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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, their credibility and their congruency with the advertisement, and consumer’s attitudes toward the advertisement, the brand and their intent to purchase the advertised product. Participants were asked to answer a questionnaire that corresponded with three different apparel advertisements, using three different celebrities. The dependent variables, purchase intentions, attitude toward the ad and attitude toward the brand were measured against the independent variables, physical attractiveness, source credibility, and celebrity/brand congruency using one-way ANOVA and backward linear regression. Findings indicated that celebrity endorsements generated higher purchase intentions, positive attitudes toward the ad and positive attitudes toward the brand. However, the celebrity itself should be taken into consideration. All three celebrities had different scores for each backward linear regression test. Further research should include measuring celebrities endorsing their own brands, using multiple celebrities in one ad and measuring the same product using a celebrity and a non-celebrity.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Celebrities have become famous for more than being in the movies or on a television show; they appear on the covers of magazines, they endorse products they may or may not use, and they have started to design their own lines of clothing, perfume and accessories. A celebrity is someone who is well known and popular, whereas a celebrity endorser is someone who enjoys public recognition and who uses that recognition on behalf of a consumer good by appearing with it in an advertisement (McCracken, 1989). Celebrities can make people take notice of what they are endorsing and create an immediate identity or persona for a product (Cooper, 1984). According to Spielman (1981), celebrities increase your odds of getting attention, make the copy more memorable, humanize the company, add glamour to the product, and make it more desirable, credible and trusted. For these reasons advertisers seek out celebrities to promote their products.

Around 20% of all commercials use some sort of celebrity endorsement and 10% of all advertising dollars goes to celebrity endorsements (Bradley, 1996). The three variables that have been identified in celebrity endorsements are 1) physical attractiveness, 2) source credibility (trustworthiness and expertise), and 3) celebrity/brand congruency. No studies have been done using all three mentioned variables in relation to celebrities endorsing brand name apparel. The goal of this study is to examine the wide use of celebrity endorsements in fashion clothing advertisements; to find out how people view these ads by measuring their attitudes toward the ad and the celebrity and their purchase intentions toward the endorsed products using the above three variables.

These variables make the advertisement believable, leading the consumer to form an associative link (preexisting associations or groups of concepts that are related meaningfully to an object) (Till, 1998), and purchase the product, or turn to its competitor. With the market being so cluttered, consumers often will make purchase decisions relying more on the advertised image of the brand, than the physical aspect of
the brand (Graeff, 1996). Marketers want to generate interest and differentiate their brand from others, and one way to do that is to tie the brand’s image to a celebrity (Buck, 1993).

Through the endorsement process an associative link is built between the celebrity and the brand; this is how celebrities add meaning, or “equity” to the product they are endorsing (Till, 1998). Thus, the celebrity endorsers are used to enhance the brand’s equity, which has been defined as “a set of assets such as name, awareness, loyal customers, perceived quality, and associations that are linked to the brand (its name and symbol) and add (or subtract) value to the product or service being offered” (Aaker, 1991, p. 4). This brand equity can be achieved through celebrity endorsements in advertising.

Meenaghan (1995) identifies advertising as one of the principle ways to educate consumers about products. He points out that advertising serves to achieve a particular personality for a brand by imbuing the brand with specific associations or value-equity. Brand equity in advertising is “the additional cash flow achieved by associating a brand with the underlying product or service…the premium a consumer would pay for a branded product or service compared to an identical unbranded version of the same product or service” (Aaker & Biel, 1993, p.69).

There is great potential for using celebrity endorsers to enhance brand equity, but little empirical research has focused on this widely-used advertising technique (Walker, Langmeyer & Langmeyer, 1992). The majority of celebrity endorsement research has focused on the effectiveness of the celebrity endorsers, but provides little direction in regard to the equity which the celebrity can bring to the endorsed brand (Walker et al., 1992). Many of the celebrity endorser studies consider what effects a celebrity can have on consumers’ attitudes toward the brand and/or the ad (Atkin & Block, 1983; Frieden, 1984; Kamins, Brand, Hoeke & Moe, 1989), and/or their intent to purchase the product (Ohanian, 1991; Walker, Langmeyer & Langmeyer, 1992).

In past studies when measuring consumers’ response to celebrity endorsements in advertising, findings show that celebrities make advertisements more believable (Kamins et al., 1989), enhance message recall (Friedman & Friedman, 1979), create a positive attitude toward the brand (Kamins et al., 1989), and create a distinct personality for the
endorsed brand (McCracken, 1989). Consistently studies have shown that celebrity endorsements are believed to generate a greater likelihood of customers’ choosing the endorsed brand (Kahle & Homer, 1985; Kamins et al., 1989; Atkin & Block, 1983; Freiden, 1984; Ohanian, 1991).

The above mentioned variables have been researched using everyday household objects, and findings show respondents may feel that the celebrity and the product are a good fit (Kahle & Homer, 1985; Kamins, 1989, 1990; Kamins & Gupta, 1994), that the celebrity is an expert (Till, 1998; Ohanian, 1991; Kamins & Gupta, 1994), that the celebrity is a credible source (Freidin, 1984; Atkin & Block, 1983; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Kamins et al., 1989), and that the celebrity can sell products because the celebrity is physically attractive (Kamins, 1990; Till & Busler, 1998; Kahle & Homer, 1985; Ohanian, 1991; Chaiken, 1979; Baker & Churchill, 1977; Petroshius & Crocker, 1989).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of physical attractiveness, source credibility of the endorser, and celebrity/brand congruency on consumers’ attitudes toward the printed advertisement and brand, and purchase intentions of the endorsed product.

**Objectives**

1) To examine if the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand of the endorser in the advertisement will increase the purchase intentions of the endorsed product.

2) To examine if the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will positively influence the consumer’s attitude of the advertisement.

3) To examine if the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will positively influence the consumer’s attitude toward the brand in the advertisement.
Research Questions

1) Will the physical attractiveness of the celebrity endorser, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency generate higher intent to purchase the advertised product?
2) Will the physical attractiveness of the endorser, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency positively influence attitudes toward the advertisement?
3) Will the physical attractiveness of the endorser, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency positively influence attitudes toward the brand?

Hypotheses

1) The physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will generate higher intent to purchase advertised product.
2) The physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will positively relate to consumer’s attitude toward the advertisement.
3) The physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will positively relate to consumer’s attitude toward the brand.

Rational

This exploratory research will build foundation for future research on celebrity endorsements. There has not been a published study pertaining to celebrity endorsements using strictly fashion apparel using the three variables mentioned above. Results of this study can assist in future research of other types of celebrity endorsements. It can also help advertisers and retail companies when selecting celebrities to endorse their products.
Limitations
This study was limited by:

1) The use of a convenience sample.
2) The use of all females in the advertisements.
3) The higher percent of females surveyed.

Assumptions
The following assumptions were made:

1) That the sample measured will know the celebrity in the advertisement used.
2) That the respondents will answer the questions with honesty, completely, and
   without intentional bias.
3) That the respondents will understand the questions asked and the scales used.
4) That the respondents do not use prior opinions, attitudes or feelings about the
   product or celebrity when answering the questions.

Definition of Terms
1. **Advertising**- “sharing of information about a specific product in the most
   dramatic, compelling, persuasive, and memorable fashion possible” (Harding,
   1991, p. 4).

2. **Attitude**- “an individual’s internal evaluation of an object” (Mitchell & Olson,

3. **Brand**- “a distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as a logo, trademark or
   package design) intended to identify the goods or services of either one seller or a
   group of sellers and to differentiate those goods or services from those of

4. **a) Brand equity**- “a set of assets such as name awareness, loyal customers,
   perceived quality, and associations that are linked to the brand (its name and
   symbol) and add (or subtract) value to the product or service being offered”
   (Aaker, 1991, p.4); “the additional cash flow achieved by associating a brand with
   the underlying product or service” (Aaker & Biehal, 1993, p. 69).
5. **Celebrity** - “an individual who is known to the public (actor, sports figure, entertainer, etc.) for his or her achievements in areas other than that of the product class endorsed” (Friedman & Friedman, 1979, p. 63).

6. **Compliance** - when an individual accepts influence from another person or from a group because he hopes to achieve a favorable reaction from the other, either approval or disapproval from the influencing agent (Kelman, 1961, p. 62).

7. **Expertise** - “the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions” (Erdogan, Baker & Tagg, 2001, p. 40).

8. **Fishbein Attitude theory** - “specifies the relationship between the set of salient beliefs about a concept and an overall evaluation of, or attitude toward, the concept” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 319).
   a. **Aad** - “attitude toward the ad-predisposition to responding in a favorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure situation” (Mckenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986 p. 130)
   b. **Aact** - “attitude toward the act of purchasing and using each brand” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 323).
   c. **Ao** - “the overall evaluation of, or attitude toward the concept” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 319).
   d. **Bi** - “the strength of the association between the attitude concept O and the ith salient concept” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 319).
   - **Salient Beliefs** - “are those activated from memory and “considered” by the person in a given situation” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 318).
   e. **Bl** - “behavioral intention to purchase each brand” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 323).
   - **Intention** - “type of judgment about how in the present context, a consumer will behave towards a particular brand” (Biehal et al., 1992, p. 25).
   - **Judgments** - “an explicit evaluation of each alternative typically using a continuous or multilevel scale” (Biehal et al., 1992, p. 25).
   f. **ei** - “the evaluation of the ith salient concept” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p.319).

9. **Identification** - when an individual adopts behavior derived from another person or group because this behavior is associated with satisfying self-defining relationship to this person or group (Kelman, 1961, p. 63).
10. **Internalization**- when an individual accepts influence because the induced behavior is congruent with his value system (Kelman, 1961, p. 65).

11. **Match-Up Hypothesis**- “generally suggests that the message conveyed by the image of the celebrity and the image of the product should converge in effective advertisements, implies a need for congruence between product image and celebrity image on an attractiveness basis” (Kamins, 1990, p. 5).

12. **a) Trustworthiness**- “the honesty integrity and believability of an endorser as perceived by the target audience” (Erdogan et al., 2001, p. 40); “the consumer’s confidence in the source for providing info in an objective and honest manner” (Ohanian, 1991, p. 47).
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

This review of literature will cover an overview of what consumer behavior is, the Fishbein attitude theory which will be used to examine how attitudes and purchase intentions are formed and measured in advertising and consumer behavior studies, how consumers are informed about products through advertising, how adding a celebrity to an advertisement adds equity, or “added value” to it, and how the variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency will affect consumers’ attitudes and purchase intentions. The purpose of this study was to examine how a celebrity endorsement adds equity to the product/brand being advertised. Using the independent variables of 1) physical attractiveness, 2) source credibility of the endorser and 3) celebrity/brand congruency (match-up/fit), consumers’ attitudes toward the advertisement (print) and purchase intentions of the endorsed product were measured.

Consumer Behavior

Consumer behavior can be defined as “activities people undertake when obtaining, consuming, and disposing of products and services” (Blackwell, Miniard, & Engel, 2001, p. 6). Simply stated consumer behavior is the study of “why people buy”. Studying this behavior is important because when more is known about why people shop and buy certain products, the easier it becomes to develop strategies to influence consumers to buy. More recently, researchers are expanding their scope of research from “why people buy” to “why and how people consume” (Blackwell et al., 2001). Analysis of consumption behavior represents a broader conceptual framework than buyer behavior does because it includes factors that arise after the purchase process occurs (Blackwell et al., 2001). Ultimately, consumers decide with their money which companies will be successful and which ones will fail. Consumers have the power to make or break products. Products and services are accepted or rejected on the basis of the extent to which they are perceived as relevant to needs and lifestyles (Blackwell et al., 2001). Individuals are fully
capable of ignoring everything the market has to say, they are also capable of buying everything they like.

