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Abstract

The use of celebrity endorsement strategy is nowadays more frequently used by marketers in order to increase their sales and thereby extend their market shares. Many celebrities are used in various marketing campaigns and in most cases; the use of celebrities as endorsers is seen from mainly positive aspects. This made the authors curious whether the negative aspects, that also exists when using celebrities as endorsers, affects consumers in their purchasing decisions when a celebrity gets associated with negative publicity. Another cause of interest is which factors of a certain celebrity are most important and crucial in consumers’ perceptions, in the case of negative publicity.

Purpose: The purpose of this thesis is to study which factors consumers find important for a company to consider when a celebrity gets negative publicity, to maintain successful brand recognition.

Literature review: The use of previous studies within the field of celebrity endorsement clarifies many important aspects when it comes to celebrity endorsement and this chapter is elaborated from 4 different perspectives; Company, Celebrity, Brand and Consumer. Based on previous studies, the authors identified 6 crucial attributes when using celebrities as endorsers and this can also be seen as a pre-study that the research process has been based upon. Furthermore, the 6 attributes are chosen from the three first mentioned perspectives in order to be able to fulfil the purpose. Hence, this thesis is conducted from a consumer’s point of view.

Method: A quantitative method is used in this thesis since the authors want to base the results on collected data that is expressed in numbers and also to generate a general apprehension in this phenomenon. Moreover, the combinations containing the 6 attributes are used in the conjoint experiment.

Conclusions: It was proven in this study that consumers do get affected by celebrities as endorser, when the attributes from the literature review are in a combination. But, the consumers’ perception of the attributes differs in different cases. However, the main finding was that there are two crucial attributes, trustworthiness and expertise that companies should take into account when using celebrities in their advertising campaign.
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1 Introduction

The authors will present a general understanding of the topic, celebrity endorsement, in the first chapter. Furthermore, the authors will also present the problem area, which this study will be based on, followed by the purpose and the outline of the study.

1.1 The emergence of celebrity endorsement

The use of advertising has changed over the past 150 years, from the classical to the modern school. In the modern advertising strategies various appeals are included, such as sexual, shock, emotional, fear, and humour (Severn, Belch & Belch, 1990; Belch and Belch, 2001, Söderlund, 2003). The main purpose of these appeals is to deliver the information that the company seeks to send to gain high brand awareness and brand recognition among a large audience. However, when using any of these appeals there is always a person included, sometimes someone unknown or in most cases a well known person in the public eye. According to McCracken (1989), a well-known person tends to have a greater effect on the consumer buying behaviour. This is especially if people more easily can identify themselves with this particular person (Erdogan, Baker, & Tagg, 2001). McCracken (1989) also states that celebrity endorsement advertising has been recognized as a ubiquitous feature of modern marketing.

The concept itself, celebrity endorsement, is recognized by marketers because it has an effect that influences the message (brand) the company is trying to send from someone that the consumers feel a sense of similarity with. Consumers tend to evaluate information from a communicator (celebrity), which they have similar a goal, interest or lifestyle with greater than someone they do not (Erdogan et al, 2001). Furthermore, celebrities have an ability to transfer their image to a specific product that is being advertised (Wheeler, 2003). Companies have taken this opportunity into account and tries, through using it as an advertising tool, to gain a high brand exposure, attention, interest, desire and action (Belch & Belch, 2001).

Celebrities are people who enjoy public recognition by a large share of a certain group of people and they have distinctive characteristics, such as attractiveness and trustworthiness (Silvera & Austad, 2004). Many companies have realized the importance of celebrity endorsement as a marketing communication tool (Belch & Belch, 2001; Söderlund, 2003). In using this advertising tool, a company will in the short run generate a high awareness among a larger audience as well as an increased market share. Since this advertising tool has gained such attention from various companies, the price level is extremely high (Daneshvary & Schwer, 2000; Kambitsis, Harahousou, Theodorakis, & Chatzibeis, 2002). As billions of dollars are spent per year on celebrity endorsement contracts, which indicates that celebrities play an enormous and important role for the advertising industry. A recent example of this is the Super Bowl in the United States of America, where thirty seconds of advertising cost approximately seventeen million SEK. Pepsi used many different celebrities, such as Cindy Crawford, P Diddy and Carson Kressley to promote diet Pepsi. Heineken, on the other hand, used Brad Pitt in their endorsement strategy, where he earned around three to five million USD for his effort (Lundell, 2005).

This shows that celebrity endorsement is a very popular advertising tool, due to the prices companies are ready to pay and the effect it has on consumers buying behaviour (Belch & Belch, 2001; McCracken, 1989; Söderlund, 2003). Therefore, a disputable issue rises
upon which attributes and personal characteristics of a celebrity a company base their choice. Furthermore, Silvera & Austad (2004) state that celebrities are effective endorsers because they are viewed as highly believable, likeable, pursuable, and trustworthy. However, celebrity endorsement might vary when it comes to the fit between the celebrity and the advertised product, as well as the level of effectiveness on the purchasing behaviour (Till & Shimp, 1998). This entails that the use of celebrity endorsement might have a risk when there is a lack of fit or when the celebrity gets associated with negative publicity (Söderlund, 2003). Negative publicity occurs when negative information is spread and associated with the celebrity. Hence, negative information can be direct, indirect and/or perceived subjectively.

1.2 The two-sided effect of celebrity endorsement

There are not many researchers who have embarked on the concept of negative information, which celebrities’ causes for consumers’ evaluations of endorsed brands (Till & Shimp, 1998), but still there are many different aspects on how negative information can be viewed. Furthermore, Söderlund (2003) argues that celebrities can be perceived as less trustworthy when they are advertising too many brands (multiple brand endorsement) since the consumers get diverse information. On one hand, a celebrity who is linked with positive information has a greater opportunity to reach out to the targeted audience. On the other hand, negative information brings an association that decreases the trustworthiness of a celebrity and the fit with the brand, which is also the authors’ definition of negative information.

One example where the fit between the celebrity and the brand has been very successful is Michael Jordan and Nike. The reason that the authors assume the perfect fit with the brand is based on the fact that Nike captured their endorser to a higher level where they developed a new brand within Nike called Air Jordan. One can assume that Michael Jordan has not shown any indications of being revolutionary in the media. Basically, one can say that Michael Jordan has been a very good endorser for this brand, in the sense of his high expertise and him being trustworthy, where a large audience feels a sense of similarity with. Now twenty years later, they still use him in their advertising, which strengthens the assumption of the good fit between Michael and Nike (Belch & Belch, 2001).

Having this information in mind the authors decided to create a model to facilitate the understanding of how the use of a celebrity affects the company. Figure 1-1 shows, when the information the celebrity is sending out is optimal, and there are no obstacles between the celebrity, brand, consumers, and company. As one can see, when looking at the model, the company, celebrity, brand and consumer are interconnected as a continuous network. In this optimal model, there are no particular obstacles that harm the celebrity endorsement process. This implies that the fit between the celebrity and brand are integrated.
Söderlund (2003) argues that celebrities are not profitable to be used in a long-run perspective, if they in any matters are not maintaining relevance with the consumers.

This is an issue for companies, because consumers are easily adapting to another celebrity, sometimes because one cannot fully predict the life-span of a celebrity (Till & Busler, 1998). This can affect the brand image and also the level of loyalty a consumer has towards a brand. Furthermore, Söderlund (2003) discusses that demographical changes of a celebrity cannot be seen as anything negative towards the brand.

However, everyone cannot be as perfect as Michael Jordan. There are always some celebrities that get negative publicity, sometimes what media creates and sometimes their own personal actions. This indicates that companies have to be more careful when selecting a celebrity who will endorse one of their brands. The authors have in figure 1-2 chosen to demonstrate how negative publicity of a celebrity affects the company, brand, and consumer. This figure tells us, that when a celebrity is associated with negative publicity, the celebrity is only affecting each part separately and that there is no connection between the company, brand and consumer. Furthermore, there is no flow in the network of connections which also affects the lack of fit between the celebrity and brand. The questions that arise are, how are these four parts (company, celebrity, consumer and brand) connected, when a celebrity is associated with negative publicity? How can a company overcome these obstacles in the long run? Would the use of a celebrity who gets negative publicity destroy the brand image and the level of loyalty consumers feel towards a brand? Does the fit between a celebrity and company affect the consumers when a celebrity gets associated with negative information? Does the meaning, a celebrity is transferring; affect the consumer’s perception of the brand, if a celebrity is associated with negative information? The authors’ believe that from the perspective of this thesis, the effect of negative information on a celebrity is the most interesting aspect to study, as it is not limited to certain exceptional elements but can make use of a variety of elements like source attractiveness, source credibility, and source power.
1.3 Limitations
According to figure 1-2, the authors discuss the effect of negative information and how the celebrity affects the company, consumers and brand. However, the authors believe that the consumers are the end group of the network because they are the ones that the company is trying to reach through their brand and the advertising tool, celebrity endorsement. Therefore, the authors will base their study on a consumer perspective.

1.4 Purpose
The purpose of this thesis is to study which factors consumers find important for a company to consider when a celebrity gets negative publicity, to maintain successful brand recognition.

1.5 Research questions
This thesis is intended to investigate whether the attributes that have been conducted through the literature review (chapter 2) really affects consumer purchase decisions. Furthermore, the authors are very interested to study if the consumers evaluate the attributes differently, when different endorsers, who get negative publicity, are advertising a product or service. Lastly, the authors want to see how the consumers perceived the attributes separately. The reason in doing this is to compare the results from the conjoint and the survey to show which attributes are perceived as the most important ones. Thus, this thesis addresses more precisely the following research questions.

1. Which factors from the literature review affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service that is endorsed by a celebrity who is associated with negative information, when the attributes are in a combination?

2. Do the attributes from the literature review have different impact on consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service, when different celebrities are used as endorsers?

3. Which attributes do consumers find to be of most importance when evaluating them separately?

1.6 Outline of this study
Chapter 1: The introduction chapter consists of an explanation concerning the importance of celebrity endorsement in the advertising industry. The authors will further on explain the two-sided effect of celebrity endorsement; positive and negative. Also, the purpose of this thesis will be addressed followed by the research questions.

Chapter 2: The literature review is divided into four different phases; Company, Celebrity, Brand and Consumer. These parts are all related to celebrity endorsement strategy with its main purpose to find important attributes that will be studied further on in this thesis. Lastly, this will lead to a conclusion of this chapter and the hypotheses.

Chapter 3: The methodology chapter explains how the authors will approach this research process in order to fulfil the purpose. This will be done by using a quantitative method and more precisely a conjoint experiment.
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Chapter 4: In the analysis and results chapter, the main findings will be presented followed by an analysis of the most crucial aspects within this subject. Lastly, the authors will present a chapter summary and conclude the most important attributes.

Chapter 5: In this chapter, the authors will answer the research questions and draw the main conclusions followed by the final words from the authors. Finally, the authors will present suggestions for future researches.

Chapter 6: The final chapter will provide the reader with critique of this study.
2 Literature review

This chapter seeks to find the most crucial attributes that is mostly associated with celebrity endorsement strategy. This in turn to apply the following attributes in the methodology part of this study.

