# UNDERSTANDING THE EFFECTS OF NEGATIVE CELEBRITY ENDORSER PUBLICITY ON CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING: THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATION-PUBLIC RELATIONSHIPS

by

### OSENKOR GOGO

(Under the Direction of Bryan H. Reber)

#### ABSTRACT

Corporations worldwide have embraced socially responsible business practices due to their well-documented benefits, both for organizations and their stakeholders. In doing so, causerelated marketing (CRM) has emerged as one of the most popular means of demonstrating corporate social responsibility. It has therefore become necessary for organizations to adopt strategies, such as using celebrity endorsers, to distinguish themselves in the market and promote their products more effectively. However, according to the literature, the use of celebrity endorsers poses many risks to organizations due to the consequences of negative publicity. This dissertation opens up a novel area of inquiry by examining the extent of this threat on consumer attitudes and purchase intentions within the CRM context. It also investigates the moderating effect of organization-public relationships (OPR) on these reactions.

The following theoretical frameworks form the basis of this study: relationship management theory, the meaning transfer model, elaboration likelihood model, and schema theory. The hypothesized relationships were tested using a 2 (Endorser-Product-Cause Fit) × 2

(Cause Involvement)  $\times$  2 (Scandal Type) pretest-posttest factorial design. The study was conducted through self-administered online surveys with a sample of 500 Millennials recruited from a large Southeastern university.

The results indicated that negative celebrity endorser publicity elicits unfavorable consumer attitudes toward endorsers, CRM products, and sponsoring organizations. It also lowers purchase intentions. Also, endorser attitudes have both direct and indirect predictive effects on purchase intentions through product and organizational attitudes. Moreover, the results suggest that product and organizational attitudes override the influence of fit on consumer attitudes. Cause involvement was also found to be a less powerful predictor of consumer reactions in this context. Finally, it was revealed that positive OPRs mitigate the effects of CRM endorser misdeeds on consumer reactions.

This dissertation demonstrates the value of public relations for organizations. It also holds insights for corporations engaged in (or considering) celebrity-endorsed CRM initiatives. Moreover, it builds on the body of knowledge on relationship and crisis management, celebrity endorsement, and CSR. Finally, among other things, it opens avenues for further inquiry into the functions of fit, cause involvement, and consumer attitudes in forming reactions to celebrityendorsed CRM initiatives.

INDEX WORDS:Organization-public relationships, Cause-related marketing, Celebrity<br/>endorsement, Negative CRM endorser publicity effects, Meaning transfer,<br/>Crisis management, Attitude change, Millennial consumer behavior.

# UNDERSTANDING THE EFFECTS OF NEGATIVE CELEBRITY ENDORSER PUBLICITY ON CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING: THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATION-PUBLIC RELATIONSHIPS

by

### OSENKOR GOGO

B.A., University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana, 2007

M.S., University of Denver, 2011

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

### DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

# © 2014

# Osenkor Gogo

# All Rights Reserved

# UNDERSTANDING THE EFFECTS OF NEGATIVE CELEBRITY ENDORSER PUBLICITY ON CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING: THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATION-PUBLIC

## RELATIONSHIPS

by

OSENKOR GOGO

Major Professor:

Bryan H. Reber

Committee:

Jooyoung Kim Lynne M. Sallot Jhih-Syuan (Elaine) Lin Yoo-Kyoung Seock

Electronic Version Approved:

Julie Coffield Interim Dean of the Graduate School The University of Georgia August 2014

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my profound gratitude to God for seeing me through my doctoral program to completion. I also owe my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Bryan Reber, for his unwavering support and guidance throughout my time at UGA. Thank you for your genuine concern for my well-being, your listening ear, and your ability to make students feel valued, even at your busiest times. I am very grateful to Dr. Jooyoung Kim for his guidance in analyzing my data, and always being available to answer my many questions, both online and in person. I also thank Drs. Sallot, Lin, and Seock for serving on my advisory committee. I appreciate all your feedback. My dissertation is better because of you.

In addition, I wish to thank my colleagues (past and present) who assisted me throughout this process. Particularly, I would like to thank Nadine for being there for me from the very beginning, when this dissertation was just an abstract idea I was trying to formulate. Thanks for always making the time to meet with me to hear out my thoughts, giving me tips and tricks on how to navigate these waters, and providing me with any information needed even after you had graduated. I also want to thank Hojoon Choi for helping me work out the initial research design, and Jiran for answering any questions I had along the way. Kuan-Ju, Eun Sook, and Yan deserve mention for cheering me on during tough times and supporting me in many more ways. I also appreciate the help of all the faculty members and fellow doctoral students who granted me access to their students during data collection, as well as everyone who completed my surveys.