Consumer behavior is an applied science drawing from economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, statistics, and other disciplines (Blackwell et al., 2001). To understand consumer behavior, researchers must learn what is going on in consumers’ heads. They must understand not only why consumers behave the way they do, but also apply that knowledge to product development, advertising, retailing, and other areas of marketing (Blackwell et al., 2001).

There are several ways in which researcher’s measure consumer behavior. Some conduct experiments to determine changes in buyer behavior using focus groups, conducting interviews, or administering questionnaires, others might explore store settings or people’s home to better understand how consumers use products or invent ways to solve problems (Blackwell et al., 2001). All studies have one goal in mind and that is to learn more about the consumer and how their mind works.

There are many variables that affect consumer behavior, such as age, income, gender, geography and personality. Every consumer is different and because of that, marketers and advertisers must get consumers to think about their product, so they will go out and buy it (Blackwell et al., 2001). The more comfortable a consumer feels towards the advertiser and/or the marketer, the more likely the consumer is to buy that specific product. There are also many ways to measure consumer behavior. How is this done? Measuring attitudes, purchase intentions and product beliefs are the most common. Attitude research in consumer behavior field traditionally assumed that attitudes were learned in a fixed sequence, consisting first of the formation of beliefs (cognition) regarding an attitude object, followed by some evaluation of that object (affect) and then some action (behavior) (Solomon, 2004). The consumer’s level of involvement in the object also plays a key role on how they form their attitudes. Multiattribute models are very popular among researchers to measure attitudes because they help break down the complexity of attitudes. One very commonly used multiattribute model is the Fishbein Attitude Theory.
Fishbein Attitude Theory

The Fishbein Attitude Theory presents the clearest theoretical explanation of the term “attitude”. According to Fishbein (1967), a person’s attitude is a function of his salient beliefs (beliefs that are activated from memory and “considered” by the person in a given situation) at a given point in time. Mitchell & Olson (1981), proved this concept by specifying the relationship between the set of salient beliefs of a concept and an overall evaluation of, or attitude toward, the concept. In turn, attitude, especially attitude toward the act of purchasing a brand (Aact), is presumed to have a casual influence on behavioral intentions (BI). This attitude theory has three main variables: beliefs evaluations/attitudes, and intentions. According to Mitchell & Olson (1981), the basic theoretical proposition of Fishbein’s Attitude Theory is that beliefs cause attitude. Because attitude is determined by a set of salient beliefs, changes in attitude must be mediated by changes in those beliefs; therefore to change a person’s attitude toward a concept/brand (Ao), one must modify the salient beliefs about that concept. Beliefs can be modified by changing the strength of a salient belief (b1), changing the evaluation of a belief (e1), creating a new salient belief, or making a salient belief nonsalient. Fishbein also proposed that the attitude-belief relationship holds for attitudes toward a specific behavior like buying a product (Mitchell & Olson 1981).

The Fishbein Attitude Theory is a widely used theory, because there are so many different formulas that can be formed using it. Ultimately, it is important to understand not only a consumer’s attitude toward the product, but how it is formed.

The Fishbein Attitude Theory also breaks down the word “attitude” into two separate constructs, Aad, and AB. This breakdown helps measure attitudes specifically toward the advertisement and the brand. Equally important are consumers’ intent to purchase and their beliefs toward the brand. These three concepts are beneficial to study; however, they are quite different in meaning. Before defining Aad and AB, the concept of the word “Attitude” needs to be introduced.

Attitude

The word “attitude”, like many words in the English language, has many meanings. Derived from the Latin Aptus, it has on the one hand the significance of “fitness” or “adaptedness” and like its by-form aptitude connotes a subjective or mental
state of preparation for action (Fishbein, 1967). One of the first places the concept of attitude was tested was in experimental psychology. This lead to many questions about the word attitude, mainly, where the meaningness of where attitudes are represented; in the consciousness of brain activity or in the unconscious mind (Fishbein, 1967). Many scientists argue about this topic. Studies are still ongoing and have invaded the realm of social psychology. The definition of the attitude concept has generated a multitude of definitions, but the most widely used one is by Martin Fishbein; “an attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related” (Fishbein, 1967, p. 8). Attitudes can be either positive or negative, depending on how people form them. One of the more famous and popular scales to measure attitudes is the Fishbein Attitude Model. The Fishbein Model is a multiattribute model. These models imply that a consumer’s attitude (evaluation) toward an attitude object (Ao) will depend on the beliefs he or she has about several or many attributes of the object (Solomon, 2004). The use of this model states that identifying these specific beliefs and combining them to derive a measure of the consumers’ overall attitude can predict an attitude toward a product or brand (Solomon, 2004). The Fishbein Attitude Model has been used extensively by consumer researchers since its conception nearly forty years ago (Blackwell, Miniard, & Engel, 2001).

Attitude can be defined as an individual’s internal evaluation of an object such as a branded product (Mitchell & Olson 1981). To understand the usefulness of the attitude construct, marketers must develop a clearer understanding of the determinants of attitude formation and change (Mitchell & Olson, 1981). Attitudes have been found to encompass different dimensions, namely accessibility and confidence (Berger & Mitchell, 1989). Attitude accessibility is how available the consumer is to the product they have feelings for; where attitude confidence is regarded as an individual feeling of belief or assurance toward something, such as a product (Berger & Mitchell, 1989).

Studies have shown that attitude accessibility and confidence can increase by advertising; it has also been found that if the relationship between attitude accessibility and attitude confidence are positive the accessibility and confidence will increase (Berger & Mitchell 1989). The study by Berger & Mitchell (1989) also showed that advertising
can influence more than just the evaluative dimension of the consumers’ attitude—when individuals are highly motivated to process brand information, advertising can influence the confidence and the behavior of the consumer.

The attitude concept can be categorized into attitude toward the advertisement (Aad) and attitude toward the brand choice (AB). Aad includes the entire content of the ad, not just the pictorial information, as found by Mitchell & Olson (1981).

**Attitude toward the Advertisement**

Aad is 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). According to Baker and Lutz (1988), Aad may contain both affective reactions (ad-created feelings of happiness) and evaluations (an ad’s credibility or informativeness). The advertising function for Aad is not directed at specific products’ attributes/benefits, and the objective is not to influence consumers’ beliefs toward the brand per se (Shimp, 1981). The direction is instead directed towards creating a favorable attitude toward the advertisement in order to leave consumers with a positive feeling after processing the ad (Shimp, 1981). There are two distinct dimensions of Aad, one cognitive and the other emotional (Shimp, 1981). Emotionally, consumers form attitudes toward the ads by consciously processing executional elements (components found in advertisements, such as the endorser, presentation style, color use, and title/font presentation) (Shimp, 1981). Cognitively, consumers form attitudes resulting from the conscious processing of specific executional elements in the ad, such as the endorser, the copy, the presentation style etc. (Shimp, 1981). Simply stated, Aad may result because the ad evokes an emotional response, such as a feeling of love, joy, nostalgia, or sorrow, without any conscious processing of executional elements (Shimp, 1981). These two dimensions may have different impacts on consumers’ attitudes.

Mitchell and Olson (1981) conducted an innovative study that posed the question “are product attributes the only mediator of brand attitude?” They found that brand attitudes are not solely a function of the attribute beliefs that are formed about the brand, but also may be influenced by consumers’ general liking for the ad itself or the visual stimulus presented in the advertisement.
Attitude toward the Brand

Attitude toward the brand, (AB), attempts to influence brand choice by engendering favorable consumer attitudes toward the advertised brand (Shimp, 1981). This concept is achieved by structuring ads to influence consumers’ beliefs and evaluations regarding the favorable consequences of consuming the brand (Shimp, 1981). AB includes beliefs formed from the ad brand attribute information and inferences based on ad picture content (Gardner, 1985; Mitchell & Olson 1981). AB mediates the impact of the Aad on intentions in two ways, indirectly or directly (Biehal et al. 1992). Indirectly Aad has an impact on AB, therefore, AB affects the consumers’ intentions. Thus, AB, which includes beliefs formed from a brand attribute information and inferences based on ad picture content (Mitchell & Olson, 1992), mediates the impact of Aad on intention—there is no direct Aad-intention link (Biehal et al., 1992). Directly, Aad and AB have separate influences on consumers’ intentions. Forming overall brand evaluations/intentions may be relatively more time consuming and effortful for the consumer to do than making a choice (Biehal et. al., 1992). Choices may be formed for one or for several alternatives without a decision actually being made from any of the consumers’ attitudes toward the brand (Biehal et al., 1992).

To make choices, consumers may use many types of processes to eliminate certain brands early in their processing by simply comparing the brands (Biehal et al. 1992). The consumer could choose a brand without differentiating between different brands on the basis of AB or even without ever forming an overall brand attitude (Biehal et al., 1992). This concept implies that AB formation may not necessarily be a precursor of brand choice. Direct Aad effects toward brand choice may occur in other ways. When one brand is clearly superior to the other brand based on this processing, Aad may not directly affect brand choice (Biehal et al. 1992). Any influence the brand choice has may be indirect via its impact on the acceptance of ad information and the formation of brand beliefs, which are then incorporated in AB, (MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch, 1986).

However, if two brands are perceived to be very similar overall, it may be difficult for the consumer to discriminate between them (Biehal et al. 1992). If consumers wish to choose the best brand, they may possibly consider other relevant, brand-related information, such as advertisement reactions. Thus, ad liking may have a direct effect on swaying the
consumer’s choice between two or more similar brands (Biehal et al. 1992). Very little research has been done that examines Aad and its effects either directly or indirectly on brand choice, (Biehal et al., 1992).

**Intentions**

Intentions are “type of judgments about how in the present context, a consumer will behave towards a particular brand” (Biehal et al., 1992, p. 25). Intentions may be based on processing all relevant and available brand information (Biehal et al. 1992). A close relationship between intentions and choice may not always occur; consumers may make choices without completely processing all brand information (Biehal et al. 1992). Consumers may not even form overall evaluations/intentions either, but they may form attitudes toward the brand without making choices (Biehal et al. 1992).

One can distinguish intentions and choice when considering how Aad, a predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure situation, affects brand choice. If, during the early stages, consumers use prior attitudes to eliminate brands, they may not form AB’s for those brands (Biehal et al. 1992). This implies that the mediating role of AB will not operate (Biehal et al. 1992). If a consumer uses a noncompensatory process to lead to a final choice without AB formation, Aad will not indirectly affect a consumer’s brand choice (Biehal et al. 1992). If this occurs and Aad has any effect on brand choice, it will most likely be direct and not mediated by AB (Biehal et al. 1992).

Purchase intentions, is a topic that has not been widely studied. When paired with advertising, the studies conducted are scarce. Woodside & Taylor (1978), hypothesized that the more the product is advertised the higher quality it has and the more it will be consumed. The more advertised brands are more easily recognizable leading to greater consumption. Woodside & Taylor (1978) found that consumers viewed products that are nationally advertised to be higher in quality, and therefore, its purchase intentions increase. By creating a greater confidence in the quality of a brand, advertising may be more directly related to the purchase decision (Woodside & Taylor 1978). The critical point here is that advertising, and the amount of advertising, can influence consumers’ perceptions of quality and may also affect consumer purchase behavior (Woodside &
Taylor 1978). Ohanian (1991), whose study will be discussed in more detail later on in this review, found that the expert celebrity endorser elicited higher purchase intentions.

The variables of the Fishbein Attitude Theory are all an integral part of consumer behavior. They are interwoven in meaning and formation. There is not much existing research focusing on Attitude toward the advertisement and Attitude toward brand name apparel (Biehal et al., 1992) which is why measuring consumers’ attitudes toward advertised brands will be beneficial.