2.1 Introduction

When a celebrity gets associated with negative information a company has to consider various actions to be able to maintain a good position on the market and a similar level of brand recognition as well. This indicates that a company needs to develop a strategy that prevents upcoming obstacles (Till & Shimp, 1998), if a celebrity that they are using as an endorser gets associated with negative information. Within this frame, which is also the main body of this thesis, the authors will divide it into four different phases that are directly related to each other. Hence, these are the main pillars. The purpose of this chapter is to identify crucial attributes that will further on be used in the research process. To facilitate for the reader, the authors have chosen to explain the structure of this chapter in the figure below.

![Diagram of Celebrity endorsement strategy]

Figure 2-1: The structure of the literature review

As one can see from the figure 2-1, this chapter is outlined with the basis of celebrity endorsement strategy which is also the main focus when elaborating later, concerning the four different phases. These parts will be integrated and brought together as a summary of the most important issues, which will also enhance the process of choosing relevant attributes for the experimental design (see section 3.3.3).
2.2 Celebrity endorsement strategy

Marketers usually use individuals who have achieved some form of celebrity status to serve as spokespersons for their companies. Most of the celebrities that are hired by a company to pitch their products or services are popular people, movie stars, entertainers, athletes, or pop-stars, although occasionally a politician or some other well-known public figure may be used (Belch & Belch, 2001). Furthermore, when a company decides upon using an endorsement strategy as their marketing communication tool, the main focus lies in exposing their brand (Kotler, Armstrong, Saunders, & Wong, 2001). In an endorsement strategy a new sort of product is given a new brand name that is unique for that product (Riezebos, 2003). Besides the unique brand name, they also get provided with the name of an endorser. In this case, the endorser is a celebrity and functions as endorsement which means an approval or support that can be seen as a guarantee of recommendation for consumers. According to Riezebos (2003) it is only advisable to use endorsers for brands if there is a high level of brand-added value. This means that the name of the endorser should be clearly visible next to the name of the branded article.

Companies have jointly been using their brands and themselves, through the use of celebrity endorsers, in hope that celebrities may boost effectiveness of their marketing attempts in the long-term (Belch & Belch, 2001). Basically, a company is trying to send various types of information to their target audience. To be able to develop an effective advertising and promotional campaign, a company has to select their endorser appropriate to different channels and media (Till & Shimp, 1998), such as source, message, and receiver (Belch & Belch, 2001). Thus, the brand can be seen as the message the company is trying to send to their audience. Moreover, the source which is intended to send this message in an endorsement strategy is in this case, the celebrity. Furthermore, the receiver in the communication process is the consumer (Belch & Belch, 2001).

The authors have chosen to present each phase of this thesis separately. The reason in doing this is to bring the reader an understanding of the effect celebrity endorsement strategy has on each phase.

2.3 Company

According to Erdogan & Baker (2004), there are several reasons why companies choose to use celebrity endorsement to a larger extent. Managers seek to refresh the brand image, awareness and attention getting and also to add new dimensions to the brand image. According to Pringle (2004), the best identified celebrity that is seen as the best for promoting a brand, is one of the more important decisions considering how consumers will perceive the brand. There are less important decisions for a brand compared to the choice of celebrity such as what it is named, places where it is seen and sold and what kind of advertising campaign it runs. These considerations are taken into account and this is also the reason why many companies are ready to invest a huge amount of money in choosing and using a certain celebrity, whose identity fits well with their brand. However, it is not only the involvement between the celebrity and the brand, the consumers are also integrated. Pringle (2004) has outlined this relationship and it is shown in figure 2-2.
These three factors are important for a company to take into account in order to avoid any obstacles when it comes to the triangular relationship. Hence, another important area is that the company only can regulate these three to a certain extent, for the process of celebrity endorsement to be successful.

Unfortunately, when looking at previous experiences from the use of celebrity endorsement, there are many examples that celebrities might change their behaviour, views and their perceived personality rather drastically (Söderlund, 2003). Certainly, consumers might change their perception of the celebrities since the latter mentioned have changed. However, the worst outcome is that a celebrity is certainly no longer the individual that the company chose to promote their brand in the first place. This leads to a decrease in the connection between the celebrity and brand (Belch & Belch, 2001).

### 2.3.1 Choose and use celebrities as endorsers

According to Erdogan et al. (2001) managers choose celebrity endorsers depending on the product type and how that fits with the characteristics of a celebrity. This will, according to Louie & Obermiller (2002), lead to a more efficient advertising.

Celebrities can be chosen by companies to increase their competitive advantage for three main reasons; launch, reinforcement and repositioning (Pringle, 2004).

- The first opportunity is when launching the brand for the first time and the use of celebrity can be very powerful in this situation. This can be particularly strong when establishing a new category and the consumers need reassurance and an appropriate star will provide them this.

- Celebrity endorsement can be very effective when maintaining and reinforcing a brand’s competitive position in the market. The use of celebrities in this situation can be especially effective if other brands have entered the marketplace and thereby changed its dynamics.

- When the consumers’ needs create greater potential in a different sector in the market than the one which the brand is currently positioned, repositioning with the help of a celebrity will be in order. The appropriate celebrity can be used as the focus of the brand communication and this shows consumers that it’s positioning is changing in order to suit an emerging target audience.

In a research done by Bielli (2003) it is shown that 18% of all the tested commercials feature famous celebrities. In overall, this study shows that celebrities are used to grab attention, generate interest and involvement in the brand. Also, the “right” celebrity can add values by associations. A suggestion made by this research is that the celebrity should not overshadow the brand and instead be beneficial if the celebrity is used for what the
brand is already famous for. Instead, the brand should borrow and build on the celebrity. A conclusion made by Bielli (2003) is that a celebrity with a generally likeable personality is more likely to make for success. Moreover, advertisers and marketers need to ask themselves four questions before engaging too deep in a celebrity. How famous is the celebrity? How well does the celebrity fit with the brand? Which facets of this celebrity can best work for the brand profile? How much of this can the brand finance? Many studies show that the deeper fit between the celebrity and the brand it is the more likely to be effective in the marketplace. Therefore, the company should strive to create a close connection as possible between the celebrity and the brand (Pringle, 2004).

2.4 Celebrity

A celebrity can be considered as the source of the message a company seeks to send to their target audience. According to Belch & Belch (2001), the term source, when talking about the involvement in communicating a marketing message, can occur either directly or indirectly. Directly can be the celebrity who functions as a spokesperson and who sends out the information that the company wants to deliver to their target audience. Indirectly is when a celebrity does not send the message, but instead draw attention to and/or enhances the appearance of the ad (Belch & Belch, 2001). However, as mentioned in phase one, a company have to carefully select a celebrity that has a good fit with the brand, which is intended to be exposed (Pringle, 2004).

When a company decides on the use of a celebrity in their endorsement strategy, there are three very important source factors; source credibility, source attractiveness, and source power (Belch & Belch, 2001; Till & Shimp, 1998; Ohanian, 1990). These will now be presented.

2.4.1 Source credibility

Credibility is the extent to which the receiver sees the source as having relevant knowledge, skills, experience and trust to give unbiased and objective information. Source credibility is used to imply a communicator’s positive characteristics that will affect the receiver’s acceptance of a message (Ohanian, 1990). Basically, one can say that a communicator, celebrity, can be seen as knowledgeable and a person with expertise. Furthermore, the source needs to be trustworthy, in the sense of honesty, ethics, and believability (Belch & Belch, 2001). These two attributes, that a celebrity needs to have to be a successful endorser in an advertising campaign, are presented more in-depth below.

- **Expertise:** Belch & Belch (2001) discusses that a spokesperson are often chosen due to their knowledge, experience, and expertise in a particular product or service. Furthermore, Ohanian (1990) states that the perceived expertise of celebrity endorsers is more important in explaining purchase intentions rather than their attractiveness and trustworthiness. She also argued that celebrity endorsers are more effective when they are knowledgeable, experienced, and qualified to talk about the product they are endorsing. On the whole, *source expertise* in persuasive communication, indicates generally that the source’s perceived expertise has a positive impact on attitude change.

- **Trustworthiness:** In comparison to expertise, a celebrity needs to be trustworthy when endorsing a product or a service (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2004). This is logically based on how honest the celebrity is about what he/she says concerning the brand. Furthermore, Belch & Belch (2001) discusses that the target audience must find the
source (celebrity) believable. Moreover, Ohanian (1990) states that when a celebrity is perceived more trustworthy, the message will be more effective and the receiver will be more integrated. Hence, trustworthiness is the degree of confidence in the communicator’s intention to communicate the assertions he/she considers being the most valid (Ohanian, 1990).

Belch & Belch (2001) argues that when the information from a credible source influences the beliefs, opinions, and attitudes of the receiver, the latter mentioned adopts the opinion of the credible communicator. This is based on the assumption that the information from the source is accurate. If the celebrity achieves to integrate the receiver with the information that he/she meant to send, the company will in the long run gain a loyal consumer, in the sense that the consumer is more integrated with the brand and not to a high scope with the celebrity.

The authors believe that using these attributes, expertise and trustworthiness; will be accurate in the research process. The authors believe it will provide the thesis with valuable results. Furthermore, it will also be considered as the underlying factor in the process of finding suitable attributes which consumers find important for a company to consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative information.

### 2.4.2 Source attractiveness

Source attractiveness is more related to physical attributes, such as similarity, familiarity, and likeability. These are important in the individual’s initial judgment of another person (Ohanian, 1990). Similarity is a supposed resemblance between the source and the receiver of the message, while familiarity refers to the knowledge of the source through exposure. Likability is affection for the source as a result of physical appearance, behaviour or other personal traits (Belch & Belch, 2001). Source attractiveness affects the receiver in the sense of that they are identifying themselves with the celebrity. This does also motivate the receiver to seek some type of relationship with the source and thus adopts similar beliefs, attitudes, preferences, or behaviour. Furthermore, if a celebrity changes position, the receiver might follow and adapt to these changes (Belch & Belch, 2001; Ohanian, 1990). If this happens, the celebrity has fulfilled its function. However, not many celebrities achieve this, but as mentioned before, the main purpose with source attractiveness is to make a consumer feel a part of the celebrity as well as the company and brand.

The three attributes similarity, familiarity, and likeability are more elaborated below.

- **Similarity**: When talking about similarity, Belch & Belch (2001) mentions that the consumers are more easily influenced by a message coming from someone with whom they feel a sense of similarity with. Furthermore, Ohanian (1990) elaborated on the fact that similarity can be measured if the communicator and receiver have similar needs, goals, interest and lifestyle.

- **Familiarity**: According to Belch & Belch (2001), familiarity can be considered as the level of knowledge a celebrity possesses of a brand. When a company considers choosing a celebrity for their advertising campaign, they need to analyze the previous knowledge a celebrity has or how he/she will utilize their knowledge in the exposure phase. The authors believe that this will be an attribute that the respondents will observe as too difficult to evaluate and therefore the authors will exclude it from the research process. Furthermore, the respondent might find it to be to diffusive.
2.4.3 Source Power

When mentioning the power a celebrity has in advertising, one mainly refers to how well they can persuade the consumer to a purchase. This is very beneficial in personal selling, where personal communication can be an efficient way to convince or lead a consumer into a purchase (Salomon, 2002; Ohanian, 1990). However, the power as source characteristics is very difficult to apply in a non-personal influence situation such as advertising. The reason is that a celebrity in an ad generally cannot apply any sanctions to the receiver or determine any compliance that will actually occur (Belch & Belch, 2001). However, the source power can be beneficial in an endorsement strategy when using an individual with an authoritative personality as a spokesperson.

