). The linear relationships between each independent variable and each dependent variable were also positive.

In addition, the correlation table showed high correlations not only between independent variables and dependent variables, but also between independent variables. The correlation coefficient between credibility and identification was quite high (.756), and correlation coefficients between other independent variables ranged from .387 to .550. The high correlation between independent variables might be due to the overlap of these independent variables. The selection of the items that measured each independent variable might cause this overlap.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Aad</th>
<th>FI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aad</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Coefficients between each of the Independent variables and dependent variables
5.4 Multivariate Regression Analysis for Attitudes toward the Ads

To further test the hypotheses, a multivariate regression analysis was used to test the relationship between the four independent variables on attitudes toward the ads.

Hypothesis 1a stated that celebrity spokesperson who are perceived as being more credible will produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less credible. However, credibility was not significant ($\beta=0.044$, $t=.76$, $p=.447$), and thus Hypothesis 1a was not supported. Hypothesis 2a predicted that celebrity spokespersons who were perceived as being more attractive would produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less attractive. This hypothesis was supported because attractiveness was significant at a level of .01 ($\beta=0.154$, $t=3.45$, $p=.001$).

Hypothesis 3a predicted that celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse would produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse. The regression showed that expertise was significant ($\beta=0.344$, $t=7.87$, $p<.001$), and thus supported this hypothesis. Hypothesis 4a predicted that celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents identify will produce more favorable attitudes toward the ads than those celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents do not identify. The regression showed
that identification was significant ($\beta=.314$, $t=5.21$, $p<.001$) and this hypothesis was supported.

To conclude, expertise and identification were making relatively larger contributions to the explained variance of attitudes toward the ads. Three of the constructs (attractiveness, expertise, and identification) were significant at a significance level of .01. The celebrity endorsers’ attractiveness, expertise, identification were significant and positive, which supported hypothesis 2 a, hypothesis 3 a, and hypothesis 4 a.

5.5 Multivariate Regression Analysis for Future Interest

Hypothesis 1b stated that celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more credible will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service toward the product than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less credible. Results showed that credibility was significant ($\beta=.163$, $t=2.42$, $p=.016$) and thus hypothesis 1b was supported. Hypothesis 2b predicted that celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more attractive will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service than those celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less attractive. However, attractiveness was not significant ($\beta=.039$, $t=.75$, $p=.455$) and this hypothesis was not supported. Hypothesis 3b predicted that celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being more knowledgeable about the product or service they endorse
will report higher levels of future interest toward the product or service than those
celebrity spokespersons who are perceived as being less knowledgeable about the product
or service they endorse. This hypothesis was supported ($\beta=.221$, $t=4.32$, $p<.001$).

Hypothesis 4 b predicted that celebrity spokespersons with whom respondents identify
will report higher levels of future interest in the product or service than those celebrity
spokespersons with whom respondents do not identify. This hypothesis was also
supported ($\beta=.200$, $t=2.81$, $p<.001$).

As a result, the celebrity endorsers’ credibility, expertise, identification are all significant
and positive, which supports hypotheses hypothesis 1b, hypothesis 3b, and hypothesis 4b.
Expertise and identification are making large contributions to the explained variance of
future interest. Attractiveness is not significant ($p=.455$) and therefore, hypothesis 2b is
not supported.
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitudes toward the Ads</th>
<th>Future Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>3.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>7.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>5.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $r^2$</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Table for Attitudes toward the Ads and Future Interest
6. Discussion and Conclusion

The ANOVA test did not reveal a significant result for most of the hypotheses. The credibility hypotheses on both attitudes toward the ads and future interest were not supported by ANOVA. Attractiveness was significant and in the predicted direction with regard to attitudes toward the ads but not to future interest. The identification hypotheses were not supported for attitudes toward the ads nor for future interest. Match-up was significant for both attitudes toward the ads and future interest. In addition, ANOVA revealed a significant effect of attractiveness * identification interaction for both attitudes toward the ads and future interest. The positive findings of match-up was consistent with Kamins’ (1990) finding that physical attractiveness of a celebrity endorser may only enhance both product- and ads-based evaluations if the product’s characteristics “match-up” with the image conveyed by the celebrity. Due to the unequal cell size, small sample and differences between the pre and post test samples it is difficult to accurately interpret the results of the hypotheses from the ANOVA.

In a more sensitive test of the hypotheses, a multivariate regression analysis was run that included all dependent variables as continuous. The results from the multivariate regression showed that credibility was not significant for attitudes toward the ads but was significant for future interest. Ohanian (1990) suggested that a source who was perceived
to be both an expert and trustworthy generated the most opinion change. But the present research only found the effect of credibility on future interest.