Basically, consumers are finicky, and how they feel about the product or advertisement of the product, will affect if they buy the product or not. Consumers will form beliefs, either prior to learning about the brand or while it is being advertised. Those beliefs, in turn will cause the consumers to form an overall attitude. The formed attitude will lead the consumers to purchase, or have intent-to-purchase the product. The Fishbein Attitude Theory is especially effective when measuring brand names or if a specific advertisement has generated a high consumer response.

Advertising

One of the most popular forms of advertising is using celebrity endorsers. A recent estimate indicates that the use of celebrity endorsers in the United States has increased from a little over 15% to about 25% of advertisements between 1979 and 1997 (Stephens and Rice, 1998). The celebrity endorser remains a favorite among advertising agencies (Kamins, 1990).

Advertising is how consumers learn and communicate information about products. There are many underlying themes associated with advertising such as, the relationship of to the product and the ad, or the persuasion factor of the person in the ad and the consumers to buy or ignore the product. Consumers live in a media—saturated and product—cluttered environment. An adult may see up to 3,000 advertising messages in one day, with over 2 million brands vying for our attention (Hotz, 2005). Celebrities ostensibly have the ability to hold viewers’ attention and penetrate the clutter of the multitude of advertising spots that compete for audience attention (Miciak & Shanklin, 1994). So how do consumers choose? The concept of advertising must first be explained.
Advertising is the manner in which consumers become educated in a persuasive and elusive manner about the various products that corporations and other types of businesses have to offer (Harding, 1991). The main goal of advertising from a business standpoint is to generate the sale of products by having consumers relate to messages and claims being made through different advertising mediums (Harding, 1991). These mediums can be television commercials, print ads, billboards, posters, flyers and more recently, product placements on television shows. Advertising affects people in many ways. It can influence everything from large corporations to small rural churches (Qualter, 1991). Advertising that is intended to educate the consumer of the products available is done so by explaining and demonstrating the products’ attributes. While doing this, benefits are stated to show the consumer how their life would be better if they buy this product (Himmelstein, 1985). Usually the attributes, including the cost, are conveyed to the consumer in a way that persuades the consumer to buy the product (Rossiter & Percy, 1980). Advertising that can arouse feelings, create liking, stir desire, or persuade convincingly can have a greater impact on the consumer, generating sales for that product (Kim, 1992). The bulk of advertising is an attempt to build and strengthen the consumer’s conception of what the brand means to them (Kim, 1990). Ultimately, the advertisers want to make their product distinct and so valuable that the consumer will become a repeat buyer.

According to Woodside and Taylor (1978), consumers related higher quality products with more heavily advertised products. Purchase intentions were also associated with higher quality nationally, advertised products. They found that advertising may influence the perception of quality in consumers’ minds, which in turn may affect their purchase behavior (Woodside & Taylor, 1978).

Advertisers must be careful not to confuse the consumer. The greater the number of competing brands advertised in a product category, the greater the likelihood that the target brand and its advertised attributes will be either confused with other product information or simply passed over (Keller, Heckler, & Houston, 1998). When multiple brands are advertised in a specific product category, overlapping themes might become confusing to the consumer, resulting in the consumers forming weak associations with the product and the advertisement (Keller et. al., 1998). Advertisers must find a way to
make their advertisement different from the others. One way that this can be done is by using celebrities.

**Celebrities in Advertising**

A celebrity endorser is “an individual who is known to the public (actor, sports figure, entertainer, etc.) for his or her achievements in areas other than that of the product class endorsed” (Friedman & Friedman, 1979, p. 63). Reports from the annual surveys of Forbes magazine reveal that many celebrities earn much more money from their endorsement contracts than from their usual fields of practice (Lane, 1994). The widespread and persistent use of celebrities in advertising suggests that they are worth the costs associated with hiring them (Agrawal & Kamakura, 1995). Advertisers have long since used endorsements as a promotional strategy to communicate product attributes (Kamins, 1990).

Piccalo (2005) has traced the history of celebrity endorsements to the 1800’s, when Queen Victoria’s laundress was used to endorse Glenfield Patent Starch and Mark Twain’s face appeared on a bag of flour and two different kinds of cigar boxes. In the 1930’s Johnny Weissmuller appeared on the Wheaties box. In the 1940’s people took note that Ronald Reagan and Lucille Ball endorsed cigarettes (The Big New Celebrity Boom, 1978; Piccalo, 2005). The 1980’s served as the pinnacle of celebrity endorsements, including Michael Jackson’s $50-million dollar deal with Pepsi, Bill Cosby’s $1.5 million for endorsing Coca-Cola and Jell-O pudding pops, and James Garner and Mariette Hartley’s $3 million for promoting Polaroid (Piccalo, 2005; Sherman, 1985). The 1990’s saw Michael Jordan’s net worth at $10 billion for his multitude of endorsements, and Oprah Winfrey became more than just a talk show host; she was endorsing everything from books to cars on her show (Harrington, 1998; Piccalo, 2005). Within the last year T-Moble paid $20 million to Catherine Zeta-Jones, and Pepsi has paid tens of millions to land numerous stars including Beyonce, Britney Spears, Puff Daddy, Carson Daily, and Tiger Woods (Schiering, 2003).

Cooper (1984), indicates that the key to using a celebrity in an advertisement is to ensure that the celebrity is well-known enough to get attention, but also will not upstage the product; the product and not the personality has to be the star. One way in which
celebrities attract the attention of consumers is by the meanings the celebrity brings to the brand he or she is endorsing, which McCracken (1989) described as the Transfer Meaning Model. According to the model, celebrities’ effectiveness as endorsers stem from the cultural meanings in which they are endorsed. It is a three stage model that states the transfer starts at the formation of celebrity image which is then transferred from the celebrity to the product, and finally from the product to the consumer. Distinctions of status, class, gender, age, lifestyle types, and personality types are examples of meanings represented by the vast pool celebrities advertisers have at their disposal (McCracken, 1989). Consumers can perceive these meanings in different ways. Three documented ways that consumers relate to the meanings that the celebrities can occupy are compliance, identification, and internalization (Kelman, 1956).

Compliance can occur when an individual accepts influence from another person or from a group because he hopes to achieve a favorable reaction from them (Kelman, 1956). The individual may be interested in attaining certain specific rewards or avoiding certain specific punishments that the influencing agent controls (Kelman, 1956). The influencing agent can be the celebrity, and the consumer may be complying with them so he can feel that he has approval of his purchase. When the individual complies, he does what the controlling agent wants him to do—or what he thinks the controlling agent wants him to do—because he sees this as a way of achieving a desired response from the controlling agent (Kelman, 1956).

Identification can occur when an individual adopts behavior derived from another person or group because this behavior is associated with a satisfying self-defining relationship to this person or group (Kelman, 1956; Cohen & Golden, 1972). The individual actually attempts to be like the other person; by saying what the other says, doing what the other does, wearing what the other person wears, the individual maintains a relationship that is self-satisfying (Kelman, 1956). In this case the person is buying something because he sees the celebrity wearing or promoting it and wants to be just like that celebrity. The consumer thinks that if he/she buys that specific product he/she will either look like or become like the celebrity. Physical attractiveness is one of the main elements found in this process. The individual is not primarily concerned with pleasing others, as in compliance, but is concerned with meeting the controlling agent’s
expectations for his own role performance (Kelman, 1956). Individuals accept influence from an attractive/likeable endorser because of a desire to identify with that person (Kamins & Gupta, 1994). The physical attractiveness factor is one element this study will examine and will be thoroughly explained later in the review.

Internalization can occur when an individual accepts influence because the induced behavior is congruent with his value system (Kelman, 1956). It is the content of the induced behavior that is intrinsically rewarding (Maddox & Rogers, 1980); the individual adopts it because he finds it useful for the solution of a problem, or because he perceives it as inherently conducive to the maximization of his values (Kelman, 1956). Credibility is a major factor here. Typically, when this process occurs the individual will not totally accept the recommendations, but will modify them to fit his own situation (Kelman, 1956). The consumer here will look to the celebrity for expertise, and if he feels that the celebrity is knowledgeable enough he will buy the endorsed product. Advertising using celebrity endorsers must match-up the celebrity’s image with the image of the product advertised because that makes the message easier for the consumer’s to internalize (Kamins & Gupta, 1994). Various types of endorsements by spokespersons attempt to project a credible image to influence consumers favorably toward the product being advertised; those perceived as a credible source have such intrinsic attributes as trustworthiness, expertise, and attractiveness (Dholakia & Sternthal, 1977). It is this process where McCrackens’ Meaning Transfer Model is best formed because information from the spokesperson is internalized with the individual’s own attitudes and values (Kamins & Gupta, 1994). The source credibility factor is another element that this study will examine and will be thoroughly explained later in the review.

A study conducted by Romer (1978) demonstrated that identification and internalization are independent processes with separate determinants and separate consequences and that attraction toward like things is a function of both identification and internalization. He found that respondents that had positive attitudes also thought the communicator was trustworthy and were attracted toward others who agreed with their position; the more the respondents agreed with the position, the more trusted the communicator and the more attracted they were to others who agreed with them, thus proving that identification and internalization are independent processes. It also proves
that attraction of like things is affected by both identification and internalization. These two processes independently mediated attitude change.

All three processes are relevant to the way consumers buy products. How the consumer relates to the celebrity, to the ad, and to the product itself will determine which product they purchase. The celebrity has many roles when endorsing a product; he/she can act as an expert, a spokesperson, a promoter, or “just be a pretty face” (Erogan et. al., 2001), adding equity (value) to the brand and enhancing the brand’s competitive position (Till, 1998). Thus, celebrity’s stamp of approval can bring added value to a brand’s equity and can create an emotional bond, if the fit is right (Bradley, 1996).

Brand Equity

Aaker (1991) defines a brand as “a distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as a logo, trademark or package design) intended to identify the goods or services of either one seller or a group of sellers and to differentiate those goods or services from those of competitors”. Brands are ubiquitous in products ranging from household cleaners to ready-to-wear clothing. A brand signals to consumers a specific image and provides qualities that its competitors do not have (Aaker, 1991). “Brands (and their associated images) let consumers express who they are, what they are, where they are, and how they want to be viewed by other people” (Graeff, 1996). Levy (1959) suggests that the things people buy have personal and social meanings in addition to what their function is; “People buy things not only for what they can do, but also for what they mean”. The feelings and attitudes people have toward brands are crucial to them when deciding which brand will be selected and earn loyalty (Gardner & Levy, 1955).

Consumers like brands because they package meaning; they form a shortcut in the minds of consumers when it comes time to make a decision (Aaker & Biel, 1993). Brands let consumers escape from a feature-by-feature analysis of category alternatives, and in a timed-frenzied world, they make it easier for consumers to find what they like and become loyal customers (Aaker & Biel, 1993). Brands have attributes and associations with which consumers can find a connection; they can evoke feelings, relate
functions, and provide comfort (Aaker & Biel, 1993). Brands are not only bought for “who they are” but for “what they are” (Aaker & Biel, 1993).

The first brands were developed by industrial concerns over 100 years ago to wrest the control of sales of products from retailers (Aaker & Biel, 1993, p. 69). Brands began in the field of consumer goods, but now stretch across a wide range of “purchasables” (Aaker & Biel, 1993). The equity of a brand is the sum total of the what and the who (Aaker & Biel, 1993).

“Brand equity is a set of assets such as name awareness, loyal customers, perceived quality, and associations that are linked to the brand (its name and symbol) and add (or subtract) value to the product or service being offered” (Aaker, 1991, p.4); a “premium a consumer would pay for a branded product or service compared to an identical unbranded version of the same product/service” (Aaker & Biehal, 1993, p. 69). Brand equity assets (the added value, such as a celebrity endorser) can help interpret, process, and store huge quantities of information about the brand, which can ultimately affect a consumer’s confidence in a purchase decision (Aaker, 1991). It also can generate additional cash flow by providing a competitive advantage that presents a barrier to competitors (Keller, 1991).