The authors have decided to exclude the whole concept of source power from the research process, since it does not belong within the frame of this thesis. The main reason underlying this statement is because the purpose of this thesis does not involve any personal selling, more than the advertising perspective of the use of celebrity.

2.5 Brand

A brand, according to Keller (2002) is a name, term, sign, symbol or even a combination of them in order to identify the goods and services that are being advertised. The consumers will be able to more easily differentiate one brand from their competitors due to the different attributes associated with the brand. Advertising has a great impact on how consumers will perceive a brand. Branding is about creating differences and providing products/services with the power of brand equity (Aaker, 1991).

Brand is one of the main pillars of this thesis and the authors explained earlier its importance on the celebrity endorsement process. Since branding is an extensive area, there will be a special focus within branding such as brand equity, the meaning transfer process, and multiple brand endorsement. The concepts of brand linked together with the advertising tool celebrity endorsement will be discussed in the different sections below.

2.5.1 Brand equity

Even though brand equity differs among companies it should in general be defined within the area of marketing effects that is distinctive to a brand. The concept of brand equity
arises when consumers react to more preferable products and the way it is marketed when the brand gets identified. One has to be aware, according to Walgren, Ruble & Donthu (1995) that brand equity will be less valuable for the manufacturers and retailers if it does not have any meaning to the consumers. Keller (2002) continues explaining that brand knowledge is composed of awareness (recall and recognition) whereas brand image is more about favourability, strength and uniqueness of a brand association.

Advertisers spend great sums of money to have celebrities promoting their products/services with the expectation that consumers will react positively to the celebrity’s association with a certain brand. Consumers might say to themselves “If she uses it, it must be good” and “If I use it, I will be like her” (Belch & Belch, 2001). In the long term, this way of thinking may lead to an increase in the sales and thereafter the brand equity. Brand equity (Riezebos, 2003) indicates the intrinsic value in a well-known brand name. The amount of value that is referred to in a brand name depends on consumer’s perception of the brand domination and through social esteem that is provided when using it as well as the consumers trust and identification with the brand. The most valuable assets in many companies are their brand names such as Coca-Cola and Nike which are also referred to as mega brands (Riezebos, 2003).

Brand equity can be influenced by advertising in several ways (Walgren et. al, 1995). Awareness of the brand can be created and increase the possibility that the brand is included in the consumer’s mind. Moreover, when these brand associations get stored in the consumers accessible memory, it can later lead to behavioural actions. The usage experience can be influenced through the use of advertising and it can also affect the perceived quality of a brand (Walgren et. al, 1995). A celebrity spokesperson is used in order to promote a company’s product/brand and for these in turn to be associated with the celebrity (Belch & Belch, 2001). This relates to the image/meaning transfer model described in the next section.

### 2.5.2 Meaning transfer

McCracken’s transfer model is based on meanings and he suggests that the effectiveness of the endorser depends on the meaning the celebrity is bringing into the endorsement process and the brand (Schlecht, 2003; McCracken, 1989). Hence, he created the meaning transfer model in order to explain the celebrity endorsement process.Celebrities are full of different meanings e.g. demography (age, gender) personality and lifestyle types. This makes it obvious that a celebrity represents not only one meaning but rather a variety of several ones. These celebrity spokespersons are very useful in marketing brands since they provide the consumers with quite a few characteristics when evaluating the brands in question. Celebrities add value to the image transfer process because they are offering meanings of deepness and power from their personality and life styles, in comparison to non-famous endorsers (Schlecht, 2003).
The model illustrates a three-stage process of meaning transfer. This involves the creation of the celebrity image, transfer of meaning from the celebrity to the brand and the third stage is how the brand transfers image onto the consumers (Schlecht, 2003).

![Diagram of meaning transfer in the endorsement process (Schlecht, 2003)](image)

When the brand’s representative features should be determined, the consumers’ needs should be considered. Then the advertising company has to decide on what celebrity to choose and who possesses the most appropriate characteristics in relation to the brand. Simply, there has to be a congruence or fit between the celebrity and the product/brand (Schlecht, 2003).

### 2.5.3 Multiple brand endorsement

Nowadays, it is not unlikely that celebrity spokespersons can and are endorsing several or a specific brand. This situation is called multiple brand endorsement or even multiple celebrity endorsement. Advertising firms might share certain spokespersons and thus the celebrity will end up promoting more than one brand. An example of this is the actress Catherine Zeta-Jones who promoted both T-Mobile and Elizabeth Arden. Also, the golf champion Tiger Woods endorsed as much as three brands; American Express, Rolex and Nike. The marketers have to question if this kind of celebrity endorsement does affect consumer brand attitudes (Schlecht, 2003). However, consumers are becoming more knowledgeable within the field of marketing and they might think that the celebrity rather prefers to get paid instead of transferring any meaning to the product, which in turn will affect the consumer buying behaviour (Belch & Belch, 2001).

Previous experience explained by Redenbach (2005) shows that an endorsement of four different brands or products does indeed influence the celebrity’s credibility, trustworthiness, expertise and likeability. The reason for this is that a famous person, who endorses several products instead of only focusing and representing one specific brand, will eventually attain a lack of distinctiveness. However, one has to be aware that the use of multiple brand endorsement does not have to imply that it is useless. Researches have actually showed some potential positive effects like transfer of positive brand images. Also, the shape of consumers response gets affected positively when more than four products are being endorsed (Redenbach, 2005).

It can also be beneficial to endorse a product with multiple celebrities. Celebrity spokespersons represent a different mix of types, like gender and age. Using multiple celebrities in collaboration they can more effectively endorse a specific brand. The cosmetic manufacturer L’Oreal matches its wide range of product lines depending on the celebrities and their meanings (Redenbach, 2005).
2.6 Consumer

The continuously increasing competitiveness has triggered many advertisers to realize that they need to detect the consumers’ actual needs in order to satisfy them. By identifying the consumer buying behaviour, it is more likely that the marketers will target products and services directly towards the consumers’ needs. Marketing is about satisfying needs and therefore it is crucial for marketers to understand the relevance of human needs to buyer behaviour. Consumers tend to search for, purchase, use, evaluate, and dispose products/services that they expect will satisfy their needs (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2004).

The uses of endorsers or spokespersons as credible sources are nowadays being frequently used by advertisers in order to influence consumer’s attitudes and purchase intentions (Goldsmith, Lafferty & Newell, 2000). Credibility according to Belch & Belch (2001) means in this context the extent which the source is perceived as possessing expertise relevant to the communication topic and can be trusted to give an objective opinion related to the subject. Trustworthiness refers to the honesty and believability of the source whereas expertise is originated from the knowledge of the subject. Trustworthiness along with expertise are dimensions that are important to theorize credibility and it has been shown that they are very influential when influencing attitudes and persuading consumers.

2.6.1 Consumer behaviour and negative publicity

Publicity tends to be more credible and have more power than general marketing communications exerted by a company (Dean, 2004). Especially, negative publicity seems to have the tendency to damage the company’s image. This is mainly due to the fact that high credibility as well as the negativity effect has a tendency to be more reflected upon than positive information in the consumer’s evaluations. It is more likely that companies will receive bad exposure since the media prefers to present bad news. Till & Shimp (1998) support this statement and continues, explaining that companies have to be aware of the possibility of attaining negative publicity when using celebrities as endorsers, since this may effect the consumers’ perception of the brand.

The consumers’ support of a brand is of major importance for the prospect existence of a brand and the organization (Riezebos, 2003). If an incident occurs in relation to the brand, the consumer’s trust in the brand will fade and the consequence will affect the consumers purchasing behaviour. When consumers get questioned by marketers about their purchasing behaviour, they give the impression that incidents with brands do not influence their choices. Usually they also claim that neither advertising nor negative publicity affects them. Riezebos (2003) also states that the most objective way to determine this effect on consumers is to list changes in the market shares.

Moreover, if negative publicity leads to brand damage, the media can be seen both as the source/spreader of publicity simultaneously as challengers. In the case of source/spreader the media functions as a gate-keeper whereby it concentrates on those incidents that bring about newsworthiness. Other incidents with a high newsworthiness are relevant with a particular brand in crisis. This is true mainly because the other events can act as deflections and push away the negative publicity of the brand. An example of this “push away event” can be a natural disaster. The media can therefore also play an essential role in the challenge of negative publicity. In this case, one can think of the incident as possible but on the other hand the attention during this news should be spent on the rebuilding of a brand in order to retain the consumers and maintain the brand recognition (Riezebos, 2003). Louie & Obermiller (2002) explains the case of “negative events” as problems that can take
place when a famous person gets involved in incidents that change or damage his/her reputation. These kinds of circumstances can differ widely from misused exposure to an accident that holds back a celebrity’s ability to perform. In a study made by Till & Shimp (1998) it was found that negative information about a celebrity can harm how consumers perceive the product/brand through the connected link between the brand and celebrity.

When a company has a potential relationship with a celebrity, the consumers will not focus on the company but rather on the circumstances surrounding the celebrity. Consumer’s reaction may not be unpleasant when firms reject high blame potential endorsers since these could be harmful to the company’s image and the consumer buying behaviour. However, due to the reason of consumers being defensive, they are supposed to not react heavily when the potential endorsers have low blame. Also, endorser candidates can be more complex than the existing endorsers (Louie & Obermiller, 2002).

2.7 Chapter summary

The main purpose of this section is to introduce the features that are relevant when investigating which attributes consumers consider to be most appropriate for a company to keep in mind, before developing a celebrity endorsement strategy. The attributes have been elaborated from previous empirical findings within celebrity endorsement, where the main focus have been addressed on celebrities and the effect they have had on company, brand and consumer. Furthermore, the authors have narrowed this additionally and put the focal point on how negative information will affect the consumers and how this is linked to the three other phases in this thesis. These attributes will play the most important role when conducting the conjoint analysis, and they will be presented in section 3.3.1.

By analyzing many earlier studies, the authors came to the conclusion that most of these have been structured in a similar way. Basically, the starting point was to elicit the enormous role a celebrity have had on the modern advertising industry. Furthermore, many of these researchers have embarked on how the consumers get affected by celebrities (Till & Shimp, 1998, Söderlund, 2003, Silvera & Austad, 2004, Belch & Belch, 2001, McCracken, 1989). Only a few of them have concentrated on the negative effect a celebrity can have on consumers. This is the reason why, the authors chose to conduct this thesis from that nature.

These attributes are based on studies from both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The fact that similar or exact attributes are mentioned and discussed in the both research methods, only strengthen the thought that the attributes within this thesis are comprehensive. However, it can also be seen as a weakness in only using the already analyzed attributes since there might be other more important attributes that consumers might evaluate in this dynamic market. Hence, the time span limits the author’s ability to search for other innovative attributes. Despite this, earlier attributes will hopefully bring another understanding related to consumer’s perspective on celebrities in advertising.

The following attributes are elaborated on previous studies. These attributes are related to the company, celebrity and brand. The reason why no attributes are directly related to the consumer is because the research is conducted from a consumer perspective, which indirectly will lead to findings on what attributes consumers feel are most important for companies to take into account when celebrities get associated with negative publicity.
Company

The most important aspect that has been brought up is how well the celebrity “fits” (matches) with the company’s environment and the brand as well. Consumers might perceive a brand differently depending on what celebrity a company chooses. The greater “fit” between the celebrity and the brand, it is more likely for a consumer to accept this advertising tool. A good congruence between the beliefs of a celebrity and a company will enhance the brand recognition. Therefore, the authors believe that the “fit” (match) between the celebrity and company is rather important to investigate further on when a celebrity gets associated with negative information and if a change of the “fit” will in turn change consumer’s perception of a brand. This assumption is strengthened by Erdogan & Baker (2004); Pringle (2004); Brown (2003); Daneshvary & Schwer (2000); Louie & Obermiller, (2002); Kamins (1990); & Till & Shimp (1998) who claim that “fit” (match) can be considered as an attribute.