Finally, I would like to thank my family (especially my sister, Ashrifia), and my friend, Claudette, for their endless support and encouragement.

iv

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	
CKNOWLEDGEMENTSiv	ACKN
IST OF TABLESviii	LIST (
IST OF FIGURESxi	LIST (
HAPTER	СНАР
1 INTRODUCTION	
2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT	
Corporate Social Responsibility and Cause-Related Marketing	
The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion15	
Celebrity Endorsement as a Promotional Strategy	
The Moderating Role of Gender in Strategic Brand Alliances and Reactions to	
Negative Information40	
Relationship Management Theory42	
Summary of Hypotheses53	
3 METHODS55	

	Research Design	55
	Stimuli Development	56
	Main Study	86
4	RESULTS	
	Manipulation Checks	98
	Hypothesis Testing	
5	DISCUSSION	121
	Understanding the Findings	121
	Theoretical Implications	
	Practical Implications	
	Limitations and Avenues for Future Research	
6	CONCLUSION	142
REFERE	INCES	
APPENI	DICES	
А	PRETEST 1 ANNOUNCEMENT	
В	PRETEST 1 INSTRUMENT	
C	SCANDAL TYPE: FREQUENCIES	214

D PERCEIVED SCANDAL SEVERITY: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
E PAIRWISE COMPARISONS: SCANDAL SEVERITY MEAN DIFFERENCES
AND P-VALUES
F PRETEST 2 ANNOUNCEMENT
G PRETEST 2 INSTRUMENT
H MAIN STUDY ANNOUNCEMENT
I MAIN STUDY INSTRUMENT
J DEBRIEFING FORM

## LIST OF TABLES

Page
Table 1: Definition of terms
Table 2: Pretest 1 sample characteristics and frequencies  58
Table 3: Means and standard deviations for celebrity endorsers  64
Table 4: Means and standard deviations for products
Table 5: Means and standard deviations for organizations
Table 6: Means and standard deviations for causes  69
Table 7: Pairwise comparisons: Cause involvement
Table 8: Scandal type: Frequencies71
Table 9: Perceived scandal severity: Means and standard deviations
Table 10: Pairwise comparisons: Perceived scandal severity
Table 11: Frequencies of primary news sources and social networking websites used74
Table 12: Pretest 2 sample characteristics and frequencies  75
Table 13: Jennifer Lawrence scandal type: Frequencies and Chi-square results
Table 14: Jennifer Lawrence scandal severity: Means and standard deviations

Table 15: Pairwise comparisons: Jennifer Lawrence scandal severity mean differences and <i>p</i> -
values
Table 16: Celebrity endorser-product fit: Means and standard deviations
Table 17: Celebrity endorser-cause fit: Means and standard deviation
Table 18: Product-cause fit: Means and standard deviations
Table 19: Celebrity endorser-product-cause fit: Anne Hathaway and Beyoncé
Table 20: Main study experimental design
Table 21: Main study sample characteristics and frequencies  88
Table 22: Main study items and reliability measures
Table 23: Summary of statistical tests and variables
Table 24: Sample descriptives using within-subjects MANCOVA: Negative publicity effects
Table 25: Sample descriptives using <i>t</i> -test for equality of means
Table 26: Summary of multiple mediated regression analysis for variables predicting purchase
intentions111
Table 27: Summary of moderated multiple regression analysis for variables predicting product
and organizational attitudes117

Table 28: Sample descriptives using between-subjects MANCOVA: (	OPR effects	120
Table 20: Summary of hypotheses and results		120

## LIST OF FIGURES

Page
Figure 1: The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion16
Figure 2: Meaning movement and the endorsement process
Figure 3: Mean differences in attitudes and purchase intentions between the pretest and the
posttest101
Figure 4: Indirect effect of CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions through product and
organizational attitudes109
Figure 5: Mediated effect of CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions through product and
organizational attitudes111
Figure 6: Moderator effect of fit in the pre-scandal relationship between endorser and product
attitudes113
Figure 7: Moderator effect of fit in the pre-scandal relationship between endorser and
organizational attitudes114
Figure 8: Moderator effect of fit in the post-scandal relationship between endorser and product
attitudes115

Figure 9: Moderator effect of fit in the post-scandal relationship between endorser and	
organizational attitudes	116
Figure 10: Mean differences in post-scandal attitudes and purchase intentions between pos	itive
and negative OPR conditions	119

#### CHAPTER 1

#### INTRODUCTION

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives have caught on well with corporations worldwide due, in part, to their positive effects on consumer attitudes and behaviors (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Cause-related marketing (CRM), which is one such initiative, is said to strengthen stakeholder relationships (Duncan & Moriarty, 1997), enhance corporate reputation and brand image, increase sales, promote brand awareness and recognition, and widen corporations' customer bases, among other virtues (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988).

Described as "a form of sponsorship that links purchase of an organization's brands with donations to a specific cause" (Hoek & Gendall, 2008, p. 284), CRM is an immensely popular promotional tool among corporations (Kim & Johnson, 2013; Chowdhury & Khare, 2011). It has therefore become necessary for organizations to adopt strategies to distinguish themselves in the market and enhance the persuasive appeal of their products.