Operationalizations of brand equity usually fall into two groups: those involving consumer perceptions (awareness, brand associations, perceived quality) and those involving consumer behavior (brand loyalty, willingness to pay a high price) (Cobb-Walgren, Ruble, & Donthu, 1995). Businesses need to know the boundaries of a brand’s equity because exploiting a brand can actually do more harm than good for the product and company (Yovovich, 1988). When the added value becomes too removed from the product, the consumers will doubt the expertise of the company (Yovovich, 1988). The best combination of brand equity is customer loyalty, product positioning, and brand image (Yovovich, 1988). Managers want to create positive brand equity by influencing consumer perceptions of a product in a unique and positive way (Aaker & Biel, 1993).

An area of increasing importance is that of linking a product to another person, place or thing; this is one way marketers can increase their brands’ equity (Keller, 2003). This also increases consumers’ knowledge of brands, and gives consumers something physical with which to relate. To study this growing trend, one should first understand
what consumers already know about that certain brand and how this knowledge might be affected by linking the brand to other entities (Keller, 2003). Knowledge of the entity, meaningfulness of the knowledge of the entity, and the transferability of the knowledge of the entity are all key elements when studying brand equity (Keller, 2003). One of the major contributors of brand equity is advertising (Aaker & Biel, 1993).

Brand Equity in Advertising

Advertising can influence brand equity in numerous ways: it can create awareness of the product, and the endorser, can influence preferences and purchase intentions, and can ultimately affect brand choice (Cobb-Walgren et. al., 1995). A study done by Cobb-Walgren et. al. (1995) found that the brand with the greater advertising budget yielded much higher levels of brand equity, which generated higher preference and purchase intentions. It also showed that the nature and quality of advertising content play important roles in forming brand equity (Cobb-Walgren et. al., 1995). Advertising lets people at all social levels become aware of and find a need to purchase products in a plethora of categories. Three main components that were found for this study when researching the literature on celebrity endorsements were: physical attractiveness, source credibility and product/endorser congruency. These variables have been studied at length, but they have never been studied all together in relation to brand name apparel.

Physical Attractiveness

Most television and print ads use physically attractive people because many studies have shown that consumers tend to form positive stereotypes about such people (Ohanian, 1991). Studies have shown that attractive people are more successful in changing beliefs than their unattractive counterparts (Kamins, 1990; Till & Busler, 1998; Kahle & Homer, 1985; Ohanian, 1991; Chaiken, 1979; Baker & Churchill, 1977; Petroshius & Crocker, 1989; Horai, Naccari, & Fatoullah, 1974). In an exhaustive review by Joseph (1982), he summarized the experimental evidence in advertising and related disciplines regarding physically attractive communicators’ impact on opinion change, product evaluations, and other dependent measures. He concluded that attractive versus
unattractive communicators are consistently liked more and have a positive impact on products with which they are associated.

Non-Celebrity Studies

Baker and Churchill (1977) conducted a study that measured the physical attractiveness of both male and female models in print advertisements of perfume/cologne/aftershave and found that the more attractive the model, the higher the rating of the advertisement. This finding suggests that people look at the physical qualities of the advertiser to determine whether they like the ad or not. Chaiken (1979) conducted a field study that employed both attractive and unattractive communicators to persuade people to take an opinion survey and found that the attractive communicators elicited greater agreement from respondents than their unattractive counterparts. This study also showed that people thought the attractive communicators were more friendly, better speakers and smarter than their unattractive counterparts (Chaiken, 1979). Petroshius and Crocker (1989) conducted a more in-depth study that focused on the physical attractiveness, race, and sex of the spokesperson and how those elements impacted the respondents’ perceptions of the ad and the product (soap and pens) being advertised. They found that physical attractiveness influenced the respondent’s overall liking of the ad and affected their willingness to purchase the product. More specifically, the ad (print) with the more physically attractive spokesperson resulted in a more positive attitude toward the ad and a greater willingness to purchase that product. Horai et al. (1974), manipulated expertise and physical attractiveness orthogonally and found that the two manipulations contributed independently to producing agreement with the communicator’s position.

Celebrity Studies

Kahle & Homer (1985) conducted a study using celebrities that measured their physical attractiveness, their likeability, and their involvement in the products (Edge razors) they were endorsing, and then measured attitude and purchase intentions. Print advertisements were used, eleven real and one fictitious. Their results correspond with the previous studies showing that the more likeable and attractive the celebrity the more
favorable attitudes consumers had toward the ad and the product; it also showed consumers’ had greater purchase intentions for that product (Kahle & Homer, 1985).

Ohanian (1991) performed a study that calculated the physical attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness of a celebrity on a respondent’s intent to purchase. The celebrity/products used for this study were: Linda Evans promoting new perfume, Madonna promoting a new line of designer jeans, John McEnroe promoting a new line of tennis rackets, and Tom Selleck promoting a new brand of cologne. Ohanian found that the type of celebrity used can affect consumers’ attitudes toward the ad and toward the product, as well as consumers’ purchase intentions for the endorsed product. Different celebrities elicit different meanings to different people. Physical attractiveness and trustworthiness of a celebrity were not significantly related to intent to purchase, but expertise was; gender and age of respondents had no significant effect on their intent to purchase (Ohanian, 1991). This finding suggests that most advertisements use physically attractive celebrities; consumers have become accustomed to seeing “pretty” people in advertisements. Since expertise was the most significant factor in this study, findings indicated that people related to “expert” celebrity endorsers more than physically attractive ones. Ohanian (1991) suggests that for celebrity spokespersons to be truly effective, they should be knowledgeable, experienced, and qualified to endorse a product.

Till and Busler (1998) conducted a study that focused on celebrity physical attractiveness and how that affects the respondents attitude toward the endorsed brand. They used a pen and mens’ cologne as the products, with a fictitious name and endorser. They showed respondents either attractive pictures of the made up celebrity or unattractive pictures. They found that when the attractive pictures were shown, the brand attitude and purchase intention were significantly higher, irrespective of the product type (Till & Busler, 1998).

Source Credibility/Expertise

This variable has two sides: trustworthiness and expertise. The source credibility variable model contends that the effectiveness of a message depends on the perceived level of expertise and trustworthiness of an endorser (Hovland & Weiss, 1951). “Trustworthiness refers to the honesty, integrity, and believability of an endorser as perceived by the consumer” (Erdogan, Baker, & Tagg, 2001, p.40). “Expertise is referred
to as the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be the source of valid assertions” (Erdogan et. al., 2001, p.40). Expertise is the level of knowledge, experience or skills the endorser possesses (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953).

Non Celebrity Studies

Dholakia & Sternthal, (1977) hypothesized that the higher the source’s credibility, the more persuasive they are. They used a bill that was pending in the U. S. Senate at the time of this study, and employed a lawyer and a layman person with an interest in being a lobbyist to be the spokesperson for the study. They found that the lawyer was perceived as the more credible source, thus being perceived to be more trustworthy (Dholakia & Sternthal, 1977). McGinnies & Ward (1980) manipulated a source’s expertise and trustworthiness to assess the impact of each of these components on the communicator’s persuasiveness. Their findings indicated that a source that was perceived to be both an expert and trustworthy generated the most opinion change. Research investigating source expertise in persuasive communication generally has indicated that a source’s perceived expertise has a positive impact on attitude change (Horai et al., 1974; Maddux & Rogers, 1980; Mills & Harvey, 1972).

Celebrity Studies

Most of the studies done on this variable have included a combination of non-celebrities and celebrity endorsers. Friedman, Termini and Washington (1976) studied four types of endorsers: the celebrity, the typical consumer, the professional expert, and the company president. The study compared ads with endorsers to an ad with no endorser to see which was more effective in an advertisement. The product they used was a fictitious type of wine. They found that any endorser, no matter what type, brought higher taste expectations, intent-to-purchase and believability than the ad with no endorser (Friedman et. al., 1976).

Another study that focused solely on the trust factor was done by Friedman, Santeramo, and Traina (1978). They sampled two populations and two types of celebrities (a celebrity who has done endorsements, and a celebrity that has not). Study one used undergraduate students, whereas study two used members of a civic group with an average age of 45. Both studies showed that awareness correlated with trust; celebrities that were perceived as having constant media coverage, were trusted more
than celebrities not in the constant spotlight (Friedman et. al., 1978). This finding suggests that consumers who constantly see a celebrity in the media feel a greater connection with them than a celebrity that is not. Friedman and Friedman (1979) designed another study that attempted to determine whether or not the effectiveness of the endorser type is dependent upon the type of product being endorsed. Twelve print ads using the four types of endorsers mentioned above, promoted a fictitious brand name for costume jewelry, a vacuum cleaner, and a box of chocolates (Friedman & Friedman, 1979). They found that a endorser/product interaction occurred. The celebrity endorser was given the highest rating for the costume jewelry. Also, consumers’ evaluations of the ads’ believability varied according to the product/endorser combinations (Friedman & Friedman, 1979).

Atkin and Block (1983) proposed that a celebrity endorser will have a greater impact on responses, be more credible, and create more favorable attitudes toward the product than a non-celebrity. A whisky magazine ad featuring Telly Savalas, a newspaper beer ad featuring Happy Hairston and another whisky magazine ad featuring Cheryl Tiegs, were all compared to non-celebrity versions of the same ads (Atkin & Block, 1983). For all age groups the celebrity figure was perceived as more competent, trustworthy, and rated more positively than the noncelebrity versions (Atkin & Block, 1983).

Freiden (1984) developed a study that measured whether or not consumer attitudes generated by advertising would differ depending on the type of spokesperson, the gender of the spokesperson, and the age of the respondents. Four types of endorsers were used: a celebrity, a CEO, a typical consumer and an expert; two different age groups were measured: an adult sample and a college age sample, and the product used was a color television set (Freiden, 1984). The results showed that the type of consumer used in advertising can affect consumer response: the celebrity generated the best results in the category likeability, but not in the categories of product quality, ad trustworthiness, and spokesperson knowledgeably (Freiden, 1984). Gender did not significantly affect consumer attitudes, but age did affect attitude (Freiden, 1984).

For this study, since celebrities can be perceived to be an expert of clothing, their expertise of the brand they are endorsing will be measured. Since everyone wear clothes,
it would be hard to test that factor. Past studies that have been discussed earlier used products that made it easier to measure expertise. Clothing is objective, so the brand of clothing will be measured instead.

Celebrity/Brand Congruency

The “Match-Up” hypothesis “generally suggests that the message conveyed by the image of the celebrity and the image of the product should converge in effective advertisements and implies a need for congruency between product image and celebrity image on an attractiveness basis” (Kamins, 1990, p. 5). It suggests that the visual imagery contained in the advertisement conveys information over and above the information contained in explicit verbal arguments (Rossiter & Percy, 1980). According to Kahle and Homer (1985), when a celebrity’s physical attractiveness is congruent with the product they are endorsing, the “match-up” hypothesis would predict a positive impact on the product and the advertisement evaluations; if there is incongruence, those evaluations would decline. This finding may be particularly true for products that enhance beauty which are endorsed by celebrities. Consumers may believe that the product plays a role in their own attractiveness (Kamins, 1990).

Kamins (1990) decided to test this hypothesis using a celebrity endorser. He used the celebrities Tom Selleck and Telly Savalas, and a car and a computer for products, in a print ad (Kamins, 1990). Results showed that the celebrity had higher credibility with consumers, and a more positive attitude toward the ad was formed by consumers, which is consistent with other studies (Kamins, 1990). Kamins extended his findings in another study. Kamins and Gupta (1994) found that the higher the degree of congruency between the types of endorsers and the product advertised, the greater the believability of the endorser. The linkage between congruence and endorser/advertiser believability was only present for the celebrity endorser (Kamins & Gupta, 1994). Overall, the study implied that congruence between product and celebrity endorser has the potential to be an important factor in advertising. A higher degree of congruency between product and celebrity image resulted in enhanced endorser believability and attractiveness as well as significantly more favorable attitudes and purchase intentions toward the product.
Till & Busler (1998) measured candy bars and energy bars with an actor and an athlete, to determine which combination had the best fit. The actor/candy bar and the athlete/energy bar was suggested as the best fit, and they proposed that the expertise dimension may be more useful than attractiveness when matching endorsers with brands.