Celebrity

When talking about source credibility, both the attributes expertise and trustworthiness are included. Furthermore, the effectiveness of a message depends on the celebrities’ expertise and trustworthiness. The beliefs, opinions, attitudes and behaviour can be influenced by the information of a credible source. This occurs when the consumer (receiver) accepts a source influence when it comes to their personal attitude. Source attractiveness includes similarity and likeability which are also two attributes that will be used in the conjoint analysis. The underlying reason for this is because the authors feel they can play an important role when analyzing the celebrity’s expertise, trustworthiness, similarity and likeability and how that influences the consumers’ purchase behaviour when the celebrity gets associated with negative information (Erdogan et al, 2001; Ohanian, 1990; Till & Shimp, 1998; Silvera & Austad, 2004; Kamins, 1990; Daneshvary & Schwer, 2000; Kamins, Brand, Hoeke & Moe, 1989).

Brand

The most important aspect to consider when talking about brand and celebrity is to what extent a celebrity can transfer any meaning to the brand itself. Therefore, the more a celebrity has the ability to transfer meanings to the brand, the more a consumer will associate with the celebrity. Hence, when a celebrity gets associated with negative information, it might occur that the celebrity loses the ability to transfer the right meaning to the brand as the company would like to. This indicates also that the consumer will get affected, sometimes in a positive way and sometimes negatively. Therefore, the authors assume this is an important attribute to study, in the sense on how consumers react to the meaning a celebrity transfers, when negative information is associated with a certain celebrity (Schlecht, 2003; Redenbach, 2005; Till & Shimp, 1998; Walgren, Ruble & Donthu, 1995; Gwinner, 1997).

2.7.1 Hypotheses

To summarize this, one can conclude that the presented attributes are considered as the personal characteristics of a celebrity. However, the main purpose of this thesis is to study which attributes that a company has to consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative information. To be able to fulfill the purpose of this thesis and also answer the research questions (the first and second) that are posed in section 1.5, the authors find it very appropriate to investigate if there is a relationship between the consumer willingness to purchase a product or service, with the presented attributes in a conjunction. Therefore,
the first hypothesis deals with if the consumers really get affected by the chosen attributes from the literature review. This leads us in to the following hypothesis:

\[ H_A: \text{The celebrity-product combination attributes expertise, trustworthiness, similarity, likeability, meaning transfer, and “fit” (match) affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service also under condition of negative information.} \]

As in research question two, the authors are aiming to understand if the consumers are affected differently by these attributes when different celebrities are used as endorsers. Therefore, the authors are very keen on investigating if consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service differs when using different celebrities. This leads us into the second hypothesis:

\[ H_B: \text{The relative importance of specific celebrity-product combination attributes is different depending on which specific celebrity is used as endorser.} \]
3 Methodology

This chapter will describe the choice of methods and how the process of gathering empirical data will occur to fulfil the purpose of this thesis. The approach that will be used is a quantitative one, and the survey will be analysed through a conjoint experiment.

3.1 Introduction

Many researchers have supported the idea of using a multi-method approach in a marketing research study. Flick (2002) & Carson, Gilmore, Perry & Gronhaug (2001), are just a few to mention and they further claimed that a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches can lead to interesting and exciting explorations within a research study. The integration of these two methods should also be seen as complementary rather than rivalry. Moreover, Flick (2002) suggested that a thorough qualitative pre-study should be carried out in order for a quantitative study to be successful. However, due to the time span the authors have with the thesis they decided that a multi-method-approach cannot be undertaken. Therefore, the authors have decided upon conducting a quantitative research. In a quantitative method according to Esaiaisson, Gilljam, Oscarsson & Wägnerud (2002) the study is based on collected data that can be expressed in numbers to be estimated later.

The reason for this choice of method is based on the fact that many companies claim themselves to be consumer-driven, but still fail when conducting a marketing research, this because they are only running focus groups, sending out questionnaires, and analysing sales data (Gustafsson, Herrmann, & Huber, 2001). However, the main reason for this failure is basically that the company does not understand the consumer needs and has a lack of information about the market (Iggland, 1989). From the perspective of the purpose of this thesis, the authors are aiming to identify the most important factors a company should consider from consumers point of view, when a celebrity gets associated with negative information. Therefore, a quantitative approach will provide this thesis with better results that will lead to the process of drawing general conclusions and to get an overall picture among the larger sample (Gustafsson et al., 2001). As stated in the multi-method approach, conducting focus groups as a pre-study will favour the study of this thesis. But, at the same time many researchers have embarked on the concept or the use of celebrity endorsement, and therefore they have come to the conclusion that some factors are more beneficial for a company to consider when using a celebrity in their endorsement strategies (McCracken, 1989; Severn, Belch & Belch, 1990; Erdogen et al., 2001; Wheeler, 2003; Silvera & Austad, 2004; Till & Shimp, 1998, Till & Busler, 1998). The authors of this thesis have therefore chosen to use the recommended attributes when conducting a quantitative approach, and exclude the use of focus group or any other pre-study.

The attributes have been divided within the frame of this thesis, company, celebrity, brand, and consumer. Basically, one can say that this thesis has four different phases. Hence, relevant attributes have been directly addressed to each phase and research questions have been developed. The authors will aim to find proper results for each research question in an efficient way in order to identify the diverse consumer needs.

3.2 Sampling

The most important aspect a researcher has to keep in mind is how to determine an appropriate research population and a proper sampling procedure. According to Churchill (1995) the sampling procedure can be divided into probability and non-probability
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sampling. Furthermore, Saunders et al. (2003) explains probability sampling, as the chance of each case being selected from the population which is known. In non-probability sampling there is an assumption that there is an even distribution of characteristics within the population. Within business research it is often not possible to specify the probability that any case will be included in the sample and thus, the sample must be selected some other way (Churchill, 1995).

Probability sampling involves the selection of a sample from a population, based on the principle of randomization or chance (Aczel & Sounderpendian, 2002). Hence, probability sampling is more complex in the sense that it sometimes involves two different stages of sampling. Therefore, it can be considered to be more time consuming and more costly than a non-probability sampling (Saunders et. al, 2003). Non-probability sampling is cheaper and used when a sampling frame is not available. Also, this method is used in a research where there is an interest of obtaining an idea of responses on ideas that people have (Churchill, 1995). Based on this discussion, the sampling technique that will be used in this thesis is non-probability sampling. The main argument for this is the limited time and the expenses. Additionally, the authors have no sampling frame available and want to keep the research to a low cost while putting the main interest on getting hold of responses that people have.

When conducting non-probability sampling, the main assumption a researcher makes is that there is an even distribution of characteristics within the population. In doing this, the sample would be representative which will also lead to that the results will be truthful (Aczel & Sounderpendian, 2002). Furthermore, non-probability sampling provides a range of alternative techniques based on the researchers’ subjective judgement and examples of these are: quota sampling, purposive sampling, snowball sampling and convenience sampling (Saunders et al, 2003).

To be able to fulfil the purpose of this thesis, the main focus lies on the consumers’ assumptions, and also the most important factors that are related to celebrities that get associated with negative information. Therefore, the authors believe quota sampling is most appropriate. This sampling technique means that a researcher has the ability to get information from a respondent in the easiest way (Esaiasson et al., 2002), which in this case is on the campus area in University of Jönköping. Quota sampling was chosen because there will be a sampling focus on students at University of Jönköping. The underlying factor for this statement is according to Tang, Kim & Tang (2002); Till & Shimp (1998), that students are more conscious about celebrities and the authors also believe that they will gain more valuable information from students. Furthermore, to be able to get a wider understanding and strengthen the assumption that the students that are selected are similar to those not selected, the authors will not focus on one faculty and therefore take the four faculties into consideration. Basically, Saunders et al. (2003) argue that the sampling is done, when a specific number of units (quotas) for various sub-populations have been selected. This means that the main population in this case are the students at University of Jönköping, and the sub-population is the students at each faculty.

Shepherd and Zacharakis (1997) state that the sample size used in a conjoint analysis is smaller than 250 respondents, which is the normal amount in a required standard survey. Furthermore, they state that 50 respondents is a very sufficient amount of respondent, when conducting a conjoint analysis. As mentioned before, the total population is the students at Jönköping University. Furthermore, Saunders et al. (2003) state that the quotas may be based on population proportions. To facilitate the understanding for the reader, the authors chose to present the sample population and how the quotas are selected in table 3.1.
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Table 3-1: Numbers of Students at Jönköping University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percentage of students</th>
<th>Quota of students in sample of 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIBS(^1)</td>
<td>1 750</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING(^2)</td>
<td>1 800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLK(^3)</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHJ(^4)</td>
<td>2 116</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 666</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Conjoint Analysis

Conjoint analysis is a measurement technique that is concerned with an understanding of how people make choices between products or services, or a combination of them that better meet the consumers underlying needs (Gustafsson, Herrmann, & Huber, 2001). Rather than asking respondents for their self-perceptions of what attributes determine their choices, conjoint analysis investigations ask consumers to rank or rate “complete” or “full profile” descriptions objects. The importance of each specific attribute is tested out in the statistical analysis. Therefore, conjoint analysis has been recognized as an extremely powerful way of capturing what really drives consumers to purchase a product over another and what consumers really value (Green & Srinivasan, 1990; Green, 2001). Moreover, conjoint analysis can according to Malthotra (1996) and Green & Srinivasan (1990) be used when developing a model that enables companies to understand consumers’ needs. This is also important knowledge to be able to improve their market shares and as well as understand how competitors’ behaviour will affect their consumers.

Conjoint analysis has been used within many different research areas, such as consumer behavior (Bruns, 2004), and in different marketing areas (segmentation, positioning, preference models) (Green & Srinivasan, 1990; Malhotra, 1996; Gustafsson, Herrmann & Huber, 2001). As one can tell, conjoint analysis is an efficient research method when the aim is to investigate and understand how consumers evaluate different combinations. Within the frame of the thesis, the authors aim to understand what the underlying factors consumers consider to be most important considering the aim of this thesis.

The main reason to the decision to conduct a conjoint analysis is developed from the aim to fully understand how consumers are driven in evaluating a celebrity that gets associated with negative information. Also, a standard survey will not provide the authors with enough data to be able to draw conclusions and present a model for companies that seek to use a celebrity in their endorsement strategy. Hence, the respondents in a standard survey

\(^1\) Jönköping International Business School

\(^2\) Engineering School

\(^3\) School of Education and Communication

\(^4\) School of Health and Science
Methodology

will only evaluate each attribute (factor) separately, and therefore not provide a general impression of the use of celebrity in an endorsement strategy. But, in a conjoint analysis the respondents are asked to rate different combinations of attributes at different levels and in doing this the authors believe they will gain more valuable information that will facilitate the creating of a model that embarks the concept, celebrity endorsement.

There are no specific and reliable approaches to evaluate the validity and reliability in a conjoint analysis. Hence, according to Antilla, Heuvel & Möller (1980) the choice of attributes and their levels are very determined when it comes to validity and reliability. To be able to reach a high validity, Antilla et al (1980), argues that a respondent needs to evaluate realistic attributes, such as expertise and trustworthiness.