Celebrity endorsement, a widely used marketing communications strategy, is one such approach. For instance, one of the most popular CRM initiatives, Yoplait's *Save Lids to Save Lives*, which supports the Susan G. Komen Foundation, recently signed on singer Martina McBride as an endorser (Shelton, 2012). Moreover, Ford Motor's *Warriors in Pink* initiative, which supports breast cancer organizations, has employed celebrities such as actress Jennifer Aniston, singer Kelly Clarkson, and actor James Denton in promoting its cause-related products (Arellano, 2007; Capotorto, 2011; Justin, 2013). Even cause-related merchandise produced by luxury brands Emporio Armani, Louis Vuitton, and Omega have been promoted by celebrities like actor Sean Connery, rock star Bono, actress Julia Roberts, and actor Daniel Craig (Foiret, 2008; Woollard, 2010; Setiawan, 2011).

The benefits of using celebrity endorsers are well-documented (see Erdogan, 1999). However, studies have also suggested that celebrity endorsement should be approached cautiously, as it poses some risks for corporations and their brands. Negative endorser publicity, in particular, may have adverse effects on brand image (Till & Shimp, 1998), consumer attitudes, and purchase intentions (Fong & Wyer, 2012). Scandals are common occurrences among celebrities, thus for organizations that employ celebrity endorsers, the threat of a scandal comes with the territory. Erdogan (1999) advocated the inclusion of provisional clauses in endorser contracts to stave off the adverse effects of a public scandal on an organization's image. However, although moral clauses make it easy for organizations to contractually disassociate themselves from endorsers, in the minds of consumers it may not be as easy to separate the two.

In the area of CRM, the effects of negative endorser publicity on consumer attitudes and behaviors have not yet been examined. As evinced by cyclist Lance Armstrong's fall from grace, this is a real issue with profound implications for corporations and nonprofit organizations. Against this backdrop, the situation is much more complicated, as it goes beyond consumerism into philanthropy.

Based on relationship management theory, the meaning transfer model (McCracken, 1989), schema theory (Bartlett, 1932), and elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1983), this dissertation answers the question of how consumers navigate their evaluations of celebrity endorsers, CRM products, and sponsoring organizations in the event of an endorser scandal. The extent to which these evaluations differ as a function of fit, cause involvement, and scandal type is also examined. Moreover, the process of meaning transfer from endorser to

product and organization will be investigated, as will the predictive effect of these attitudes on purchase intentions.

Lastly, it has been suggested that organization-public relationships (OPR) lessen the damaging impact of negative information on corporate reputations (Coombs, 1998). This study also aims at examining OPR's moderating function within the context of negative information tied to a CRM endorser.

This study is significant for many reasons. First, it serves as an advisory for CSR managers considering the use of celebrity endorsement as part of their CRM campaigns. This dissertation provides important information on the implications of using celebrity endorsement as a promotional tool, as well as the influence of congruence and cause involvement in strategic brand alliances of this nature – information managers should have beforehand. Although this study focuses on implications for corporations, it will also produce must-know information for nonprofit organizations and charities, public relations firms, as well as celebrity endorsers.

This study will also reveal the various degrees of consumer reactions to negative endorser publicity, depending on the factors involved in a particular situation. This will help organizations select the best endorser for minimal damage to their reputations, brands, and CSR initiatives in the incidence of a scandal. This study has further implications for image management by revealing if and how consumer perceptions about corporations are likely to change in the event of negative CRM endorser publicity.

This study will also provide corporations with some suggestions on how to handle CRM endorser crises based on situational factors. Knowing what informs consumers' post-scandal perceptions and their ensuing behaviors will help corporations identify their problem areas, which is the first step in image restoration.

Examining the role of OPR as a moderator of consumer reactions to negative CRM endorser publicity also helps public relations managers in target public segmentation, which facilitates crisis response. Knowing how consumers with different OPR perceptions react in this context helps direct the formulation of audience-specific crisis response strategies. Moreover, the examination of OPR's moderating role in this context may lend support to other research underscoring the importance of effective relationship management.

Finally, this study fills the gap in the CRM, celebrity endorsement, OPR, and negative publicity literatures by considering a previously unobserved phenomenon. It contributes to theory development in public relations research, in particular, by incorporating theoretical and conceptual frameworks from other fields like psychology, marketing, and advertising into a study on corporate perception and CSR, community relations, as well as crisis, relationship, and campaign management.

This dissertation is structured as follows: Chapter 2 reviews the literature on the conceptual and theoretical foundations of this study. The chapter ends with a summary of the hypotheses proposed. Next, Chapter 3 describes the methods through which this study was developed and conducted, while Chapter 4 presents its results. Subsequently, Chapter 5 discusses the implications of the study, as well as its limitations and directions for future research. Finally, the conclusion is presented in Chapter 6.

The definitions of key terms used throughout this dissertation can be found in Table 1.