According to Walker et. al., (1992), when selecting a celebrity endorser, advertisers should consider not only the product attributes that are to be established, but also the broader meanings associated with the endorser. Although the endorser may have certain attributes that are desirable for endorsing the product, they may also have associated attributes that are inappropriate for the product as well. The main point in using a celebrity endorser is to get the consumer to purchase the product. It is important to know what role the celebrity’s attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertise have on consumers’ attitudes and purchase intentions.

Summary

There are myriad ways to measure consumer behavior; there are countless influences that affect brand consumption, but one of the most intriguing is through the celebrity endorsement process. This relatively new phenomena is a rapidly growing business, that spills into every avenue of the market. For this reason, celebrity endorsements of brand name apparel should be studied more closely. As consumers are inundated with celebrity advertisements in every day life, it would be beneficial to know how they think, feel, and react to this very fashionable trend. So the purpose of this study was to examine how a celebrity adds equity to the product/brand being endorsed, will it help researchers learn how consumers really feel about celebrities in advertising and how that is related to their attitudes toward the advertised product and their intent to purchase the advertised product. Using the variables of 1) physical attractiveness, 2) source credibility (of the endorser), and 3) celebrity/brand congruency (match-up/fit), will help researchers understand what factors consumers look for when forming attitudes towards celebrities.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Purpose

Purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of physical attractiveness, source credibility of the endorser, and celebrity/brand congruency on consumers’ attitudes toward the printed advertisement and brand, and purchase intentions of the endorsed product.

Design

This research was conducted using a questionnaire designed to understand consumer’s views on celebrity endorsements, measuring their attractiveness, expertise and trustworthiness. In addition, a separate questionnaire was used to examine consumers’ attitudes toward this form of advertising, their attitude toward the advertised brand and their purchase intentions.

The three advertisements were chosen based on the price of the brands being endorsed. Three different price points were chosen, designer, better and moderate. Versace was chosen as the designer, Guess was chosen as the better and the Gap was chosen as the moderate. The celebrity’s age was also taken into consideration. Each celebrity used was of a different age, and appealed to different age groups.

Variables

The independent variables in this study are the physical attractiveness of the celebrity, the source credibility of the celebrity and the celebrity/brand congruency of the product. The dependent variables of this study are the attitudes toward the advertisement and the product and the consumers’ intent to purchase the product.
Description of the Instrument

The instrument that was used for this survey was a valid and reliable scale developed specifically for research on celebrity endorsements by Ohanian (1990). It has a reliability of .904 and .903 for attractiveness, .895 and .896 for trustworthiness, and .885 and .892 for expertise. It measures credibility of the celebrity (including trustworthiness, expertise, and physical attractiveness). The celebrity/brand congruency will be measured by asking how congruent (how well they fit together) is the image of the celebrity with that of the brand advertised, along with questions that ask how believable that celebrity is. This question has been asked in past research (Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Kamins, 1990; Till & Busler, 1992).

To measure the belief attributes toward the advertisement a modified scale was taken from Pollay and Mittal (1993). It has a reliability of .47 to .78. To measure attitude toward the ad, scales were taken from Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, (1957), which include both affective and evaluative content, and were selected based on a review of existing research (Gardner, 1985; Mackenzie, Lutz, & Belch, 1986; Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Kamins, 1990; Kahle & Homer, 1985; Baker & Churchill, 1977; Petroshius & Crocker, 1989; Biehal, Stephens, Curlo, 1992). To measure attitude toward the brand, scales from Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum’s (1957) were constructed and were selected based on existing research (Gardner, 1985; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Till & Busler, 1998; Kahle & Homer, 1985; Petroshius & Crocker, 1989; Biehal, Stephens, Curlo, 1992). To measure purchase intentions, three questions using five-point scales assessing the likelihood that the respondent would purchase the product, the likelihood that the respondent would try the product on if seen in a store, and the likelihood the respondent would actively seek out the product in a store will be used. These questions have been used throughout past research (Petroshius & Crocker, 1989; Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Ohanian, 1991; Kamins, 1990; Till & Busler, 1992; Kahle & Homer, 1985).
Sample

The sample that was used for this research was undergraduate and graduate students currently taking classes in the college of human sciences at a prominent Southeastern university. Surveys were administered during the various classes. The sample consisted of 300 participants, which is consistent with past studies. Using students, otherwise known as “Generation Y” is important because they have the most spending power, and spend an estimated $153 billion a year on everything from computers to apparel (Brand, 2000). “Generation Y” is defined as those individuals that were born between 1977 and 1994 (Bush, Martin, & Bush, 2004). This generation is very trend conscious, knowledgeable in accessing the media, as well as advertising and they have grown up in a consumer orientated society (Brand, 2000). These individuals are big spenders, trendsetters, receptive to new products and have tremendous potential for being lifelong customers (Wolburg & Pokrywcynski, 2001). “Generation Y” also are constantly searching for their independence, so influences form the media, such as, celebrities, become very important to them (Bush et. al., 2004). This generation does not respond well to lectures from parents, instead they turn to their peers for advice and opinions, when forming their brand preferences (Keillor, Parker, & Schaeffer, 1996). A variety of ethnic backgrounds and income levels were also used.

Data Collection/Procedure

First a questionnaire was passed out containing questions that the respondents answered using a likert scale. Then three different advertisements showing three different celebrity’s endorsements were shown. The first advertisement shown was Demi Moore endorsing Versace; next Paris Hilton endorsing Guess; and finally Sarah Jessica Parker endorsing the GAP. All three advertisements were shown in that order to undergraduate and graduate students taking various classes at a large southeastern university. The students were then asked to answer the corresponding questions for each advertisement. Celebrity endorsements, the advertisement, the consumer’s attitude toward the ad and brand, and the consumer’s intent to purchase the product will all be measured. After all three advertisements were shown the students answered some demographic questions.
Data Analysis

Data was analyzed by SPSS. Factor Analysis was used to get an idea of how the students scored each advertisement and used to measure the demographic questions. After looking at the Factor Analysis, it was concluded that the congruency questions needed be separated into two groups. Question #1, was separated from questions 2-5. Then Factor Analysis was run again for congruency question #1 and congruency #2-5. The next test that was run was Cronbach’s Alpha. ANOVA was run next to measure the significance of my variables. Linear Regression was run to see where the significance lies. The purchase intentions, attitude toward the advertisement and the brand were measured against the dependent variables. A more specific regression was required, so a Backward Linear Regression was run.
CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of physical attractiveness, source credibility of the endorser, and celebrity/brand congruency on consumers’ attitudes toward the printed advertisement and brand, and purchase intentions of the endorsed product.

Sample Size and Description

The sample that was used for this research was 300 male and female undergraduate and graduate students currently taking classes in a college of human sciences at a prominent southeastern university. Four classes were randomly picked to survey. The data collection instrument was administered on February 20, 2006 to an advanced merchandising class. Eighty booklets were passed out and turned in. The next data collection took place on February 22, 2006 to a visual merchandising class; 100 booklets were collected. The third data collection occurred on March 14, 2006 to a core merchandising class, required by all majors; sixty-five booklets were completed. The last data collection date was conducted on April 5, 2006 to a general home economics core class, also required by all majors in the college. Fifty-five booklets were completed and returned.

Almost all of the respondents (94%) surveyed were female and 6% were male. Three-fourths (75%) of students surveyed were White, 11.3% were African-American, 9.3% were Hispanic, 3% were Asian, and 1.3% checked the “other” category. An overwhelming majority (98.3%) of the students were single, while 1.3% were married and 0.3% were divorced. Over half (59.3%) of the students surveyed had an income of $25,000 or below; 6% had an income of $26,000-$50,000; 5.7% had an income of $51,000-$75,000; 6.3% had an income of $76,000-$100,000; 5.7% had an income of $101,000-$125,000, and 17% had an income of over $125,000. All (100%) of the students surveyed were between the ages of 18-29. Forty-one percent of the students had a bachelor’s degree, 17% of the students had a high school diploma, 37.7% had an associate’s degree, and 4.3% of the students had a graduate degree. See Table 1.
Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purchase Intentions

Research Question One:

Will the physical attractiveness of the celebrity endorser, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency generate higher intent to purchase the advertised product?

Factor analysis was first run to determine the relationship between the physical attractiveness of the celebrity and its influence on the consumer’s intent to purchase the advertised product, their attitude toward the advertisement, and their attitude toward the
brand. This was done to show if the ideas, (unattractive/attractive, not classy/classy, ugly/beautiful, plain/elegant, not sexy/ sexy,) were congruent with each other and how well they matched up together. Factor analysis showed that each idea was congruent with the others, so the significance of the ideas were measured next. Second, Cronbach’s Alpha was run for each ad’s set of physical attractiveness questions for a measure of internal consistency. The reliability coefficient for the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement was 0.877; 0.880 for the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement, and 0.913 for the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement. All of these were very good reliability coefficients that represent good internal consistency.

One-way ANOVA (Table 1) was run to next to see if significant differences between the means of the physical attractiveness questions existed between the three advertisements. Results revealed that scores of the physical attractiveness questions for each advertisement were statistically significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05; Table 2).

### Table 2. Physical Attractiveness of the Printed Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>30184.816</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15092.408</td>
<td>427.796</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61830.466</td>
<td>899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linear regression was run next to determine the difference in significance levels. Linear regression showed that there were many significant factors; so another post hoc test was run. Backward linear regression was run to determine where the source of the significance lies. Specifically, purchase intentions, attitude toward the advertisement, and attitude toward the brand were measured separately against the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, their credibility, and their congruency with the brand. This was done for each of the advertisements.

Factor analysis was run next to determine the relationship between the credibility of the celebrity and its influence on the consumer’s intent to purchase the advertised product, their attitude toward the advertisement and their attitude toward the brand. This was done to show how if ideas, (undependable/dependable, dishonest/honest, unreliable/reliable, insincere/sincere, untrustworthy/trustworthy, not an expert/an expert, inexperienced/experienced, unknowledgeable/knowledgeable, unqualified/qualified,
unskilled/skilled) were congruent with each other together and how well they matched up together. Factor analysis showed that each idea was congruent. Second, Cronbach’s Alpha was run for each ad’s set of source credibility questions for a measure of internal consistency. The reliability coefficient for the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement was 0.933; 0.934 Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement; and 0.950 for the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement.

One-way ANOVA was run to next to see if significant differences between the means of the source credibility questions existed. Results revealed that score of the physical attractiveness questions were statistically significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05). See Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Source Credibility of the Printed Advertisement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>21286.722</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10643.361</td>
<td>90.299</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127013.9</td>
<td>899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linear regression was run to determine the difference in significance levels. Linear regression showed that there were many significant factors; so another post hoc test was run. Backward linear regression was run to determine where the source of the significance lies. Specifically, purchase intentions, attitude toward the advertisement, and attitude toward the brand were measured separately against the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, their credibility, and their congruency with the brand. This was done for each of the advertisements.