3.3.1 Attributes and attribute level

When choosing the attributes and the levels of attributes, it is according to Ekdahl (1997), very important that they are realistic and related to the problem. Furthermore, he states that the number should be as small as possible to minimize estimation efforts. Bruns (2004), also states that the first steps in designing a conjoint study is to develop a set of attributes and their levels.

Furthermore, to be able to conduct a conjoint analysis one has to identify the most important attributes that a consumer assumes to be of most importance in their purchase behaviour (Antilla et al, 1980; Green & Srinivasan, 1990). From the perspective of this thesis, the attributes can be chosen from previous studies, both qualitative and quantitative research methods, concerning the use of celebrity endorsement in marketing.

When deciding upon different levels of an attribute, one has to consider whether the attributes are quantitative or qualitative. The attributes that are presented in table 3-2 are from a quantitative base. This indicates that the level of the attributes will be easier to estimate.

Table 3-2: Attributes and attribute level of the conjoint experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be able to create attribute levels both the authors and the respondents have to understand the clear difference of level which an attribute is attached to (Van Der Pol & Ryan, 1996). From the literature review, it has been proven several times, that the attributes and their levels presented in table 3-2 are very applicable when studying celebrity endorsement (Erdogan, Baker & Tagg, 2001; Ohanian, 1990; Till & Shimp, 1998; Silvera &
3.3.2 Different approaches of conjoint analysis

When one considers conducting a conjoint analysis, there are many different approaches to reflect upon. However, the most popular one is a full profile approach (Green & Srinivasan, 1990) when the amounts of attributes are not less then six and at the most eight. They recommended using trade-off matrices, when a larger number of attributes are used. Furthermore, they also argued that when the number reaches ten or more attributes, a researcher should use self-explicated data and methods involving a combination of self-explicated and conjoint data. The latest recommendation can be compared to an Adaptive Conjoint Analysis (ACD). The ACD has gained more acceptances in recent years, due to that it can accommodate a larger number of attributes, where it combines self-explicated data with pairs in comparison to intensity ratings (Johnson, 1987).

The approach, full profile, is chosen by the authors to gather relevant data for further analysis. The main reason is based on the amount of attributes that the authors decided to support their research on (see table 3-2). The amounts of attributes are six, which indicates that a full profile is the most suitable approach for this study. However, this can be seen as a negative aspect due to that the respondents should not be overloaded. Therefore, the authors decided upon attributes that are relevant to the purpose of this thesis and also not overwhelming for the respondent.

3.3.3 Experimental design

Before designing the survey one has to distinguish and make clarifications concerning dependent and independent variables. According to Antilla et al. (1980) the dependent variable can be seen as the preference which can be explained by a number of independent variables. The dependent variable used in this study is: the willingness to purchase. In other words, the analysis aims at finding out what attributes affect the most respondents in their purchasing decisions, in the context of a celebrity being associated with negative publicity.

The independent variables can also be considered as attributes, which in this case are six different ones at two levels. Furthermore, the basic assumption for a conjoint experiment is that the attributes are known in advance (Bruns, 2004). This means that the researcher can select the attributes that are most appropriate for the study from literature and previous empirical findings. The authors support this assumption and have presented the choice of attributes more in-depth in chapter two. After clarifying and deciding upon the dependent and independent variables one can start designing the experiment.

When designing the experiment one has to keep in mind how the respondents will interpret it and as well understand it. In the case of conjoint analysis, the experiment will be based on different generated combinations or conjoint profiles, in this case 64, which also is a full factorial design. The surveys are usually not performed as full factorial design, but rather as fractional factorial designs, which basically are fractions of the full design. The reason that researchers use fractional factorial designs, according to Ekdahl (1997), is that they usually are utilized in order to add more attributes into the combinations and at the same time to not increase the strain on the respondents. One can for sure use a full factorial design, when collecting data, but according to Bruns (2004), there will be too many combinations for a respondent to rate and still provide valid results. Therefore, the
most important reason for limiting the experiment according to Bruns (2004) is to keep the number of cases manageable while still creating valid results.

In this case the authors came to the decision that two levels and six attributes will provide this thesis with valid results. Furthermore, the assessment of six attributes with two levels for each variable would lead to 64 \( \left(2^6\right) \) hypothetical combinations which is a full factorial design. This according to Green & Srinivasan (1978) would be an overwhelming task for each respondent to evaluate and still give consistent and meaningful answers. Therefore, Gustafsson et al. (2001) argues that it is important to keep the number of cases to be evaluated to as few as appropriate and possible, but still have enough cases to generate significant and valid results. This is the reason why an orthogonal fractional factorial design will be applied (Green & Srinivasan, 1978; Bruns, 2004). In doing this, the number of combinations will be reduced from 64 to 8 which is according to Ekdahl (1997) a sufficient number of combinations to conduct a conjoint analysis. But, Ekdahl (1997) also argued that a suitable fractional factorial design for six attributes at two levels could be \(2^{6-2}-2^2=16\) combinations. Furthermore, he stated that the fractional factorial designs are generally more resource effective, and in the case of conjoint analysis more feasible.

Shepherd & Zacharakis (1997) have another view of the amount of combinations that is sufficient when conducting a conjoint analysis. They claimed that duplexing the amount of combinations will lead to more valid results as well as reduced bias. This means that the number of the total amount of combinations will be duplicated into 16, when the fractional factorial design is \( 2^4 \) (8 combinations) and into 32 when the fractional factorial design is \( 2^5 \) (16 combination), and still be manageable. Conversely, Smith, Schullen & Barr (2002) argues that it is even applicable and manageable to use less than 100 combinations where the respondents are able to judge satisfactorily. They also state that the amount of combinations is related to the nature of the purpose and what the authors want to achieve.

By taking both of these approaches into consideration, the amount of combinations (8 or 16), which will be sufficient to fulfil the purpose of this thesis, have made the authors question it. Therefore, to not decrease the reliability of this thesis and the ability to maintain accurate data to reach a sati factional conclusion, the authors chose to test both 8 and 16 combination in duplex form, before conducting the collection of data which leads us into the next section.

### 3.3.4 Pilot study

When constructing the experiment, crucial feedback from the respondents were given to the authors, who realized that 32 combinations would be too extensive for the respondents and therefore the authors chose to keep it to 16 combinations. Other crucial feedbacks were given, both positive and negative. The positive ones were that the instructions and description of the attributes and levels were straightforward. The main concern was how to deal with the combinations and the question related to them. The respondents interpreted the question differently, which also affected their ratings. When asking them how they were thinking, the authors could clearly see a pattern of different interpretations. Therefore, the authors found it highly important to re-phrase the question, which later on showed that the interpretation of the question did not differ in a crucial matter. In appendix 3, an extract from the pilot study will be presented.

### 3.3.5 Data collection

There are usually two types of scales used in conjoint analysis surveys; rating and rank order (Ekdahl, 1997). Furthermore, Gustafsson (1996) explains five different response
scales, where a conjoint analysis can be conducted. These are: rank order, rating, verbal rating, first rank order and then distribute the concepts on a scale, and first rate and then rank order among combinations with the same rating. When the respondents are asked to rank the combinations, which is rather easy for them, they will only provide information that is in order of preferences and not stating the degree of preferences (Green & Srinivasan, 1978). Ranking is also not suitable for postal questionnaires, since the respondents require help to facilitate their task. Verbal rating (would buy and would not buy) is also not useful for postal questionnaires as it is most applicable for low involvement products. The rating scale (1-7 or 1-9), makes the respondents evaluate each combination separately in regard to other combinations. The first mentioned scale will be used in this thesis for data collection. The reason for this is that the authors want each combination to be evaluated separately, while the respondents assume that a celebrity gets associated with negative publicity. Also, the results will be more integrated and understandable in comparison to a scale of 1-9, which can provide too averaged results. Furthermore, after the pilot study was conducted, the authors came to the conclusion that a rating scale from 1 to 7 will make it easier for the respondents to evaluate the different combinations. This is also stated by Smith et al. (2002) who claimed that this rating scale is normally expected to show fulfilling reliability and variability.

3.3.6 The survey

The main survey is divided into five different parts: (1) presentation and task instructions for the respondent; (2) description of the attributes and their levels; (3) the combinations (conjoint profiles); (4) a post-experiment questionnaire; (5) a short questionnaire concerning the respondents’ characteristics. The complete survey is presented in appendix 2.

In the first part the respondents were instructed to assume that the celebrity was associated with negative information, and from that rate each combination in order to show which factors a company should consider in such particular case. The second part the authors believe it is highly important for the respondents to understand the meaning of each attribute and their levels, to facilitate for the respondent and to provide the authors with more accurate data. Thirdly, the combinations will be presented in a verbal description where the attributes will be introduced sequentially. The order in which the attributes are presented is crucial since the results depend highly on this. Two different cases will be provided for the respondents to facilitate their rating of the attributes. In the fourth part the respondents will be asked to evaluate the different attributes and state how important they are for a company to consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative publicity.

Lastly, the authors are not seeking to segment the total population based on the answers that are given. This leads to no particular interest in demographical information, such as age, sex, income etc. This is why, in the short questionnaire, the authors only asked about their personal characteristics and how well fashion-oriented they are. Even though the authors randomly chose respondents within each school, they avoided asking respondents that are not conscious about fashion in order to enhance the validity. By using non-probability sampling the authors’ choice of data collection was supported.

3.4 Statistics

When conducting the regression analysis (multiple regressions) in SPSS, an understanding is needed to see how well the experiment has been explained by the regression. When looking at the significance of F (P-value) it shows how much of the results that can be
attributed to chance. This means the percentage of data, which is not explained by the right choice of attributes and attribute levels. The significance (P-value) has to be higher than 5 percent in order to support the results (Gustafsson et al. 2001).

Moreover, the significance is divided into different levels depending on how significant the results are, and the following levels are presented below: (Körner & Wahlgren, 1998)

Three star significant (***): $P$-value $<$ 0.1 %

Two star significant (**): 0.1 % $<$ $P$-value $<$ 1.0 %

One star significant (*): 1.0 % $<$ $P$-value $<$ 5.0 %
4 Analysis and results

In this chapter, the authors present the analysis and results. The most relevant findings is brought up, which the authors believe are important to fulfil the purpose. Furthermore, an analysis is conducted which leads to the decision on which attributes are most important.

4.1 Introduction

The research survey for this thesis has been divided into a conjoint experiment and two short questionnaires to be able to fulfil the purpose of this thesis. Firstly, the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service when the attributes are in a conjunction is presented. Secondly, an investigation will be brought up to see if the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service differs when different endorsers are used. The results for both these parts are received from the conjoint experiment. Data which is derived from the conjoint experiment, according to Shepherd & Zacharakis (1997) can be used through two statistical techniques, regression analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Finally, an analysis will be presented of the standard deviation and mean value when it comes to how consumers perceive each attribute separately.

The authors will introduce the results from the research process, where each part is related to a research question and there are also hypotheses addressed to the two first research questions. The last research question deals with the two last parts in the research process. To facilitate the structure of this chapter the authors want to make it clear for the reader how the different research questions are linked to the research process. This will be explained in the table 4-1.