# Table 1

# Definition of terms

Attitude	"A relatively enduring organization of beliefs, feelings, and behavioral
	tendencies towards socially significant objects, groups, events or
	symbols" (Hogg & Vaughan, 2005, p. 150)
Cause Involvement	"The degree to which consumers find the cause to be personally relevant
	to them" (Grau & Folse, 2007, p. 20).
Cause-Related	"The process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that
Marketing (CRM)	are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified
	amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue-
	providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual
	objectives" (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988, p. 60).
Fit	The degree to which a set of associated entities is perceived to be
	consistent in relation to mission, target audience, and / or values (Becker-
	Olsen & Hill, 2006).
Media Scandal	"When private acts that disgrace or offend the idealized, dominant
	morality of a social community are made public and narrativized by the
	media, producing a range of effects from ideological and cultural
	retrenchment to disruption and change" (Lull & Hinerman, 1997, p. 3).
Organization-Public	"The state which exists between an organization and its key publics, in
Relationship (OPR)	which the action of either can impact the economical, social, cultural or
	political wellbeing of the other" (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998, p. 62).
Purchase Intention	The likelihood that a consumer will buy a product (Fishbein & Ajzen,
	1975)

#### **CHAPTER 2**

### LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

This chapter provides a review of the literature on the conceptual and theoretical frameworks on which this study is based. It begins by defining the concept of cause-related marketing (CRM) within the context of corporate social responsibility. Next is a discussion of the role of cause involvement in CRM effects within the framework of the elaboration likelihood model. An overview of celebrity endorsement as a promotional strategy is then presented. Subsequently, the moderating role of gender in strategic brand alliances is discussed, followed by a review of relationship management theory. This chapter concludes with a summary of the hypotheses developed.

#### **Corporate Social Responsibility and Cause-Related Marketing**

The notion of corporate social responsibility (CSR) goes back to Mesopotamia and ancient Greece, where businessmen were penalized for ignoring the welfare of their workers and the general public through negligent business practices (Salzmann, 2006). Traces of the concept can also be detected through the medieval and mercantile times. However, most scholars attribute the growth of CSR to the industrial revolution and the more recent era of globalization (May, Cheney, & Roper, 2007).

CSR grew out of the government's increasing inability to meet society's financial needs and expectations, and, as large corporations expanded in reach and influence, societal expectations of these corporations increased as well (Adkins, 1999). Today, CSR is a global phenomenon that represents a range of activities through which corporations hold themselves accountable to their stakeholders.

Defined as "the managerial obligation to take action to protect and improve both the welfare of society as a whole and the interest of organizations" (Davis & Blomstrom, 1975, p.6), CSR enhances corporate reputation and builds trust among organizational stakeholders, as it demonstrates a company's dedication to fulfilling its social obligations beyond legal requirements (Demetriou, Papasolomou, & Vrontis, 2009).

The principle that businesses and the communities within which they operate are interdependent is central to the practice of CSR (Adkins, 1999). CSR combines the interests of organizations' shareholders and other stakeholders by meeting four responsibilities: (1) economic, (2) legal, (3) ethical, and (4) discretionary (Carroll, 1991).

Economic responsibilities are the foundation of CSR activities, without which it would be impossible to operationalize any of the other dimensions. These are therefore required of organizations. The main motive behind this is to turn a profit or to maximize shareholder value.

Legal responsibilities can be described as an organization's obligation to operate profitably within the confines of the law. This is also mandatory for functional organizations. Activities under this category include those related to obeying labor, environmental, consumer, human rights, copyright, and trademark laws, among others.

Ethical responsibilities relate to respecting social norms and values, and meeting expectations. These transcend legal obligations. Organizations strive to act ethically by conforming to social standards of what is generally considered fair, just, and moral. Activities under this category pertain to protecting stakeholders' human rights.

Lastly discretionary responsibilities pertain to an organization's goal of being a good corporate citizen. Activities under this contribute to social welfare and build goodwill within communities.

Kotler and Lee (2005) identified six types of CSR initiatives: (1) Cause promotions (where corporate resources are dedicated to raising awareness of a social cause through various activities), (2) corporate social marketing (where corporate resources go toward promoting behavioral change pertaining to health, safety, the environment, or community interests), (3) corporate philanthropy (a direct contribution to a cause in cash or in kind), (4) community volunteering (corporate support of volunteer recruitment), (5) socially responsible business practices (discretionary business operations and investments that promote social causes with the goal of enhancing community life and protecting the environment), and (6) cause-related marketing (CRM), which is the focus of this study.

Cause-related marketing (also known as "cause marketing") is defined as "the process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue-providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives" (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988, p. 60). Put simply, CRM is a partnership between a corporation and a nonprofit organization where the corporation dedicates a portion of its revenue gained from products or services to a specific cause advocated by the nonprofit.

Over the years, conceptualizations of CRM have evolved to include other kinds of consumer action-based campaigns. Rather than purchase a product, these may ask consumers to perform some other action in exchange for a specified corporate donation to a cause. Macy's *Believe* campaign is an example. The company pledges the Make-A-Wish Foundation \$1 for

each letter to Santa Claus that is dropped off at its locations each Christmas. Other examples include social media engagement such as "liking" a Facebook page or retweeting a Twitter post a certain number of times. For the purposes of this study, the concept of CRM is however limited to the purchase of consumer products.

CRM is a unique form of corporate social responsibility in that it is customer-driven; the corporate contribution is always proportional to sales (Wymer & Samu, 2003). Another key characteristic is that it is mutually beneficial for corporations and their nonprofit partners. CRM benefits corporations by enhancing their reputations, and boosting brand awareness and sales, while nonprofits gain greater exposure, build credibility, and raise funds (Wymer & Samu, 2003).