Attractiveness of the celebrity spokesperson was significant with regard to attitudes toward the ads but not for future interest. The significant prediction was previously showed by Joseph’s (1982) research, concluding that attractive communicators were consistently liked more and have a positive impact on products with which they were associated. Further, previous studies regarding attitude change suggested that increasing the communicator’s attractiveness enhanced positive attitude change (Simon, Berkowitz and Moyer, 1970; Kahle and Homer, 1985).

Expertise and identification of the spokespersons’ were significant with regard to positive attitudes toward the ads and future interest. The expertise findings were consistent with previous research suggesting that a source’s perceived expertise has a positive impact on attitude change (Horai, Naccari and Fatoullah, 1974; Maddux and Rogers, 1980; Mills and Harvey, 1972). The identification findings were consistent with Basil’s (1996) study showing that identification was an explanation for the effectiveness of celebrity endorsers.

The above results revealed differences between the multivariate regression analysis and ANOVA analysis. ANOVA and multivariate regression both showed that expertise was
the most important factor to predict attitudes toward the ads and future interest (p<.001 and p=.008 for ANOVA; p<000 and p<000 for regression separately). The fact that attractiveness doesn’t predict future interest was indicated by both ANOVA and regression. The reason for this outcome might be that, except for fragrance, all the other products and services are not attractiveness-related. People may not rely on the attractiveness of celebrities when evaluating attractiveness-unrelated products and services. This result was consistent with Kahle and Homer’s (1985) research, which suggested that if attractiveness provides central information it should only influence attitudes under high involvement, or when the product is related to attractiveness.

Both statistical methods also revealed insignificant predictions of the celebrity spokespersons’ credibility on attitudes toward the ads. This result could also be due to the products and services types used in the present study. As previously discussed, all of the products and services selected for the experiment are considered to be low-involvement. Therefore, credibility will not play as a significant role in determining peoples’ attitudes toward the ads in this low involvement situation (Kahle and Homer, 1985).

There were three possible explanations for the inconsistency of ANOVA and regression results. First, the ANOVA and regression had different types or independent variables. In ANOVA, each independent variable had two categories: low/unmatched, which was coded as 0, and high/matched, which was coded as 1. In the regression analyses,
independent variables and dependent variables were all continuous variables. Each independent variable and dependent variable had a specific score between 1 and 7. The difference in variable types would to some degree influence the results.

Second, from a psychological cognition’s perspective, the evaluation processes for the pretest and the experiment were different. Psychological cognition literature suggested that the on-line versus memory-based distinction was based on differences in the sources of the information that was entered as input to the hypothetical judgment operator (Hastie and Park, 1986). They found that subjects seemed reluctant to consult long-term memory for evidence on which to base a novel judgment. Rather, they appeared to prefer to make a new judgment on the basis of earlier judgments and inferences without retrieving specific evidence from memory (Hastie and Park, 1986). This result could be applied to explain the difference between subjects’ judgments in pretest and experiment. In the pretest, the statements regarding the celebrities were independent, while in experiment, they were dependent. Subjects might be inclined to previous judgments in the experiment.

Third, since the independent variables of the ANOVA analysis was determined by the sample of pretest, while the independent variables in regression analysis was determined by the sample of experiment, the latter sample evaluating statements regarding celebrities
in the context of the specific ad. This would bring subjectivity to the people’s evaluation of celebrities.
7. Limitations and Future Research

This study has some limitations that need further efforts. First of all, the dimensions of the scale, and the selection of the items are motivated by previous theoretical work. Therefore, one should be cautioned that quantitative studies establish the reliability and validity of the scales rather than discovers their existence. In future study, existing scales can be expanded or modified. Results indicate high correlations between each of the independent variables, which suggest that those independent variables might probably overlap to some extent. Future research could try to develop more exclusive dimensions of the scale.

Additionally, this study adopts experiment as its main research methodology. Existing studies on celebrity endorsement adopt both survey and experiment. Because of the match-up manipulation, this study requires a control group as a contrast. Nevertheless, experiment has its limitation. After the pretest, eight celebrities are needed for the experiment, with two levels of credibility, attractiveness, and identification. Although there are 28 celebrities selected for the pretest, which supposed to be enough for a selection of eight, the results still cannot meet the criteria strictly. For example, it is sometimes the case that some people cluster at low credibility, high attractiveness, and low identification, but no people fit in the low credibility, high attractiveness, and high identification cell. Therefore, a trade off has to be made so that some “highs” or “lows”
are not absolute, and they only mean relatively high or relatively low. This limitation to some extent influences the experiment design. Survey could be used as an alternative for the main research methodology, and results could be compared with experiment results in the present study.