Table 4-1 Outline of research process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question 1</th>
<th>Conjoint experiment, combination 1-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Research question 2 | Conjoint experiment, combination 1-8 case 1 (Michael Jackson).  
|                     | Conjoint experiment, combination 9-16 case 2 (Bill Clinton). |
| Research question 3 | Questionnaires regarding post-experiment and respondents characteristics. |

4.2 Research question 1

Which factors from the literature review affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service that is endorsed by a celebrity that is associated with negative information, when the attributes are in a combination?

Firstly, the level of importance of each attribute is presented when the respondents evaluated the combinations. There are only small differences between the attributes in general (see appendix 4A). However, when comparing each bar some attributes are on a higher level than the other ones. In all of the combinations, expertise was seen as the most important attribute followed by trustworthiness, similarity and likeability. All of these attributes, as was mentioned in the literature review, are directly connected to the celebrity and company. This implies that the choice and use of a celebrity is crucial since it appears
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clearly in the findings that these attributes influence the consumer mostly. Moreover, even though the level of importance between these four attributes differs slightly, they seem to affect the consumers combined with each other. The other two attributes, meaning transfer and “fit” match, showed a lower level of importance than the first mentioned four attributes. The results indicate that the meaning transfer a celebrity shifts to a certain brand is more important than how well the fit between the celebrity and brand is. Both meaning transfer and “fit” are directly connected to celebrity and brand.

Looking further into how each individual rated each combination, one can clearly see (see appendix 4B) that “fit” and meaning transfer do not show any indications of high divergence. The respondents seem to have similar opinions regarding these attributes meaning that they are not considered to be the most crucial attributes when purchasing a product/service. At the same time, the authors can strengthen this statement that the other four attributes, expertise, trustworthiness, similarity and likeability have the greatest impact on the consumers’ willingness to purchase when a celebrity is used as an endorser. One can further on see that combination 12 has the highest mean value with a level of 4.9, which makes it the most important combination and basically the winning concept. When looking at the concept (see appendix 4C) the most important attributes are expertise, trustworthiness, similarity and likeability, which also strengthen what is given from the importance summary.

4.2.1 Testing the hypothesis

As mentioned before this part of the research deals with the 16 combinations. When conducting a multiple regression analysis, one has to take into account the different statistical terms, such as R-square and the significance level. These terms are presented in the model summary (see appendix 7A). When looking at the table, R-square is 0.316 which means that 31.6 % of the observed variability of the willingness to purchase is explained by the attributes. Furthermore, $R^2$ is the squared correlation coefficient between the observed values of the dependent variable and the predicted value based on the regression model. A value close to 1 tells you that the dependent variable can be perfectly predicted from the independent variable, whereas a value close to 0 proves the opposite. The $R^2$ value in this case is 31.6 %, which is a moderately good model fit for this type of data.

Due to loss of degrees of freedom, however, the adjusted $R^2$ is only 12.8%. This loss of degrees of freedom also explains why the significant value for the model is as high as 0.078 that is higher than the 5% conventionally used in significant testing. However, this is still a significant result on the 10% level and given the theoretical support for these attributes our conclusion is that the results are more in favour of the than against hypothesis $H_A$.

$$H_A: \text{The celebrity-product combination attributes expertise, trustworthiness, similarity, likeability, meaning transfer, and “fit” (match) affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service also under condition of negative information.}$$

4.2.2 Results research question 1

As consumer willingness to purchase a product or service gets affected by the attributes, taken from the literature reviews, one can argue that these attributes are relevant when it comes to celebrity endorsement strategy. Furthermore, these attributes showed different levels of importance for consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service that is endorsed by a celebrity that is associated with negative information. It was also proven in
the findings that expertise, trustworthiness, similarity and likeability of a celebrity (source attractiveness and credibility) have a strong impact on consumers. The perceived expertise of an endorser is more important when it comes to the purchasing intentions, rather than trustworthiness. Hence, the celebrity (source) needs to first and foremost be an expert in the endorsement strategy and secondly be trustworthy in order to reach to the consumer (receiver). The other attributes linked to a celebrity are also of importance and a crucial aspect to bear in mind is that a celebrity, who is seen as having all these six attributes linked to him/her, is more likely to reach a certain target compared to a celebrity who only is perceived as linked with one main attribute. As the “fit” and meaning transfer do not show any indications of importance, one can say that consumers do not find a celebrity that is associated with negative information to affect the relationship it has with the brand or company. Finally, when looking at the importance summary one can see that the attributes are relatively important, but mostly when it comes to expertise, trustworthiness, similarity and likeability. Studying the 16 combinations in the multiple regressions, the authors find the regression to be significant since there is no high skewness and at the same time it strengthens the acceptance of the hypothesis.

4.3 Research question 2
Do the attributes from the literature review have different impacts on consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service, when different celebrities are used as endorsers?

In this section, an investigation on how the respondents rated the different combinations related to each case is presented. The reason in doing this is to see how consumers perceive the use of different celebrities as endorser. This is also done to find if consumers react equally no matter what celebrity is used at the same time as the particular celebrity is associated with negative information.

4.3.1 Case 1
Looking at the importance summary (see appendix 5A) of how the respondents rated the attributes in this case, the authors can conclude that the most important attribute was likeability followed by expertise. Trustworthiness was nearly as important followed by meaning transfer and similarity. Lastly, “fit” was not considered to affect the respondents’ willingness to purchase, as much as the previously mentioned attributes. The individual subject importance (see appendix 5B) shows that likeability is clearly the most important attribute since the respondents agree upon its importance, while the other attributes are perceived very different individually. This indicates that the respondents have different perceptions to the characteristics of the celebrity.

4.3.2 Case 2
The importance summary (see appendix 6A) tells us that the most important attributes for the respondents were trustworthiness and meaning transfer. The third attribute that the respondents considered to be important was “fit”. The three other attributes, expertise, similarity and likeability were considered to be of equal importance. The authors can further on claim, when looking at the individual subject importance (see appendix 6B), that trustworthiness was more important than meaning transfer based on that it was rated higher. Meaning transfer and “fit” were rated equally, but one can see that meaning transfer was in most cases more important. Lastly, when looking at appendix 6B, one can see that expertise, similarity and likeability are, as mentioned before, like wisely important. Similarity was slightly more important in comparison with the other two, due to the diverse rating.
4.3.3 Testing the hypothesis

When testing this hypothesis the authors intend to compare the importance values across the two regressions in case one and two. Furthermore, a comparison between the $R^2$ values in both cases is made. Looking at the importance summary of the attributes (see appendix 5A and 6A) in both cases, one can clearly see a significant difference on how the respondents perceive the attributes when different celebrities are used.

In case one the $R^2$ is 18.5% and in case two it is 25.6% (see appendix 7C and 7E). As shown there is a difference between the $R^2$ values, which also supports the hypothesis that there is a difference in the perception of the attributes, depending on which specific celebrity is used as endorser.

\[ H_0: \text{The relative importance of specific celebrity-product combination attributes is different depending on which specific celebrity is used as endorser.} \]

4.3.4 Results research question 2

The hypothesis shows that consumers willingness to purchase or not is affected by a celebrity’s characteristics (the attributes from the literature review). This means that consumers think and act differently depending on a particular celebrity who is used in the endorsement strategy. This also indicates that companies need to take this into account when choosing a celebrity, since the mechanism of negative publicity associated with a celebrity does not necessarily has to mean that the consumers choose not to purchase the endorsed brand. Instead, a company need to have in mind that the willingness to purchase a product/service depends highly on to what extent consumers perceive a celebrity as possessing the six attributes. The higher perception of a celebrity, the more likely and willing they will be to purchase. Since two different celebrities were used in each case, one can clearly see that consumers tend to evaluate a celebrity’s personal characteristics in various ways.

In case one, the attributes likeability and expertise were rated as the most important ones while “fit” was not seen as playing an important role. In case two however, trustworthiness and meaning transfer were rated as most important whereas likeability surprisingly was seen as the least important attribute. This clearly shows that there are clear differences between how consumers perceive different celebrities depending on what characteristics they possess and in what certain situation they are in. Also, as was mentioned in chapter two, it was indicated that when consumers get asked about their purchasing behaviour they usually give the impression that negative publicity in relation with brands do not usually affect their choices. However, the authors feel that consumers purchasing behaviours might occur unconsciously and even though they claim that negative publicity does not have any influence on them, they most likely can. Furthermore, the authors can argue that the attributes from the literature review are differently perceived in relationships with different celebrities.

4.4 Research question 3

Which attributes do consumers find of most importance when evaluating them separately?

In this section of the empirical study, the respondents were asked to evaluate the six different attributes separately. The reason is to compare the results from the conjoint with the survey, which in can either strengthen the research process or indicate that the respondents are not fully aware of their own decision criteria.
### 4.4.1 Perceived importance of attributes

In this section, the respondents were asked to rate the self-perceived importance of each attribute. Each of the six attributes was evaluated on a scale ranging from 1, *unimportant*, to 5, *important*. The results of the respondents’ perceived importance of the attributes are averaged and illustrated in table 4-1.

Table 4-2 Ranging of attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean of the self-perceived weights ranged from 3.0 for *likeability* to 4.3 for *trustworthiness*. This indicates that the respondents perceived *trustworthiness* as the most important followed by expertise. The “fit” match was ranked as the third most important attribute followed by *similarity* and *meaning transfer* which both were rated of equal importance. Lastly, the least important attribute is *likeability* (see appendix 8).

### 4.4.2 Results research question 3

The respondents rated the importance of the attributes in general and this is why one can see clear differences between which attributes are important and less important. Since the consumers believe that the celebrity’s credibility is the most important, where both trustworthiness and expertise are included, one can say that the consumers are more affected by a celebrity’s positive characteristics. Furthermore, how well the celebrity communicates the message that the company is trying to send, affects the consumers purchasing decision. As it was stated that expertise and trustworthiness are the most importance attributes, one can clearly state that the consumers value the knowledge, understanding and ethical aspects of celebrity more than the other personal characteristics. This also implies that companies should take these attributes more into account when choosing a celebrity as an endorser. This is because if a particular celebrity gets associated with negative information it will not affect the brand equity or lead to a decrease in the market shares as much. At the same time, the celebrity will still transfer necessary information that a consumer can find crucial and that potentially can lead to a purchase. It was also found in this research that a celebrity’s attractiveness does not affect the consumers in any way, which can be shocking for many consumers since they may assume that the use of celebrity endorsement is mainly beneficial for a company due to a celebrity’s attractiveness.
4.5 Chapter summary

As the journey to find the hidden factors that companies need to consider when using celebrities in advertising is heading towards its end, the authors need to clarify some crucial aspects. Since, the focus throughout this thesis has been conducted from consumer’s point of view; the authors will from now on consider the respondents in this research process as consumers.

The authors can clearly state that the strategy of using celebrity endorsement is an efficient way to reach out to a diverse audience. The focal point throughout this study was the investigation on how willing consumers are to purchase a brand based on the attributes elaborated from the literature review, in relation to a celebrity that gets associated with negative information. At this point the authors can clearly present facts that consumers are affected by celebrities and that negative information that a celebrity is associated with can play an important role occasionally. In the promotional campaign where celebrities are included, the purpose is to send out optimal information to the consumers that will lead to a purchase. Taken the hypothesis A into account one can say that consumers are willing to purchase a product or service based on the attributes taken from the literature review, when they are in a combination. On the other hand, when investigating hypothesis B the authors came to the understanding that the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service is affected by a particular celebrity, when the celebrity has the mentioned attributes as personal characteristics. Therefore, marketers in advertising agencies need to be aware that a celebrity’s personality together with brand- and the consumers individual personalities (triangular relationship) are integrated, and the higher the linkage is between these three parts the less likely consumers will get affected negatively by negative information.