Global financial services company American Express is credited with coining the term, "Cause-Related Marketing" in 1983 through the Restoration of the Statue of Liberty project. In 1981, the company began testing the concept of raising funds for charitable causes through customer transactions. After the success of various pilot programs, the company decided to launch its first nationwide campaign where 1 cent went toward the Restoration of the Statue of Liberty fund each time an American Express card was used. Moreover, \$1 was donated to the fund each time a new card was issued. The company also donated money to the fund after each purchase of traveler's checks and packages. At the end of the three-month campaign, American Express raised more than \$1.7 million, increased new card applications by 45%, and increased card usage by 28% in the first month alone. This campaign is widely recognized as the starting point of present-day interest in the strategy (Adkins, 1999).

The popularity of CRM has soared over the years, and is expected to continue to do so. In fact, sponsorship of philanthropic causes among North American corporations is projected to

reach \$1.78 billion in 2013, an expected increase of 4.8% over 2012 spending (IEG Sponsorship Report, 2013). Moreover, 86% of *Fortune* 500 corporations that engage in corporate philanthropy intend to either maintain or increase their spending in 2014 (The Nonprofit Times, 2013). This massive corporate investment is in reaction to consumers' increasing social consciousness (Dupree, 2000), and resulting dependence on CRM as the deciding factor in their purchase decisions (Chowdhury & Khare, 2011). In illustration, in 1993, 66% of Americans indicated that they would choose a cause-related product over others of equal price and quality. This number grew to 80% in 2010, and 88% in 2013 (Cone Inc., 2008, 2010, 2013). This can be explained by the fact that people perceive the combination of two positive outcomes as more valuable than achieving the same two outcomes independently (Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998). Thus, purchasing a product that helps others is more rewarding than performing both deeds separately.

CRM initiatives are organized at the corporate, divisional, and brand levels, and range from regional to national and international campaigns (Varadarajan & Menon 1988).

#### Attitudinal and Behavioral Effects of Cause-Related Marketing

The benefits of CRM are multidimensional. Not only is this a financially viable strategy for corporations, it also serves the needs of nonprofit organizations and their causes, as well as those of organizational stakeholders such as customers and society in general. It is for this reason that using this promotional strategy is referred to as a "win-win-win" scenario (Adkins, 1999).

CRM enhances corporate and brand image through a "halo effect" that occurs when consumers transfer their positive regard for causes on to the brands and companies associated with them (Bester & Jere, 2012). This creates brand equity, which is the value of a brand gained

through recognition, and confers symbolic meaning and direction on to brands (Deshpande & Hitchon, 2002).

Corporate image is also reinforced when the organization collaborates with a nonprofit that advocates a cause which is in line with its corporate values. CRM also stimulates brand preference by establishing a more personal connection with consumers (Deshpande & Hitchon, 2002). This connection evokes a sense of loyalty among consumers, as well as other organization stakeholders such as employees (Duff, 2003; Kotler & Lee 2005).

Moreover, partnering with a widely known nonprofit organization increases brand awareness, recognition, and visibility (Varadarajan & Menon 1988). CRM also aids market differentiation (Adkins, 1999) by providing consumers with added value for their purchase.

In addition, engaging in CRM eases market entry and broadens the customer base for products (Varadarajan & Menon 1988), as it exposes the brand to new market segments consisting of consumers who have an affinity with the cause. CRM also serves as an image restoration strategy by countering some of the adverse effects of negative information, pacifying incensed groups (Varadarajan & Menon 1988), and promotes positive relationships with stakeholders by meeting their needs and expectations (Adkins, 1999).

Then again, engaging in CRM also has its downsides. CRM has an adverse effect on consumer attitudes and purchase intentions when the cause is completely irrelevant to consumers (Sheikh & Beise-Zee, 2011). Moreover, concerns have been raised that this knowledge may compel corporations to neglect equally – if not more – important, but lesser-known causes in order to appeal to a broader audience (Varadarajan & Menon 1988). CRM critics have also condemned participating nonprofit organizations and corporations for promoting consumerism and capitalism, which are responsible for some of the problems it seeks to solve (see Bell, 2011).

Finally, corporations risk their reputations if their CRM campaigns are perceived as exploitative of causes (Varadarajan & Menon 1988), or if the nonprofit collaborator is embroiled in negative publicity (Wymer & Samu, 2003).

CRM campaigns are most effective with hedonic products (Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998; Chang, 2008) regardless of how relevant the cause is to consumers (Chowdhury & Khare, 2011). Hedonic products are pleasure-oriented, and are consumed for emotional benefits. These have "subjective, non-tangible features that fulfill experiential needs, and whose consumption produces enjoyment and pleasure" (Chowdhury & Khare, 2011, p.829). Examples include perfume, ice cream, designer clothes, and luxury cars. Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) contended that consumers experience more emotion-tied responses to hedonic products than utilitarian ones, as their purchase evokes both feelings of guilt and pleasure. The researchers posited the concept of *affect-based complementarity* to explain consumers' preference for cause-related hedonic products. According to them, when purchasing hedonic products, consumers are more likely to select one that is tied to a cause since its positive outcome offsets the guilty feelings associated with the purchase.