Finally the third independent variable was tested. Factor analysis was run to determine the relationship between the celebrity/brand congruency and the influence on the consumer’s intent to purchase the advertised product, their attitude towards the advertisement and their attitude towards the brand. This was done to show how if the ideas were congruent and how well the ideas matched up together. Specifically, “how familiar are you with the celebrity who appeared in the ad”, “how congruent is the celebrity with the brand they are endorsing”, “do you think this brand is a good fit for this celebrity to endorse”, “how believable is this celebrity endorsing this brand” and “do you
believe this celebrity would wear this product”. Factor analysis showed that each idea was not congruent. Questions #1, “How familiar are you with the celebrity who appeared in the ad” needed to be separated from the other four congruency questions. A second Factor analysis was run for question #1, and for questions #2-5. Cronbach’s Alpha was run next for each ad’s set of celebrity/brand congruency questions and was 0.852 for the Demi Moore/ Versace advertisement; 0.815 for the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement, and 0.868 for the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement.

One-way ANOVA was run to next to see if significant differences between the means of the celebrity/brand congruency questions existed. One-way ANOVA’s were run on celebrity/brand congruency question #1 (congr #1) separate from questions #2-5 (congr #2). Results revealed that score of the physical attractiveness questions were statistically significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05). Refer to Tables 4 and 5.

**Table 4. The Familiarity of the Celebrity in the Advertisements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>70.782</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.391</td>
<td>16.145</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2037.116</td>
<td>899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Celebrity/Brand Congruency of the Printed Advertisements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>7608.629</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3804.314</td>
<td>104.404</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40293.932</td>
<td>899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linear regression was run to determine the difference in significance levels. Linear regression showed that there were many significant factors; so another post hoc test was run. Backward linear regression was run to determine where the source of the significance lies. Specifically, purchase intentions, attitude toward the advertisement, and attitude toward the brand were measured separately against the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, their credibility, and their congruency with the brand. This was done for each of the advertisements.
For the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement, purchase intentions were measured first against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and the congruency between the celebrity and the brand (congr#1 & congr#2). Physical attractiveness (0.488), celebrity/brand congruency (congr#2), (0.121), and how familiar the student was with the celebrity (congr#1), (0.424) did not have a significant affect on purchase intentions. Source credibility (0.000) was the only independent variable that had a significant effect on purchase intentions. See Table 6.

Table 6. Purchase Intentions toward the Demi Moore Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>-0.694</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>4.589</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity</td>
<td>-0.801</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second advertisement, Paris Hilton/Guess, Backward Linear Regression illustrated that the independent variables of physical attractiveness (0.000) and celebrity/brand congruency #1 (0.005) (how familiar the celebrity is) were significant. Purchase intentions did not have a significant effect on source credibility, (0.153) and the celebrity/brand congruency #2, (0.93). See Table 7.

Table 7. Purchase Intentions toward the Paris Hilton Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>5.506</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity</td>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third advertisement that was measured was Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP. Purchase intentions were measured against all the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency. Backward Linear Regression illustrated that the independent variables of physical attractiveness and celebrity/brand congruency #2 were significant. Purchase intentions did not have a significant effect on how familiar the student was with the celebrity, (congr#1) (0.155) and the credibility of the celebrity, (0.618). Refer to Table 8.

Table 8. Purchase Intentions toward the Sarah Jessica Parker Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency (congr#2)</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical attractiveness generated higher purchase intentions for the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, but did not for the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement. Source credibility generated higher purchase intentions only for the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement. Celebrity/brand congruency had to be split into two categories, congr#1 and congr#2, which was explained earlier. Congr#1 generated higher purchase intentions in only the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement. Congr#2 generated higher purchase intentions in only the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement.

Overall, all the independent variables generated higher purchase intentions in all three advertisements. However, which independent variable that generated higher purchase intentions depended on the celebrity in the advertisement.
**Attitudes toward the Advertisement**

**Research Question Two:**

Will the physical attractiveness of the endorser, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency positively influence attitudes toward the advertisement?

This research question was tested the same way as research question one. Factor Analysis, One-Way ANOVA and Backward Linear Regression were all run. The independent variables were measured against the second dependent variable attitude toward the advertisement for research question two.

For the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, attitude toward the advertisement was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and the congruency between the celebrity and the brand. Backward linear regression illustrated that all the independent variables except physical attractiveness (0.172) had a significant effect on consumer’s attitude toward the advertisement. See table 9.

**Table 9. Consumer’s Attitude toward the Demi Moore Advertisement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>6.110</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>5.339</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity (congr#1)</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency (congr#2)</td>
<td>4.091</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second advertisement, Paris Hilton/Guess, Backward linear regression illustrated that physical attractiveness (0.00) did have a significant effect on the attitude toward the ad, along with source credibility (0.020) and celebrity/brand congruency (0.000) (congr#2). Attitude toward the ad did not have a significant effect on how familiar the student was with the celebrity, (0.382) as displayed in table 10.
Table 10. Consumer’s Attitude toward the Paris Hilton Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>17.745</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity (congr#1)</td>
<td>6.064</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency (congr#2)</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirdly, the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement was measured. Attitude toward the ad was measured against the independent variables. Physical attractiveness (0.000) did have a significant effect on the attitude toward the advertisement, along with celebrity/brand congruency (0.000) (congr#2). Attitude toward the advertisement did not have a significant effect on how familiar the student was with the celebrity (congr#1) (0.155) or source credibility (0.618). Refer to table 11.

Table 11. Consumer’s Attitude toward the Sarah Jessica Parker Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity (congr#1)</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency (congr#2)</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Attractiveness influenced positive attitudes toward the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisements, but not toward the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement. Source credibility influenced positive attitudes toward the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement and the Paris Hilton/Guess but not for the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement. How familiar the consumer was
with the celebrity only influenced positive attitudes toward the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement. The Paris Hilton/Guess and Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisements did not influence positive attitudes towards the respective advertisements. Celebrity/brand congruency influenced positive attitudes towards the Demi Moore/Versace and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisements, but not toward the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement.

Overall, all the independent variables influenced positive attitudes toward the three advertisements. However, which independent variable that positively influenced consumer’s attitudes toward the advertisements depended on the celebrity in the advertisement.

**Attitudes toward the Brand**

**Research Question Three:**

Will the physical attractiveness of the endorser, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency positively influence attitudes toward the brand?

This research questions was tested the same way as research question one. Factor Analysis, One-Way ANOVA and Backward Linear Regression were all run. The independent variables were measured against the third dependent variable attitude toward the brand for research question three.

For the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, the attitude toward the brand was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and both parts celebrity/brand congruency. Backward linear regression illustrates that the celebrity/brand congruency #2, (0.000) did have a significant effect on the attitude toward the brand, while congr#1, (0.250) did not. Physical attractiveness, (0.062) and source credibility, (0.000) also had a significant effect on the attitude toward the brand. Refer to table 12.
Table 12. Consumer’s Attitude toward Brand in the Demi Moore Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>1.876</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>4.313</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity (congr#1)</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency (congr#2)</td>
<td>3.552</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement was measured next. Attitude toward the brand was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and both parts celebrity/brand congruency. Backward linear regression illustrates that the celebrity/brand congruency #1, (0.036), along with physical attractiveness, (0.022) and source credibility, (0.022) all had a significant effects on the attitude toward the brand. Celebrity/brand congruency #2, (0.951) was the only independent variable that did not have a significant effect on the attitude toward the brand. See Table 13.

Table 13. Consumer’s Attitude toward the Brand in the Paris Hilton Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>5.064</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity (congr#1)</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency (congr#2)</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, attitude toward the brand was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source...
credibility and both parts of celebrity/brand congruency. Celebrity/brand congruency #2, (0.000), physical attractiveness, (0.016), and source credibility, (0.005) did have a significant effect on the attitude toward the brand. Celebrity/brand congruency #1, (0.967) was the only independent variable that did not have a significant effect on the attitude toward the brand. Refer below to Table 14.

Table 14. Consumer’s Attitude toward the Brand in the Sarah Jessica Parker Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attractiveness</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity of the Celebrity</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Brand Congruency</td>
<td>5.738</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(congr#2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical attractiveness positively influenced consumer’s attitudes toward the brand in all three advertisements. Source credibility also positively influenced consumer’s attitudes toward the brand in all three advertisements. The familiarity of the celebrity only was positively influenced in the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement. The Demi Moore/Versace and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisements were not positively influenced. The celebrity/brand congruency was positively influenced in both the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement. The Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement was not positively influenced.

Overall, all the independent variables influenced positive attitudes towards the brand in all three advertisements. However, which independent variable that positively influenced consumer’s attitudes toward the brand in the three advertisements depended on the celebrity in the advertisement.

To show the strength of the relationships between the dependent and independent variables, the backward linear regression tables are shown in Appendix.
CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of physical attractiveness, source credibility of the endorser, and celebrity/brand congruency on consumers’ attitudes toward the printed advertisement and brand, and purchase intentions of the endorsed product.

Objective 1: To examine if the celebrity’s physical attractiveness, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will increase the purchase intentions of the endorsed product.

This objective was met by testing hypothesis one using One-way ANOVA and Backward Linear Regression. The dependent variable of purchase intentions was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency #1 and #2. As stated in the previous chapter, congr#1 is how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity in the advertisement, and congr#2 is the celebrity/brand congruency. This was done for all three advertisements.

For the first ad, Demi Moore/Versace, physical attractiveness did not have a significant affect on the purchase intentions. In the second ad, Paris Hilton/Guess, physical attractiveness had a significant affect on purchase intentions. For the third ad, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, physical attractiveness did have a significant affect on purchase intentions.

In the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, source credibility had a significant affect on purchase intentions. For the second advertisement, Paris Hilton/Guess, source credibility did not have a significant affect on purchase intentions. In the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, source credibility did not have a significant affect on purchase intentions.

In the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, both parts of celebrity/brand congruency did not have a significant affect on purchase intentions. For advertisement two, Paris Hilton/Guess, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity had a
significant affect on purchase intentions, while celebrity/brand congruency did not. The Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity was did not have a significant affect on purchase intentions, while celebrity/brand congruency did have a significant affect.

Having a celebrity endorser was found to partially increase consumer’s intent to purchase the advertised products. However, the celebrity itself should be taken into consideration. While Paris Hilton and Sarah Jessica Parker had significant physical attractiveness scores, Demi Moore did not. Source credibility was only significant in the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement. How familiar the consumer was with the celebrity was significant in the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement. It was not significant in the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement. The celebrity/brand congruency was only found to be significant in the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement. The Demi Moore/Versace advertisement and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisement did not have significant affect on the purchase intentions.

Hypothesis one was partially supported. This could be because Demi Moore was endorsing a Versace, a brand too expensive for consumers to realistically buy. Demi Moore is also not as well known to “generation Y”; they may only relate to her for marrying Ashton Kutcher, a younger popular celebrity. Consumers may also find her around the age of their parents, and not think of her as physically attractive. What ever the reason was, the first advertisement with Demi Moore endorsing Versace did not generate a high intent to purchase the product.

For the Demi Moore/Versace ad, the consumers thought she was a credible source. Being a credible source shows that they are trustworthy, and an expert of what they are endorsing. Students believed that Demi Moore was those things. This could be because her age and the brand are a good fit, or because she looks like someone that would wear Versace. Her high credibility scores generated high intent to purchase the brand.

For the other two celebrities, Paris Hilton and Sarah Jessica Parker, consumer’s found them both to be physically attractive. They also were more likely to purchase the brands of Guess and the GAP. This may be because those brands are very popular among college age students, are affordable to them, and because of the celebrity endorsing them.
These celebrities are very popular and are known for their fashion choices. Consumers are very aware that these celebrities are always wearing a different designer garments and are on “best dressed” lists often. Paris Hilton is seen at fashion shows, at parties and clubs wearing something new every time. Sarah Jessica Parker will forever be linked to her *Sex and the City* character, Carrie Bradshaw. That character made her a fashion icon. She set countless trends and wore something from almost every designer in the fashion world.

These celebrities live off how physically attractive they are and how well they look in designer clothes. For those reasons or other possible reasons consumers generated higher intent to purchase the products in the second and third advertisements. These findings are the same as some previous studies, which will be discussed below.