Since it was shown from the three different sections in this chapter (research question 1-3) that the consumers rated the attributes differently based on the different cases, the authors can at this point claim that consumers tend to perceive attributes in various ways. But, to keep the focus within the frame of this thesis, the authors chose to analyze the relationship between the ratings of the different concepts with how the consumers rated each attribute separately. Firstly, when rating the 16 combinations, the most important attributes (expertise, trustworthiness, similarity, likeability) are linked with the celebrity’s characteristics (see section 2.4). On the other hand, the attribute meaning transfer which is linked with the brand and “fit” which in turn is linked with the company are not considered to have a particular importance. In the case of Michael Jackson, the three most important factors (likeability, expertise, trustworthiness) are also linked to the celebrity. At the same time, meaning transfer and “fit” are once again not perceived as crucial factors. However, in the case of Bill Clinton both meaning transfer and “fit” were considered to be important followed by trustworthiness, and the other three attributes as less important. What can be said from this, from the different levels of importance in the different cases? It is as simple as the celebrities themselves and the brand they are endorsing affects how consumers react to the different attributes in a combination. When comparing the two cases with the total rating of the 16 combinations, one can see that trustworthiness in all cases is vital whereas the other attributes are rated differently. One can also clearly understand that in the 16 combinations, expertise was seen as the absolute important attribute which is also indicated to be important in the case of Michael Jackson but less important in the case of Bill Clinton. This can be due to the product Clinton was endorsing. Therefore, the authors believe that expertise also has a crucial affect when a celebrity gets associated with negative information. This due to that expertise was perceived
and ranked as the second most important when the consumers rated the attributes separately. Furthermore, as the authors aim to reach a general conclusion, expertise would be an accurate attribute to include when choosing a celebrity in advertising purposes.

Finally, based on everything mentioned so far in this thesis, the authors can summarize the most important factors that companies need to consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative information. Basically, all attributes are important when using a celebrity as an endorser but in the case when a celebrity gets associated with negative information, the authors evaluated all the six attributes and compared them and came to decide upon the following attributes to be the most crucial attribute to be taken into account when choosing and using a certain celebrity.

**Trustworthiness:** the reason why this attribute is important is basically that it was ranked highly both when the consumers rated it in combination in all cases and when they rated it separately. Therefore, there are several reasons in concluding it as the most crucial attribute.

**Expertise:** has been rated differently in each case but it was only rated as having a low importance in the case of Bill Clinton. Despite this, the authors believe that it is an important attribute to consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative information. The reason for the low rating with the Clinton study could be explained as the product which he promoted and also that consumers did not consider him being very knowledgeable in that particular field.

The remaining four attributes; meaning transfer, likeability, similarity, and “fit” did not in most cases show a high level of importance but rather an indication of average importance. Thus, the authors do not find them to be crucial for a company when they use a celebrity in the endorsement strategy. However, these can still be of importance in conjunction with the two first mentioned attributes. This is based upon that likeability in the case of Michael Jackson showed to be the most important attribute whereas when the attributes were rated separately, this attribute was seen as the least important one. The remaining three showed a relatively averaged importance and are therefore not crucially unimportant. But, at the same time they are not the driving mechanism to successful brand recognition when using a celebrity in advertising.
5 Conclusions and discussion

In this chapter the authors will finally provide the reader with direct answers to the posed research questions. Furthermore, final words from the authors will be given. Lastly, a discussion within the research area will be elaborated and implications to prospect studies in the area of celebrity endorsement will be given.

5.1 Introduction

This thesis investigated consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service based on the six attributes that were retrieved from the literature review. In the introduction chapter, three research questions were identified. The direct answers to the research questions will be more specified in section 5.2. To be able to answer these questions, the quota sampling of 75 university students in the campus of University of Jönköping was studied. These students were asked to evaluate 16 hypothetical cases, which are based on the attributes retrieved from the literature review and they were asked to indicate the willingness to purchase a product or service.

Furthermore, the literature review provided the authors with relevant information of the crucial attributes that are associated with celebrity endorsement. These attributes have previously been used when gaining an optimal use of a celebrity as an endorser (see figure 1-1). Thus, it has led to the focal point of this thesis which is to investigate whether the attributes from the literature review really affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service, when a celebrity is associated with negative information.

The authors came to the conclusion after conducting the research process that two of the six attributes are the most important attributes a company should consider before choosing and using a celebrity, due to the possibility that a celebrity can get associated with negative information. This will further on be elaborated on in section 5.3. Before tackling and starting this discussion, the authors will answer the research questions. The last section of this chapter will, after all the different elements within this thesis, present suggestions that can be undertaken in future studies.

5.2 Research questions

Which factors from the literature review affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service that is endorsed by a celebrity that is associated with negative information, when the attributes are in a combination?

As it has been proven in this thesis, the authors can now conclude that the consumers purchasing behaviour in general do get affected by the mentioned attributes from the literature review. This is also strengthened in the support of the hypothesis, which implies that the attributes in combination really affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase under conditions of negative information. Therefore, the authors found it very important to identify these crucial attributes. As mentioned in section 4.2.2 expertise, trustworthiness, likeability and similarity were the main ones.

Marketers need to be aware that consumers perceive celebrities in different ways based on what personal characteristics they possess, thus leading to a purchase. When a celebrity is in a particular situation and promoting different products or services, the consumers tend to prefer a celebrity who is an expert and trustworthy within that situation. Moreover, the celebrity should preferably be likeable among the targeted consumers and have similar goals, interest etc. These attributes in a combination could be the winning concept in a celebrity endorsement strategy and increased market shares. The more knowledge and the
higher acceptance the consumers have regarding the celebrity, when evaluating the “problematic” endorser, the more likely they still are to make a purchase of a product/service.

Do the attributes from the literature review have different impacts on consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service, when different celebrities are used as endorsers?

The two different cases with two different celebrities show clearly that consumers react in various ways to celebrities who are associated with negative information. It is also crucial to point out that consumers may perceive a separate attribute differently in comparison to the six attributes in a combination and in relation to different endorsers. The different evaluations of the attributes with various endorsers can be related to the answer of research question one, regarding what situation the celebrity is in and what the endorser is promoting. Hence, the attributes from the literature review have different impacts on the consumer behaviour depending on who the endorser is. Finally, the authors cannot see a direct association between the used attributes from the literature review and the level of negative information.

Which attributes do consumers find of most importance when evaluating them separately?

When the consumers evaluated the attributes separately, the attribute trustworthiness was the most important one followed by expertise and “fit”. Similarity and meaning transfer were of equal importance and likeability was seen as the attribute which played the least important role. These findings together with the chapter summary in section 4.5, the authors have in a conjunction found the two most important attributes that consumers found to be of most importance when evaluating them separately and even in combinations. Trustworthiness was throughout this thesis indicated as a very important attribute and expertise was almost of equal importance. Therefore, the authors can conclude that the consumers prefer a celebrity who has the characteristics of being an expert and trustworthy within the field of advertising.

5.3 Discussion

Bringing the findings from the research questions together, the authors have decided to provide the readers with a model (figure 5-1) in order to give a general apprehension of their conclusions. This model is a deeper elaboration on figure 1-2 since the purpose of this thesis was to find the most important attributes that marketers need to consider when using celebrities in their endorsement strategies. Figure 1-2 did not indicate what factors of a celebrity that is of main importance but after conducting this research, the authors can finally conclude that the attributes trustworthiness and expertise are the hidden factors that need to be considered when advertisers use the strategy of celebrity endorsement.
The attributes trustworthiness and expertise are combined in a network within the celebrity endorsement strategy and since the consumers evaluated them as the most important ones, the authors assume this model to be as the optimal use of a celebrity. A company needs to be aware of figure 5-1 and the interaction in order to gain success or even prevent failure when using celebrity endorsers. These attributes are directly linked to the celebrity and these are what marketers should consider when choosing a particular celebrity. These will eventually affect the company, consumer and brand when a celebrity gets associated with negative publicity. It is important to have in mind that a celebrity who is linked with negative information and that possess these attributes to a very high degree, is less likely to affect the consumer behaviour negatively in comparison to the opposite case.

5.4 Final words from the authors

The main objective of this thesis was to come to an understanding of which factors consumers find to be important for a company to consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative information. These factors were as mentioned earlier trustworthiness and expertise. But, the authors claim that only considering these factors does not eliminate the other ones that has been used in the research process but rather that the identified most important factors are the vital ones. Now that the purpose is fulfilled, the authors have gained more insight within the area of celebrity endorsement and hopefully provide marketers with crucial information and knowledge that will benefit their company and strengthen their brand equity. It is also crucial to bare in mind that the selection of a celebrity should not only include the two most important attributes but also weigh the remaining four as a priority, since these may strengthen the perception of a celebrity in collaboration with the top listed attributes. Moreover, there is no strong and determinant indication that the found attributes are the only ones to consider since there may be indeed other hidden factors that consumers consider. The authors can now claim that this field is a continuously ongoing process and one should be clear that there is no correct way of doing things, but rather provide helpful insights on what factors marketers should consider when a celebrity gets associated with negative publicity.

5.5 Prospects for future researches

Some of the results in this research process suggest interesting prospects for future research. The findings from the post-experiment showed different results compared to the general understanding of each attribute. Consumers tend to think and act differently and
this is the main reason why the authors have not claimed that the results are the accurate ones. This research provided the readers with a general understanding of this subject and it is crucial to furthermore state that this subject can be narrowed down even more, mostly when it comes to psychological aspects. Potentially, this can lead to new and exiting findings that can provide marketers with more understanding and a deep focus on certain psychological issues to take into account.

What can be interesting to elaborate deeper on is how the negative information of a celebrity affects low- and high involvement products/services or luxury- and low cost products/services. Moreover, what happens if a celebrity in the case of negative information promotes a brand that do not fit well with the celebrity is also of peculiar interest.

Another major area except for the psychological aspect is the demographical area. This implies that studies regarding perceptions in different countries, ages, sex etc. can be conducted to clarify more specific issues that can be helpful and beneficial for marketers. Furthermore, as it has been stated in previous studies, that one cannot predict the life span of a celebrity and combined with the findings in this thesis, there are no clear assumptions if the consumers’ willingness to purchase a product or service that is promoted by a celebrity and associated with negative information. The authors believe that a new research area is developed. This one deals with how the ever changing identity of a celebrity might affect the consumers’ willingness to purchase, while some consumers might find this change of the celebrity as something negative. Thus, the authors assume that a potential research area can be to investigate if and in that case how consumers react to a celebrity’s identity change during their time in the spotlight and also if the celebrity might through a business perspective benefit more if they start their own business, which will lead us in to a new phenomenon of celebrity entrepreneurship.

Lastly, it would also be interesting to conduct a study within this subject, mainly from marketers point of view or even an intertwined study from both consumers and marketers perspectives. Concluding this, the authors want to make it clear and agree with the fact that the advertising industry is really efficient when using celebrities as endorsers due to its ability to reach a wider audience where the consumers can identify themselves with. The use of advertising is and will change in the future, but at this time celebrities are the driving mechanism to successful advertising within this industry.
6 Critique of this research process

Since this thesis has been conducted with a time constraint and limited resources, the authors can convey several self-criticisms and judge the research process so that the reader will not get mislead or interpret biased information.