The relationship between CRM initiatives and positive consumer attitudes and behaviors is also moderated by factors such as awareness (Hall, 2006), cause-brand fit (Gupta & Pirsch, 2006), brand involvement type (Chowdhury & Khare, 2011), donation amount and proximity (Olsen, Pracejus, & Brown, 2003; Grau & Folse, 2007), perceived motives (Barone, Miyazaki, & Taylor, 2000), as well as psychographic factors such as interpersonal trust and locus of control (Youn & Kim, 2008).

To add to this stream of research, Deshpande and Hitchon (2002) revealed that negative brand information also diminishes CRM effects. In an experimental study, the researchers

compared consumer reactions to a CRM message and a brand message before and after a scandal. The results indicated that in the absence of negative information, CRM messages were more persuasive than brand messages, however consumer evaluations of CRM turned negative after learning of a scandal.

The present study contributes to this finding by investigating the added dimension of celebrity endorsement. The use of celebrity endorsers in promoting cause-related products endows the brand with an added layer of meanings, those that are associated with the endorser. Generally, negative consumer attitudes toward celebrities involved in scandals have been found to transfer to the products they endorse (e.g. Till & Shimp, 1998; White, Goddard, & Wilbur, 2009). Thus, the following hypothesis will be tested:

**H1:** Consumers' post-scandal (a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions will be less favorable than their pre-scandal ones.

#### **Cause-Related Marketing and the Millennial Generation**

The Millennial generation, which numbers about 80 million people in the United States alone (Reilly, 2012), consists of individuals born between 1980 and 1995 (Edelman Berland, 2012). Millennials are characterized by a pro-social mindset, with 78% believing that it is a company's duty to support social and environmental causes (Cone Inc. & AMP Agency, 2006).

A company's commitment to philanthropy forms the basis of many decisions Millennials make as consumers. This, coupled with the fact that college-aged Millennials have an annual discretionary income of almost \$40 billion (Loechner, 2010), makes them a key market segment for cause-related marketing. Moreover, Millennials exert a great deal of influence over the purchase decisions of other generational groups, including their parents, and other family members (Edelman Berland, 2012). As such, they are a powerful and significant group, and

constitute a prime population for this study. This dissertation mainly focused on the perceptions and behavioral intentions of younger Millennials who – although not as financially secure as older consumers – still possess considerable purchasing power in the hedonic product category, and have steadily increased their spending over the years (see Halpert, 2013). Younger Millennials are also a valid sample because it is important to understand how they think and act as they emerge as the next frontier of mainstream consumers.

More than any other generation, Millennials desire to engage in activities that support social causes (Hyllegard, Ogle, Yan, & Attmann, 2010), particularly CRM. In fact, research has shown that 85% of Millennials wish to support philanthropic causes through this strategy (Cone Inc., 2010). Also, a greater percentage of Millennials (as compared to other consumers) are willing to switch brands to one that supports a cause, barring any differences in price and quality, and try an unfamiliar or more expensive brand simply because it supports a cause (Cone Inc., 2010).

CRM influences Millennials' decisions on which products and services to purchase and where to get them, which recommendations they make to others, which companies they support within their communities, where they choose to work, and which stocks or mutual funds they choose to invest in (Cone Inc., 2010).

Corporate social responsiveness yields many benefits among Millennial consumers: it builds customer loyalty, increases purchase intentions, and draws greater attention to corporate messages. On the other hand, Millennials react unfavorably to companies that fail to act in socially responsible ways through boycotts and negative word-of-mouth (Cone Inc. & AMP Agency, 2006).

#### The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion

Consumers' level of involvement with an object, person, or issue shapes their attitudes and behaviors. For instance, studies have demonstrated the influence of brand, celebrity, and cause involvement in consumer reactions to strategic brand alliances (Chowdhury & Khare, 2011; Lafferty, 1996; Um, 2013). This study focuses on the role of cause involvement in consumer reactions to CRM, which is underpinned by the elaboration likelihood model (ELM).

ELM has its roots in Festinger's (1954) notion that individuals are motivated to hold correct attitudes. Proposed by Petty and Cacioppo (1981), ELM assumes that individuals have limited cognitive resources and as a result, they vary in their motivation and ability to process information, depending on situational, contextual, and individual factors. Message receivers' motivation and ability to think about issue-relevant messages range on an elaboration likelihood continuum from low to high, and persuasion, a major mode of attitude change or formation, can be achieved at any point along this continuum (Petty & Cacioppo, 1983).

Two types of persuasion processes stem from receivers' elaborations: the central and peripheral routes (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). The central route is used under conditions of high involvement when message receivers are motivated to think about information they perceive as relevant. In such situations, receivers pay attention to the soundness of arguments presented and come up with cognitive responses in reaction to them. The outcome of persuasion attempts is tied to the valence of the message receiver's elaboration on relevant issues. Thus, favorable outcomes are to be expected when receivers' thoughts on a particular message are predominantly positive, and when messages reinforce existing beliefs. The opposite is also true. The strength of an argument also determines the dominant valence. Solid, wellstructured arguments are more likely to elicit positive attitudes than weak arguments since it is more probable that they will withstand intense elaboration. Moreover, pre-existing knowledge

about an issue enhances elaboration and intensifies the scrutiny of arguments. Attitudes formed through the central route are more enduring, stronger influencers of behavior, and more resistant to counterarguments.