In the, Paris Hilton/Guess and Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, advertisements did have significant source credibility scores for purchase intentions. This could be because they are so well known to the public because they are saturated in the media, that the students already feel like they know them. So they do not need to prove they are trustworthy or an expert in fashion. Another reason could be that the students felt that they were not an expert on the brands they were endorsing because they do not wear them in their daily life. Guess and the GAP are moderately priced and Paris Hilton and Sarah Jessica Parker are usually seen wearing designer brands.

Ohanian (1991) found physical attractiveness and trustworthiness of a celebrity were not significantly related to intent to purchase. This finding was similar to the results for the first advertisement. Till & Busler, (1998) found that when the attractive pictures were shown, the brand attitude and purchase intentions were significantly higher, irrespective of the product type.

Friedman H., H., Termini, S., & Washington, R. (1976) found that any endorser, no matter what type, brought higher intent-to-purchase and believability than the ad with no endorser. This finding is consistent with the Demi Moore ad, but further research should be done measuring celebrity apparel advertisements versus non-celebrity advertisements.

The Friedman H., H., Santeramo, M., J., & Traina, A. (1978) study showed that awareness correlated with trust; celebrities that were perceived as having constant media coverage were trusted more than celebrities not in the constant spotlight. This study does
not correspond with those findings in the Paris Hilton/Guess and the Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP advertisements for purchase intentions.

**Objective Two: To examine if the physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency of the celebrity in the advertisement will positively influence the consumer's attitude of the advertisement.**

This objective was met by testing hypothesis two using One-way ANOVA and Backward Linear Regression. The dependent variable of attitude toward the advertisement was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency. This was done for all three advertisements.

In the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, physical attractiveness did not have a significant affect on attitude toward the advertisement. In the second advertisement, Paris Hilton/Guess, physical attractiveness did have a significant affect on attitude toward the advertisement. For the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, did have a significant affect on attitude toward the advertisement.

In the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, source credibility had a significant affect on the attitude toward the advertisement. For the second advertisement, Paris Hilton/Guess, source credibility did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the advertisement. In the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, source credibility did have a significant affect attitude toward the advertisement.

In the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, both parts of celebrity/brand congruency had a significant affect on attitude toward the advertisement. For the second advertisement, Paris Hilton/Guess, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity did not have a significant affect on the attitude toward the advertisement, while celebrity/brand congruency did have a significant affect. In the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity did not have a significant affect on the attitude toward the advertisement, while celebrity/brand congruency did have a significant affect.

Having a celebrity endorser was found to partially relate to positive attitudes toward the advertisements. The celebrity itself should be taken into consideration. Demi
Moore was the only celebrity that did not have significant physical attractiveness scores for attitude toward the advertisement. Sarah Jessica Parker was the only celebrity that did not have significant source credibility scores for attitude toward the advertisement. Demi Moore was the only celebrity that had significant scores for both parts of the celebrity/brand congruency for the attitude toward the advertisement. Paris Hilton and Sarah Jessica Parker both had significant celebrity/brand congruency scores for the attitude toward the advertisement. How familiar they both were with consumers was not significant.

Hypothesis two was partially supported. For the Demi Moore/Versace ad, the consumers thought she was a credible source. Being a credible source shows that they are trustworthy, and an expert of what they are endorsing. Students believed that Demi Moore was those things. This could be because her age and the brand are a good fit, or because she looks like someone who would wear Versace. Her high credibility scores generated positive attitudes toward her advertisement.

In advertisement two and three, Paris Hilton/Guess and Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, had high scores for attitude toward the advertisement. They both had a significant affect on source credibility for this dependent variable. This could be because of the fact that they are so well known, consumers feel they can relate to them and what they are endorsing. Consumers may also want to dress like them or like clothes they like to feel closer to them. For these reasons, or other possible reasons, consumers generated favorable attitudes toward both these advertisements.

Ohanian (1991) found that physical attractiveness and trustworthiness of a celebrity were not significantly related to intent to purchase, but expertise was. This finding is partially consistent with the Demi Moore/Versace ad. Trustworthiness and expertise were measured together for this study. Further research could measure them separately.

The Friedman H., H., Santeramo, M., J., & Traina, A. (1978) study showed that awareness correlated with trust; celebrities that were perceived as having constant media coverage, were trusted more than celebrities not in the constant spotlight. This study is consistent with the results of the dependent variable attitude toward the advertisement.
Friedman & Friedman (1979) found that an endorser/product interaction occurred. Also, consumers’ evaluations of the ads’ believability varied according to the product/endorser combinations. This was consistent with all three advertisements.

Freiden’s (1984) results showed that the type of consumer used in advertising can affect consumer response: the celebrity generated the best results in the category likeability, but not in the categories of product quality, ad trustworthiness, and spokesperson knowledgeably. This finding is also consistent with the Paris Hilton and Sarah Jessica Parker advertisements.

Atkin and Block (1983) found for all age groups the celebrity figure was perceived as more competent, trustworthy, and rated more positively than the noncelebrity versions. This finding is consistent with the first advertisement, Demi Moore, but not for the remaining two advertisements.

Kamins (1990), found that the celebrity had higher credibility with the consumers, and a more positive attitude toward the advertisement. This finding is consistent with all three celebrities measured in this study. Kamins and Gupta (1994) found that the higher the degree of congruency between the types of endorsers and the product advertised, the greater the believability of the endorser. This finding is true for all three celebrities.

**Objective Three:** To examine the physical attractiveness, the source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency of the endorser will positively influence consumer’s attitude of the brand in the advertisement.

This objective was met by testing hypothesis three using One-way ANOVA. One-way ANOVA’s were run on celebrity/brand congruency question #1 (cong #1) separately from questions #2-5 (congr #2). Backward Linear Regression was also run. Attitude toward the brand was measured against the independent variables of physical attractiveness, source credibility and celebrity/brand congruency (congr #1 and congr #2). This was done for all three advertisements.

In the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement physical attractiveness did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand. In the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement, physical attractiveness did have a significant affect on the attitude toward
the brand. For the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, physical attractiveness did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand. This was the only dependent variable that generated significant physical attractiveness scores for all three advertisements.

In the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement source credibility did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand. In the Paris Hilton/Guess advertisement, source credibility did not have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand. In the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, source credibility did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand.

In the first advertisement, Demi Moore/Versace, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity did not have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand, but celebrity/brand did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand. In the Paris Hilton/Guess, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity did not have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand, but celebrity/brand congruency did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand. In the third advertisement, Sarah Jessica Parker/GAP, how familiar the consumer was with the celebrity did not have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand, but the celebrity/brand congruency did have a significant affect on the attitude toward the brand.

Having a celebrity endorser was found to partially relate to positive attitudes toward the brand in the advertisements. The celebrity itself should be taken into consideration. All three celebrities had significant physical attractiveness scores for this dependent variable. All three celebrities also had significant source credibility scores for the attitude toward the brand. All three celebrities had significant celebrity/brand congruency scores, while their familiarity scores were found not to be significant.

Hypothesis three was partially supported. In the Demi Moore/Versace advertisement the physical attractiveness, the source credibility and the celebrity/brand congruency were all significant. However, how familiar she was to consumer was not significant. Even though consumers did not all know who she was, they still thought she was attractive, credible and a good fit for the brand Versace. This could be because of her appearance in the advertisement, or the fact that the students believed that she would actually wear this brand or the fact that the consumers like the clothes in the
advertisement. For these reasons, or other possible reasons consumers positively related to this brand.

In the second and third advertisements, consumers believed that Paris Hilton and Sarah Jessica Parker were physically attractive, a credible source and a good fit with the brand they are endorsing. How familiar they are to consumers was not significant. This could be that consumers thought that they both looked attractive in their endorsements, or thought they were a good fit with their respective brands. Consumers also might have thought they were credible sources because of their experience with high fashion clothes or they might already have had favorable attitudes towards these brands. Guess and the Gap are very popular brands with generation “Y”, and consumers probably have shopped for these brands. For these reasons, or other reasons, consumers related positively to these brands.

Kahle & Homer’s, (1985) results corresponded with the previous studies showing that the more likeable and attractive the celebrity the more favorable attitudes consumers had toward the ad and the product; it also showed consumers’ had greater purchase intentions for that product. These findings correspond with the findings for the second and third advertisements.

Overall having a celebrity endorser generated higher purchase intentions and positive attitudes toward the ad and the brand. However, the celebrity itself should be taken into consideration. Picking the right celebrity is important because how popular they are in society or the media will ultimately affect how people will view them in the advertisement. Celebrity endorsers are an affective way of advertising a brand, however, the variables examined in the study should be considered.

Impact for Retailer’s and Advertiser’s

This study can be very beneficial to retailer’s and advertiser’s that use celebrities in their advertisements. All three companies used in this research would benefit learning about how consumers view their advertisements when celebrities are used. Some retailers have already found that celebrities are key to increasing their sales. For example, Louis Vuitton has successfully transitioned from one celebrity to another without loosing popularity or sales volume. Whether it is the fact that Louis Vuitton is so popular among
celebrities or that those celebrities appear in their advertisements, attitudes and purchase intentions for this brand seem to be quite favorable.

Learning how to pick the right celebrity would also benefit retailers and advertisers. This study found that the celebrity itself plays a big role in how consumers view not only the advertisement, but also the brand. The celebrity also plays a big role with consumers and their intent to purchase these brands.

Increasing sales volume and brand profitability are the ultimate goals for retailers and the only way for companies to survive. Using celebrities has already shown that they help increase sales profits and are also a unique way to get consumers attention. This study showed how consumers really feel towards these types of advertisements. While most were positively viewed, each celebrity did generated different scores. Advertisers and retailers need to be aware of this occurrence.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Further research on this topic should include measuring a celebrity advertisement versus a non-celebrity advertisement within the same brand. This would be important because it would show how effective or ineffective celebrity endorsements are. Research should also include measuring celebrities before they are selected to appear in an ad. This can help make the advertisement as effective as possible. Measuring celebrities endorsing their own brands should also be examined. In today’s society so many celebrities are involved in clothing lines, jewelry lines, shoe lines, and perfume lines. Measuring attitudes and purchase intentions toward these types of endorsements would be beneficial not only to their companies, but to their sales as well. Apparel companies should explore how having multiple celebrities in one advertisement compares with the same apparel company using one celebrity campaign after another. For example sketchers use four celebrities in one advertisement, while Louis Vuitton has used, Jennifer Lopez, Uma Thurman and now Lindsay Lohan in consecutive advertisement campaigns. Lastly, measuring how a celebrity that has lost their popularity, while still under contract, would be beneficial when selecting what type celebrity to use in an advertising campaign.
APPENDIX A  
BACKWARD LINEAR REGRESSION TABLES

Table 15. Purchase Intentions of the Demi Moore Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoreph1</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoresc1</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad1congr#1</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad1congr#2</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Purchase Intentions of the Paris Hilton Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.929</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>-0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoreph2</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoresc2</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad2congr#1</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad2congr#2</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Purchase Intentions of the Sarah Jessica Parker Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.434</td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>-1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad3congr#1</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad3congr#2</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoreph3</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoresc3</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Attitude toward the Advertisement of the Demi Moore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.019</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>-1.368</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoreph1</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoresc1</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad1congr#1</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad1congr#2</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Attitude toward the Advertisement of the Paris Hilton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.296</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td>-1.496</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoreph2</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoresc2</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad2congr#1</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad2congr#2</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Attitude toward the Advertisement of the Sarah Jessica Parker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad3congr#1</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ad3congr#2</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoreph3</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scoresc3</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Attitude toward the Brand of the Demi Moore Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>12.363</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoreph1</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>1.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoresc1</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>4.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad1congr#1</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad1congr#2</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>3.552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Attitude toward the Brand of the Paris Hilton Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>10.289</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoreph2</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>5.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoresc2</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>2.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad2congr#1</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad2congr#2</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Attitude toward the Brand of the Sarah Jessica Parker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>12.321</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad3congr#1</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad3congr#2</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>5.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoreph3</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>2.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoresc3</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>2.814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

Dear Student,

I am conducting a research project that will better understand how consumers feel about celebrity endorsements. I am a master’s student at The Florida State University in the Department of Textiles and Consumer Sciences. My research will give a clearer view of how effective celebrity endorsements of different price points of brand name apparel. A celebrity is someone who is well known and popular, whereas a celebrity endorser is someone who enjoys public recognition and who uses that recognition on behalf of a consumer good by appearing with it in an advertisement. Celebrities can make people take notice of what they are endorsing and create an immediate identity or persona for a product. The results of this study may be used by advertising and apparel companies when deciding if and which celebrity to use in an advertising campaign. Your participation in this survey will be greatly appreciated.