The authors feel that the limited time and resources have affected the methodology. A qualitative study (focus groups) could have benefited this thesis even more in the sense that it could have underpinned the main method used (quantitative). Furthermore, it was theoretically supported that at least 50 respondents can be used in a conjoint experiment and even though 75 respondents were used in the research process, the authors feel that a higher number of respondents could have benefited this study to a greater extent and provided more accurate results. Moreover, the $R^2$ level in all combinations (1-16, 1-8, 9-16) were on a low level which indicates that the observed variability also was low. The $R^2$ level was on an average level throughout the results and if the $R^2$ levels were closer to 1 it would increase the reliability of the thesis. This can be due to the low amount of respondents. Another reason for this can be the number of combinations of the conjoint experiment. A larger amount of combinations (cards) and fewer attributes would give less statistical uncertainty and more significant results.

The results show that the celebrity-product attribute that have been found important in previous research hold up in a context of a celebrity that is associated with negative information. However, a more ideal design would have included negative information instead of as a consequence of the attributes, allowing for a more direct comparison.

Furthermore, the authors came to the understanding that as much as conjoint came across as time consuming, they were going more for well answered questionnaires then half done ones. Furthermore, the authors believe that the conjoint experiment is such a well covered research process that many different results could have been elaborated from it. But, the authors decided to keep it as accurate to the purpose of this thesis, which was to find the hidden factors and not investigating the different relationships between the different attributes. The concern was more on which attributes the respondents perceived to be most important linked with the purpose of this thesis. This is why the authors only kept the number of hypotheses to two instead of a larger number. There was a direct interest to investigate other aspects, mainly if the consumers were willing to purchase a product or service advertised by a celebrity that is associated with negative information, and also if consumers respond differently in reaction to negative information or the celebrities negative information.

The last point of criticism that is important to point out is the order of combinations. When looking at appendix 4 A, one can see that the level of importance has a certain symmetry where it starts off with a high level and decreases slightly after each combination used. Hence, if the combinations where placed in a different order the outcome might have differed and lead to other results.
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## Appendix 1 - 8 profiles for the six attributes at two levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>Likeability</th>
<th>Meaning transfer</th>
<th>Match “fit”</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Design 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Design 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Design 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Design 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - Research Survey

Dear respondent!

You have been chosen to take part of our survey based on our Master’s thesis in marketing. This thesis has its main focus on celebrity endorsement and as you might have noticed, this concept is being more frequently used by marketers in the advertising industry. Furthermore, most of the celebrities that have been used have generated a high brand exposure and have been associated with a certain brand, which in terms have affected the consumer buying behaviour.

The use of celebrity endorsement has mostly a positive outcome for companies, since the celebrity’s characteristics fit well with the characteristics of a brand. Most of the celebrities used by companies have been chosen since they are considered to have a strong power on consumers. This means that consumers may buy a certain brand that is associated with a celebrity to identify themselves with this particular brand and also feel a sense of similarity with the celebrity. However, one can wonder how consumers get affected by celebrities that have been associated with negative publicity. **This is what we want you to consider when rating the different combinations of attributes and how the negative publicity of a celebrity affects YOU.**

We will provide you with two different cases in order for you to get a better understanding of how to rate when imagining that particular situation, and how that would effect you in your buying decision. We want to emphasize that the generated cases are made up. **Simply, what we want from you is to rate each combination of attributes from 1 to 7.** Please evaluate each combination as a separate situation independent of all others. Once you have completed one combination, you are not supposed to go back and take a previous look. You should also read through the descriptions of the attributes and their level one time only. Moreover, if you consider one combination not to have a great impact on you, you can rate it as number 1 and from that point rate the combinations a higher number the more impact they have on you with 7 being the highest.

We would like to make it clear that there is no right or wrong answer, we are more interested in what you consider to be most important when a celebrity gets associated with negative publicity. **With negative publicity we mean any information that has negative association that decreases the trustworthiness of the celebrity and the fit with the brand.**

The whole experiment might be considered as time consuming but it will probably not take you more than 15 minutes to complete this task. Finally, we emphasize that your response will remain anonymous and thank you for your participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expertise:</strong></td>
<td><em>High:</em> The celebrity has a high level of knowledge, experience and expertise.</td>
<td><em>Low:</em> The celebrity has a low level of knowledge, experience and expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustworthiness:</strong></td>
<td><em>High:</em> The celebrity is considered to be very trustworthy.</td>
<td><em>Low:</em> The celebrity is not perceived to be honest and believable enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similarity:</strong></td>
<td><em>High:</em> The consumer feels highly linked with the celebrity when it comes to the characteristics.</td>
<td><em>Low:</em> The consumer does not feel any connection with the celebrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likeability:</strong></td>
<td><em>High:</em> The celebrity is highly famous and popular.</td>
<td><em>Low:</em> The celebrity is not likeable or popular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning Transfer:</strong></td>
<td><em>High:</em> The celebrity is successfully transferring meaning to a brand.</td>
<td><em>Low:</em> The celebrity does not succeed in transferring any meaning to the brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit</strong> Match</td>
<td><em>High:</em> A very good fit.</td>
<td><em>Low:</em> No fit at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case 1. Plastic Fantastic AB

The last two years, Plastic Fantastic AB has been sponsoring the most amazing and extreme make-over TV-show (The Swan) for regular people in the USA. This has been very successful in the domestic market as well as internationally. Therefore, Plastic Fantastic has now realized that this can be a beneficial way to reach out to a larger audience in a different way than the original TV-show promotion. Talking about TV-shows, Michael Jackson is currently not only notorious for attending his own court on international TV, where he is accused of child molesting, but he is also promoting the services Plastic Fantastic AB offers.

Combination 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?

(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Willing
### Combination 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


## Combination 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Combination 4

Expertise                  High
Trustworthiness            Low
Similarity                 High
Likeability                Low
Meaning transfer           Low
“Fit” Match                High

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?
(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Willing
Combination 5

Expertise  Low

Trustworthiness  High

Similarity  Low

Likeability  High

Meaning transfer  Low

“Fit” Match  High

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?
(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Willing
Combination 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Combination 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?  
(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Combination 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this service?  
(Please rate this combination)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Case 2. Dell and Bill

Dell computers are launching their new product, Monica 69 WH, which includes a certain system for managers’ at large companies to enhance the process of keeping track of numbers. This indicates that Dell’s main target is business-oriented people. To be able to succeed with reaching this particular group, Dell have been using Bill Clinton as a spokesperson in promoting Monica 69 WH.

**Combination 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?

(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Willing
Combination 10

Expertise  
Trustworthiness  
Similarity  
Likeability  
Meaning transfer  
“Fit” Match  

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?  
(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Willing
## Combination 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### Combination 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?
(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Combination 13

Expertise                    High

Trustworthiness             Low

Similarity                  Low

Likeability                 High

Meaning transfer            High

“Fit” Match                 High

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?
(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Willing
## Combination 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


## Combination 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

59
Combination 16

Expertise                      High

Trustworthiness                Low

Similarity                     High

Likeability                    Low

Meaning transfer               Low

“Fit” Match                    High

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how willing are you to buy this product?
(Please rate this combination)

Unwilling  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Willing
How important do you consider each of the attributes mentioned to be of importance when considering a celebrity that gets negative publicity.

(Please evaluate each attribute on the scale of 1 to 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expertise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustworthiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likeability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning transfer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Fit” Match</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Please put a cross on the situation that is addressed to each question)

1. Which faculty do you belong to?

- JIBS
- ING
- HLK
- HHJ

2. Do you consider yourself to be fashion conscious?

- Yes
- No
- Occasionally

3. Do you consider yourself to be affected by celebrities in advertising?

- Yes
- No
- Occasionally

4. Do you purchase brands that are advertised by celebrities?

- Yes
- No
- Occasionally

5. Does your purchasing decisions change if a celebrity get associated with negative publicity?

- Yes
- No
Appendix 3- Extract from pilot study

Combination 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning transfer</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fit” Match</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attributes mentioned above, how important do you find the celebrity’s negative publicity affecting your purchasing decision.

(Please rate this combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low importance importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 - Appendix concerning research question 1

Appendix 4A

Importance summary

Factor

Appendix 4B

Individual Subject Importance

Factor
Appendix 4C

![Histogram for CARD12 with frequency bars showing distribution. The chart includes information on standard deviation (Std. Dev = 1.45), mean (Mean = 4.9), and sample size (N = 75,000).]
Appendix 5 - Appendix concerning research question 2

Case 1

Appendix 5A

Importance summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Averaged Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Transfer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Transfer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5B

Individual Subject Importance

Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Averaged Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Transfer</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Transfer</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 6 - Appendix concerning research question 2

### Case 2

### Appendix 6A

#### Importance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Averaged Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matching</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning transfer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthiness</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Individual Subject Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Averaged Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matching</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning transfer</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthiness</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeability</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7- Anova tables

Research question 1

Model Summary Appendix 7A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-square</th>
<th>Adjusted R-square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.562(a)</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>20.357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), CARD16, CARD10, CARD7, CARD3, CARD12, CARD11, CARD1, CARD14, CARD13, CARD5, CARD8, CARD2, CARD6, CARD4, CARD15, CARD9

ANOVA Appendix 7B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11114,608</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>694,663</td>
<td>1,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>24035,392</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>414,403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35150,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), CARD16, CARD10, CARD7, CARD3, CARD12, CARD11, CARD1, CARD14, CARD13, CARD5, CARD8, CARD2, CARD6, CARD4, CARD15, CARD9

Research question 2 case 1

Model Summary Appendix 7C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-square</th>
<th>Adjusted R-square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.430(a)</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>20.832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), CARD8, CARD7, CARD5, CARD4, CARD2, CARD1, CARD3, CARD6

ANOVA Appendix 7D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6507,286</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>813,411</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>28642,714</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>433,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35150,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), CARD8, CARD7, CARD5, CARD4, CARD2, CARD1, CARD3, CARD6

Research question 2 case 2
Model Summary Appendix 7E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-square</th>
<th>Adjusted R-square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.506(a)</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>19,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), CARD16, CARD10, CARD12, CARD14, CARD15, CARD11, CARD13, CARD9

ANOVA(b) Appendix 7F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1123,554</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>,009(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>396,387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), CARD16, CARD10, CARD12, CARD14, CARD15, CARD11, CARD13, CARD9
b Dependent Variable: RESP
Appendix 8 - Perception of attributes

**Expertise**

- Rating: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Frequency: 40, 30, 20, 10, 0
- Std. Dev = 1.25
- Mean = 4.0
- N = 75,00

**Trustworthiness**

- Rating: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Frequency: 50, 40, 30, 20, 10, 0
- Std. Dev = .93
- Mean = 4.3
- N = 75,00
Similarity

Rating

Likeability

Rating
### Meaning transfer

- **Rating:**
  - Mean: 3.4
  - Standard Deviation: 1.24
  - N: 75.00

- **Frequency Distribution:**
  - 1.0: 10
  - 2.0: 20
  - 3.0: 20
  - 4.0: 30
  - 5.0: 10

### "Fit" Match

- **Rating:**
  - Mean: 3.6
  - Standard Deviation: 1.10
  - N: 75.00

- **Frequency Distribution:**
  - 1.0: 10
  - 2.0: 20
  - 3.0: 30
  - 4.0: 10
  - 5.0: 10