Meanwhile, the peripheral route is used when message receivers lack the motivation or ability to process information. They therefore rely on heuristic principles activated by peripheral cues in forming attitudes. Such cues include source attractiveness, likability, source credibility, and the reaction of others. Persuasion achieved through the peripheral route is relatively fleeting (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983).



Figure 1: The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion (Source: Petty & Cacioppo, 1986)

The central and peripheral routes are inversely related. This means that as the importance of one increases, the importance of the other decreases and vice versa. At intermediate levels of elaboration, individuals have to negotiate between message valence and peripheral cues in processing persuasive information (Petty & Cacioppo, 1983).

Ability to elaborate on a topic is determined by prior knowledge, message repetition, message comprehensibility, and the absence or presence of distractions. Meanwhile, motivation to elaborate can be influenced by the extent of personal responsibility felt for message evaluation, message sources, need for cognition (or the extent to which a person enjoys mental activities), and level of involvement (O'Keefe, 2008).

#### **Cause Involvement**

The issue of involvement is especially relevant to CRM campaigns, as their success or failure is contingent on consumers' affinity with the cause (Bester & Jere, 2012). Involvement is commonly described as "consumers' perceptions of importance or personal relevance for an object, event, or activity" (Peter & Olson, 2010, p. 84). This stems from a person's inherent needs, values, and interests (Zaichkowsky 1985). Based on this, Grau and Folse (2007) defined cause involvement as "the degree to which consumers find the cause to be personally relevant to them" (p. 20). This may result from past experiences with a philanthropic cause or may be a part of a consumer's self-concept.

Involvement is an influential driver of consumer decisions (Peter & Olson, 2010), and has consistently been shown to be a moderator of CRM effects (e.g. Lichtenstein, Drumwright, & Braig, 2004; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Chowdhury & Khare, 2011). According to Lafferty (1996), CRM campaigns that are more relevant to consumers receive more positive reactions.

This is demonstrated by the fact that consumers respond better to local than national CRM efforts (Ellen, Mohr, & Webb, 1995).

Level of cause involvement also determines the extent of physical and mental effort dedicated toward socially responsible consumption (Laaksonen, 1994). Consumers who are highly involved with a particular cause are more likely to seek out and switch to supporting cause-related products, while those who are less involved in causes are likely to base their purchase decisions on value (Peloza & Hassay, 2007). Moreover, highly involved consumers process CRM messages with a greater level of intensity than less involved consumers (Broderick, Jogi, & Garry, 2003), evoking stronger reactions.

Level of cause involvement is also a consideration in developing CRM partnerships. Corporations that engage in CRM often seek out nonprofits that support causes which align with their target audiences, as their high level of involvement increases the likelihood of a successful campaign (Grau & Folse, 2007). Yoplait's collaboration with the Susan G. Komen Foundation on their *Save Lids to Save Lives* campaign is a prime example. As women are a key market segment for Yoplait, a cause-related product that supports the fight against breast cancer is highly relevant to consumers, and therefore likely to be purchased.

Moreover, level of involvement determines the most effective means of persuasion among consumer groups. Highly involved consumers are persuaded by issue-relevant arguments, while attitude change among less involved consumers is more likely to result from non-message cues such as source expertise and likeability (Chaiken, 1980; Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman 1981), type of message appeal (Schuhwerk & Lefkoff-Hagius, 1995), and celebrity endorsement (Petty & Cacioppo, 1983).

In relation to CRM, results from a study conducted by Grau and Folse (2007) holds promise for eliciting positive reactions to CRM among less involved consumers. Based on ELM, the researchers determined that less involved consumers use donation proximity and message framing as peripheral cues in processing CRM messages, which positively influenced their attitudes and behaviors toward initiatives. More favorable reactions resulted from local, as opposed to national programs, as well as positively framed messages, as opposed to negatively framed ones. Moreover, sometimes the mere mention of a cause can act as a means of persuasion for less involved consumers. Also drawing from ELM, Berger, Cunningham, and Kozinets (1999) revealed that while highly involved consumers were more apt to consider the arguments of cause claims, less involved consumers were more likely to base their product attitudes and purchase decisions on the mere fact that a product was tied to a cause.

The ELM literature reveals that the attitudes of highly involved consumers are more enduring, more likely to lead to corresponding behaviors, and more resistant to counterarguments (Petty & Cacioppo, 1979). As mentioned previously, highly involved consumers have stronger reactions to CRM campaigns than others due to the fact that they expend more effort elaborating on messages. They are also "motivated to consider [its] true merits" (Hajjat, 2003, p. 97), which makes it more likely for them to be persuaded by its arguments. Generally, consumers who are highly involved with causes also have more positive cause attitudes (Selius, 2010). They are also more likely to draw from prior knowledge when forming attitudes about related subject matter (Hajjat, 2003), facilitating the transfer of meaning from a cause to its associated entities. This is moderated by fit, the extent to which a brand and cause are consistent with each other. From this, it can be inferred that positive attitudes and behaviors can be expected of consumers who are highly involved with a cause even in the face of negative endorser publicity. The following hypotheses will therefore be tested:

**H2:** Under conditions of good fit, negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) endorser, (b) product, and (c) organizational attitudes among consumers with low cause involvement than those with high cause involvement.