This questionnaire will only take about 15 minutes of your time, and your participation is very important to the success of my research. There is no risk to you, and the questionnaire is anonymous. The results of this study may be published, but your name will not be known.

By filling out this questionnaire I assume you are 18 years of age or older. Completion of this questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. For further information on this study, please contact Karla Renton at (850) 644-2498 or Jeanne Heitmeyer at (850) 644-5578 or the Office of Human Subjects at (850) 644-8633. Thank you for your help in this research project.

Sincerely,

Karla Renton                                                   Jeanne Heitmeyer, Ph.D
Master’s Student                                             Associate Professor
Merchandising Program                                  Dept. of Textiles & Consumer Sciences
Florida State University                                  Florida State University
APPENDIX D

SURVEY

Advertisement #1

I. Physical Attractiveness, Trustworthiness, and Expertise

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity's PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS.

1. Unattractive  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Attractive
2. Not Classy  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Classy
3. Ugly  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Beautiful
4. Plain  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Elegant
5. Not Sexy  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Sexy

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity's TRUSTWORTHINESS.

1. Undependable  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Dependable
2. Dishonest  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Honest
3. Unreliable  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Reliable
4. Unsincere  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Sincere
5. Untrustworthy  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Trustworthy

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity's EXPERTISE of the brand they are wearing.

1. Not an Expert  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  An Expert
2. Inexperienced  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Experienced
3. Unknowledgeable  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Knowledgeable
4. Unqualified  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Qualified
5. Unskilled  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Skilled

II. Product/Brand Congruency

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the following questions pertaining to the CONGRUENCY BETWEEN THE CELEBRITY AND THE BRAND.

1. How familiar are you with the celebrity who appeared in the ad?
   Unfamiliar  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Familiar

2. How congruent is the image of the celebrity with the brand they are endorsing?
   Incongruent  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Congruent
3. Do you think this brand is a good fit for this celebrity to endorse?
   Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Agree

4. How believable is this celebrity endorsing this brand?
   Unbelievable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Believable

5. Do you believe this celebrity would wear this product?
   Unbelievable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Believable

III. Attitude toward the Advertisement

On a scale of 1 to 7 please circle the number that best reflects your ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ADVERTISEMENT.

1. Bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Good
2. Uninteresting 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Interesting
3. Dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Like
4. Uncreative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Creative
5. Uninformative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Informative

IV. Attitude toward the Brand

On a scale of 1 to 7 please circle the number that best reflects your ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BRAND

1. Bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Good
2. Unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Pleasant
3. Dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Like
4. Poor Quality 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Good Quality
5. Unsatisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Satisfactory

V. Purchase Intentions

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being "very unlikely" and 7 being "very likely", circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the following questions pertaining to your INTENT TO PURCHASE THIS PRODUCT.

1. How likely you are you to purchase this product? Very Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    Very Likely
2. How likely are you to try this product on if seen in a store?  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. How likely are you to actively seek out this product in a store?  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

## VI. Advertising Attributes

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being “very unlikely” and 7 being “very likely”, circle the number that best reflects your **BELIEFS** towards the following questions pertaining to **THE ADVERTISEMENT**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This ad is misleading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This ad is entertaining</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This ad is persuasive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This ad taught me about fashion and what to buy to impress others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This ad tells me what other people like me are buying and using</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This ad shows me which features of the product are important</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This ad represents a true picture of the product advertised</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This ad reflects something I would wear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This ad is better than a commercial</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This ad informs me about what is available in the marketplace</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advertisement #2

I. Physical Attractiveness, Trustworthiness, and Expertise

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity’s **PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS**.

1. Unattractive
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Attractive

2. Not Classy
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Classy

3. Ugly
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Beautiful

4. Plain
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Elegant

5. Not Sexy
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sexy

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity’s **TRUSTWORTHINESS**.

1. Undependable
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dependable

2. Dishonest
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest

3. Unreliable
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Reliable

4. Unsincere
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sincere

5. Untrustworthy
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trustworthy

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity’s **EXPERTISE** of the brand they are wearing.

1. Not an Expert
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 An Expert

2. Inexperienced
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Experienced

3. Unknowledgeable
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Knowledgeable

4. Unqualified
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Qualified

5. Unskilled
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Skilled

II. Product/Brand Congruency

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the following questions pertaining to the **CONGRUENCY BETWEEN THE CELEBRITY AND THE BRAND**.

1. How familiar are you with the celebrity who appeared in the ad?
   Unfamiliar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Familiar

2. How congruent is the image of the celebrity with the brand they are endorsing?
   Incongruent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Congruent

3. Do you think this brand is a good fit for this celebrity to endorse?
   Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree
4. How believable is this celebrity endorsing this brand?
   Unbelievable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believable

5. Do you believe this celebrity would wear this product?
   Unbelievable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believable

III. Attitude toward the Advertisement

On a scale of 1 to 7 please circle the number that best reflects your ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ADVERTISEMENT.

1. Bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good
2. Uninteresting 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Interesting
3. Dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Like
4. Uncreative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Creative
5. Uninformative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Informative

IV. Attitude toward the Brand

On a scale of 1 to 7 please circle the number that best reflects your ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BRAND.

1. Bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good
2. Unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Pleasant
3. Dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Like
4. Poor Quality 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good Quality
5. Unsatisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Satisfactory

V. Purchase Intentions

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being "very unlikely" and 7 being "very likely", circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the following questions pertaining to your INTENT TO PURCHASE THIS PRODUCT.

1. How likely you are you to purchase this product?
   Very Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Likely

2. How likely are you to try this product on
if seen in a store?

3. How likely are you to actively seek out this product in a store?  

VI. Advertising Attributes

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being "very unlikely" and 7 being "very likely", circle the number that best reflects your **BELIEFS** towards the following questions pertaining to **THE ADVERTISMENT**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This ad is misleading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This ad is entertaining</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This ad is persuasive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This ad taught me about fashion and what to buy to impress others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This ad tells me what other people like me are buying and using</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This ad shows me which features of the product are important</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This ad represents a true picture of the product advertised</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This ad reflects something I would wear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This ad is better than a commercial</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This ad informs me about what is available in the marketplace</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Physical Attractiveness, Trustworthiness, and Expertise

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity’s PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS.

1. Unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Attractive
2. Not Classy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Classy
3. Ugly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Beautiful
4. Plain 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Elegant
5. Not Sexy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sexy

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity’s TRUSTWORTHINESS.

1. Undependable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dependable
2. Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest
3. Unreliable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Reliable
4. Unsincere 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sincere
5. Untrustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trustworthy

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the celebrity’s EXPERTISE of the brand they are wearing.

1. Not an Expert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 An Expert
2. Inexperienced 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Experienced
3. Unknowledgeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Knowledgeable
4. Unqualified 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Qualified
5. Unskilled 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Skilled

II. Product/Brand Congruency

On a scale of 1 to 7, please circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the following questions pertaining to the CONGRUENCY BETWEEN THE CELEBRITY AND THE BRAND.

1. How familiar are you with the celebrity who appeared in the ad?
   Unfamiliar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Familiar

2. How congruent is the image of the celebrity with the brand they are endorsing?
   Incongruent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Congruent

3. Do you think this brand is a good fit for this celebrity to endorse?
   Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

4. How believable is this celebrity endorsing this brand?
   Unbelievable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believable
5. Do you believe this celebrity would wear this product?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unbelievable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Attitude toward the Advertisement

On a scale of 1 to 7 please circle the number that best reflects your ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ADVERTISEMENT.

1. Bad
2. Uninteresting
3. Dislike
4. Uncreative
5. Uninformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Attitude toward the Brand

On a scale of 1 to 7 please circle the number that best reflects your ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BRAND.

1. Bad
2. Unpleasant
3. Dislike
4. Poor Quality
5. Unsatisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Purchase Intentions

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being "very unlikely" and 7 being "very likely", circle the number that best reflects your feelings towards the following questions pertaining to your INTENT TO PURCHASE THIS PRODUCT.

1. How likely you are you to purchase this product?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How likely are you to try this product on if seen in a store?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How likely are you
to actively seek out this product in a store?  

VI. Advertising Attributes

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being "very unlikely" and 7 being "very likely", circle the number that best reflects your **BELIEFS** towards the following questions pertaining to **THE ADVERTISEMENT**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This ad is misleading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This ad is entertaining</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This ad is persuasive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This ad taught me about fashion and what to buy to impress others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This ad tells me what other people like me are buying and using</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This ad shows me which features of the product are important</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This ad represents a true picture of the product advertised</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This ad reflects something I would wear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This ad is better than a commercial</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This ad informs me about what is available in the marketplace</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Demographics

Please check the appropriate responses

1. What is your gender?
2. What is your race or ethnic background?
   __Male
   __Female
   __White
   __Black or African American
   __Hispanic or Latino
   __Asian
   __Other

3. What is your marital status?
   __Single
   __Married
   __Divorced
   __Widowed

4. What is your household income?
   __$25,000 or less
   __$26-50,000
   __$51-75,000
   __$76-100,000
   __$101,000-$125,000
   __$126,000 or more

5. What is your age?
   __18-29
   __30-39
   __40-49
   __50-59
   __60-69
   __70 or above

6. What is your education level?
   __Below high school
   __High school or equivalency
   __Associate's Degree
   __Bachelor's Degree
   __Graduate of professional degree

Thank You for your Participation
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I was born in a blizzard in Denver, Colorado. I moved to Florida when I was five, but it was not long until we moved again, this time to Louisville, Kentucky. Luckily we were only there for two years until we made it back to Florida. I spent the rest of my childhood here and decided to attend Florida State University to attain my bachelor’s degree. After graduating with my degree in merchandising, I moved to Los Angeles, California. I thought that it would be quite easy to find a job in fashion there, but I moved the day before 9/11. Finding a job was hard, but even harder was retail as a living. I held many different positions out there including assistant store manager, visual display manger and stylist. I worked for a various different retail companies including The Men’s Wearhouse, Organized Living, and for fashion designer Nicole Miller.

After being burnt out living in the “real world” I decided to go back to school. Florida State University expressed interest and after being accepted not only to the Mater’s program and as a teaching assistant, I moved back to Tallahassee. The two years it took to get my master’s was truly a learning experience. I am gearing up to start the doctoral program. I have taught two different classing, including a visual design class where I was a co creator of an update compute program designed to teach students about floor layouts and merchandising standards. I also took on the Retail Math classes, at the last minute when the assigned teacher’s husband fell ill. I have completed by degree with a 4.0, which got me in to several honor societies including, Kappa Omicron Nu, and Phi Kappa Phi. I was also inducted in the Glenn Society, prestigious society in the college of Human Sciences.

I will be starting the doctoral program in the fall after a well deserved break. I am staying true to my love of research and getting ready to teach the basic merchandising class.