With regard to the generalizability, the samples of both pretest and experiment consist of university students. Although university students are generally considered as a convenience sample, it might not as representative as people from different positions. In addition, because of budget constraint, the samples for both pretest and experiment are small. A more representative sample can be used in future research to ensure the generalizability of the study.

This study has compared celebrity spokespersons’ credibility, attractiveness, expertise and identification on attitudes toward the ads and future interest in the product or service. The present study is essential for both researchers and marketers. From a theoretical perspective, the scales in this study include dimensions such as credibility, attractiveness, expertise, identification, attitudes toward the ads, and future interest. Research using other items to measure the same dimensions could compare the reliability of the scales and thus select the best measurements for future study.
The current scale can also be adapted to various situations. Advertisers can use the scale as an integral part of their effectiveness testing and tracking. Advertisers and marketers should have an idea of the credibility, attractiveness, expertise and identification of the celebrity spokespersons that they are going to use. Moreover, it is important for them to be fully aware of the features of their products or services so that the product type and celebrity type can be matched. Further, since the attitudes toward the ads outcome is not fully consistent with future interests about product or service outcome, an implication of the findings is that it is essential for advertisers and marketers to figure out whether their emphasis is on ads or on product or service, and then understand what kind of features their endorsers should have.

In selecting celebrities for the pretest, a larger pool of celebrity candidates could be considered in order to insure that there would be people diversify in credibility, attractiveness, and identification. Since ANOVA test here has high/low levels of independent variables, and this study only has 28 celebrity candidates, therefore, it comes out that the requirements for experiment cannot be strictly satisfied. In Future research, more celebrity candidates are recommended in order to have a better identification of “high and low”.

To better assess the effectiveness of celebrity advertising, purchase intention can be used instead of future interest. Admittedly, purchase intention is difficult to examine only by
using the current items such as credibility, attractiveness, expertise and identification. A larger perspective of considerations, such as financial condition and personal interest, should be made to measure purchase intention.
Reference


Mills, J. and Harvey, J. (1972). Opinion Change as a Function of When Information about the Communicator is Received and Whether He is Attractive or Expert. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 21, 52-55.


### Scale Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward the Ads</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Interests</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Pretest Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>4.558</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpton</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>2.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>3.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couric</td>
<td>4.254</td>
<td>4.526</td>
<td>3.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>4.983</td>
<td>4.120</td>
<td>4.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Donnell</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>3.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>2.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>4.192</td>
<td>3.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuliani</td>
<td>4.592</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>3.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>4.108</td>
<td>3.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>3.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbaugh</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>2.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paker</td>
<td>4.225</td>
<td>5.171</td>
<td>4.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripa</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>5.108</td>
<td>3.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>3.601</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>3.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>2.573</td>
<td>3.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>3.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>4.492</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>4.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twain</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>3.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voisine</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>3.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td>3.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4.088</td>
<td>4.377</td>
<td>3.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretzky</td>
<td>5.354</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>4.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furtado</td>
<td>4.453</td>
<td>5.363</td>
<td>4.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>4.517</td>
<td>5.392</td>
<td>4.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>3.944</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td>3.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>2.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>4.006</td>
<td>3.697</td>
<td>3.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>5.354</td>
<td>5.392</td>
<td>4.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>2.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

#### Attitudes toward the Advertisement Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Reliability/Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good/Bad</td>
<td>Nine-point</td>
<td>Davis (1995)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/Negative</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable/Unfavorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix D

#### Purchase Intention Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Reliability/Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never/Definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spears and Singh (2004)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely do not intend to buy/Definitely intend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low/High purchase interest</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Spears and Singh (2004)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not buy it/Definitely buy it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not/Probably buy it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E

### Attractiveness, Trustworthiness and Expertise Scale

**Item Reliability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linda Evans</th>
<th>Tom Selleck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classy</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handsome/Beautiful</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegant</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Reliability</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Var. Extracted</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract/Trust</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Var. Extracted</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust/Expert</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Var. Extracted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert/Attract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix F

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward the Ads</th>
<th>Future Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>3.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>7.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>5.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Pretest (Sample)

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree

1. The Rock is trustworthy. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. The Rock is handsome. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. The Rock is sexy. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. The Rock is a personal role model. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. The Rock is convincing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I like The Rock. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I find The Rock to be attractive. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. The Rock is dependable. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I think of The Rock as a good friend. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

In what area do you consider The Rock to be an expert?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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Please fill out the following information:

1) I depend on the print media to keep me informed about the world.

   Strongly Disagree  1       2       3       4       5       6       7  Strongly Agree

2) Television news is an important source of knowledge for me.

   Strongly Disagree  1       2       3       4       5       6       7  Strongly Agree

3) Newspaper and news magazines help me to relate better with others.

   Strongly Disagree  1       2       3       4       5       6       7  Strongly Agree

Your gender: M__________         F___________
Your Age: ___________

Thank you very much for your participation!
Please answer the following questions regarding the ad on the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is attractive.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is an expert in fitness.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is trustworthy.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the Rock.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is dependable.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is handsome.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is a personal role model.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rock is knowledgeable in fitness.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I admire the Rock.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to find out more about the 24 Hour Fitness Club.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will pay more attention to the 24 Hour Fitness Club in the future.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What best describes your attitude toward the ad?

Bad   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Good

Negative 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Positive

Unfavorable 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Favorable
Please answer the following questions about yourself. Your information will be CONFIDENTIAL and restricted for academic use only.

Gender     M _____     F _____

Age          __________

Where were you born ________________________

How many years have you been in U of L ________________

What program you are studying at the University of Lethbridge:  
____________

Thank you very much for your participation!
THE BEST DAY OF TELEVISION

--- THE ROCK

DIGITAL VIEWING GUIDE

10:00 Live with Regis and Kelly
11:00 Animal Planet Pet
11:30 Headline News
12:00 Oprah Winfrey
13:00 Days of Our Lives

CHANNEL TEN

NEXT DR. PHIL

THIS IS A GOOD PLACE TO HEAR THE LATEST MUSIC.

--- SHANIA TWAIN

CENTERSTAGE COUNTRY MUSIC CLUB

COMEDY CLUB

Is your idea of musical genius Adam Sandler or Spinal Tap? Well, if you love using music to make people crack up - this is definitely your scene. Some performers are William Hung clones, some change up the lyrics a la Weird Al Yankovic and others do hysterical impressions of the original artist. Whatever your act - this is the place to showcase your comedic skills! No need to be funny - it's worth coming just to watch the light-hearted musical humor. So get an extra dose of laughter and step in!

"THIS COMEDY CLUB IS WORTH GOING."

--- SHANIA TWAIN
Speakers.
Discussions.
Internships
Activism.

THIS IS THE PLACE TO REALLY LEARN ABOUT POLITICS

--- NEVE CAMPBELL

The Political Science Association
www.csbsju.edu/polisciassociation

SPECIAL ADVANCE SCREENING

ONE OF THE YEAR'S BEST MOVIES
--- NEVE CAMPBELL

Now and Then

To qualify, you must purchase one of the screening tickets and be postmarked by October 4, 1995. Winners will be notified at random. No checks will be mailed to you.
COMEDY CLUB

Is your idea of musical genius Adam Sandler or Spinal Tap? Well, if you love using music to make people crack up - this is definitely your scene. Some performers are William Hung clones, some change up the lyrics a la Weird Al Yankovic and others do hysterical impressions of the original artist. Whatever your act - this is the place to showcase your comedic skills! No need to be funny - it's worth coming just to watch the light-hearted musical humor. So get an extra dose of laughter and step in!

THIS IS A GOOD PLACE TO HEAR THE LATEST MUSIC.

---- NATHAN LANE

CENTERSTAGE COUNTRY MUSIC CLUB
ROCH VOISINE

"THE NEW FRAGRANCE FOR MEN"

armani mania
the new fragrance for men
GIORGIO ARMANI

SPACE SOLUTIONS FOR THE WORLD’S PROBLEMS

HOW THE UNITED NATIONS FAMILY IS USING SPACE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT...

— ROCH VOISINE
SPACE SOLUTIONS FOR THE WORLD’S PROBLEMS

HOW THE UNITED NATIONS FAMILY IS USING SPACE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT...

---- RUDOLPH GUILIANI

RUDOLPH GUILIANI

"THE NEW FRAGRANCE FOR MEN"

ARMANI MANIA

GIORGIO ARMANI
THE BEST DAY OF TELEVISION
---- ROOSIE O'DONNELL

10:00 Live with Regis and Kelly
11:00 Animal Planet Pet
11:30 Headline News
12:00 Oprah Winfrey
13:00 Days of Our Lives

DR. PHIL

24 HOUR CONVENIENCE.

"THIS IS THE BEST PLACE TO WORKOUT I'VE FOUND"
---- ROSIE O'DONNELL

6 Weeks of Fitness for only $29

800.204.2400 www.24HourFitness.com