**H3:** Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in lower purchase intentions under conditions of low cause involvement than under conditions of high cause involvement.

#### **Celebrity Endorsement as a Promotional Strategy**

The strategy of associating well-known individuals with organizations, products, or services has been established as an effective marketing communications tool (Erdogan, 1999; Lafferty, 2002). Due to the prominence associated with celebrity endorsers, using this strategy increases visibility and publicity for organizations and their brands, boosts brand recognition, enhances brand recall, and creates product differentiation (Um, 2013). These are some of the reasons behind the prevalence of celebrity endorsement in marketing communications.

A celebrity endorser is "any individual who enjoys public recognition and who uses this recognition on behalf of a consumer good by appearing with it in an advertisement" (McCracken, 1989, p. 310). Celebrity endorsement has been in use since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (Erdogan, 1999). However, it did not gain popularity until the expansion of commercial radio and television in the 1930s and the 1950s respectively (McDonough, 1995). Prior to this, there was limited availability of individuals who were considered celebrities, and even fewer "bona fide" celebrities who were willing to endorse brands due to the fact that they considered it against their integrity to be paid to promote a commercial product, and feared risking their image (Erdogan, 1999).

Today, celebrity endorsers appear in about a quarter of all advertisements in the United States (Erdogan, Baker, & Tagg, 2001; Shimp, 2008). Recent major endorsements include Beyoncé's \$50 million deal with PepsiCo, David Beckham's \$150 million deal with Adidas, and Tiger Woods' \$200 million deal with Nike (Said, 2013; Chung, Derdenger, & Srinivasan, 2012).

#### **Benefits and Risks of Celebrity Endorsement**

Atkin and Block (1983) asserted that celebrity endorsers elicit more favorable brand attitudes than non-celebrities during marketing communication campaigns. This is especially true for products that involve high psychological or social risk on the part of consumers. Such products may reflect consumers' personal taste and self-image, or shape the opinions of others (Friedman & Friedman, 1979). The nature of cause-related products thus lends itself to celebrity endorsement.

Celebrity endorsers have high economic worth to organizations (Agrawal & Kamakura, 1995). For instance, sportswear giant Nike is one of the most prolific employers of celebrity endorsers, and this has paid off tremendously. In 1984, Nike entered into one of the most successful partnerships in sports marketing history by signing former basketball great Michael Jordan. This endorsement deal is credited with helping the company secure 50% of the market share in the athletic footwear segment. Twenty-eight years later, this partnership continued to prove fruitful. In 2012, Nike earned \$2.5 billion from the sale of Air Jordan shoes, translating to 58% of all basketball shoes, and 77% of all children's basketball shoes sold in the United States (Rovell, 2013a). In 1996, Nike struck gold again by signing golfer Tiger Woods. Within the six months subsequent to signing Woods, Nike's market value in the golf sector increased from 0.9% to 4% (Chung et al., 2012). Moreover, the company earned approximately \$91 million

from 2000 to 2010 through this endorsement deal, and sold \$60 million worth of golf balls through the 4.5 million customers who switched to the brand because of Woods (Schultz, 2010). It is estimated that in 2012, Woods earned Nike \$18.1million worth of airtime by simply displaying the Nike logo on his apparel and equipment (Bandenhausen, 2012).

Furthermore, hiring a celebrity endorser enhances corporate image and increases publicity due to the prestige surrounding celebrities (Erdogan, 1999). Celebrity endorsers also allow products to stand out in a sea of similar products due to the appeal they bring to advertisements (Sherman, 1985). In doing so, they enhance product and message recall (Friedman & Friedman, 1979). In addition, pairing a celebrity endorser who has the right image with a new or re-launched product eases brand introduction and repositioning (Erdogan, 1999). Lastly, certain world-renowned celebrities facilitate global marketing communications campaigns, as their influence is able to transcend cultural barriers. For instance, PepsiCo credits the Spice Girls with increasing its global market share by 2% in the late 1990s (Erdogan, 1999).

Then again, potential hazards also exist. Extremely famous celebrity endorsers may overshadow the brand, diminishing the attention it receives from consumers. This creates the situation where consumers only remember the celebrity endorser, but not the product (Rossiter & Percy, 1987). In 2010, fashion brand St. John decided to discontinue its association with actress Angelina Jolie for this particular reason (Odell, 2010). Corporations may also become unable to continue to be affiliated with a particular celebrity endorser when their image changes, as was the case with skincare brand Nivea and singer Rihanna (Goldwert, 2012).

Overexposure is another risk involved with celebrity endorsement. This occurs when celebrities endorse multiple products. Overexposure lowers consumers' perceptions of the value of celebrities (Graham, 1989), diminishes the perceived connection between the endorser and
each brand (Mowen & Brown 1981), and increases consumer skepticism of the celebrity endorser's motives (Tripp, Jensen, & Carlson, 1994), as well as their message.

Moreover, hiring a celebrity endorser can be very expensive for organizations. Celebrity endorsers lose their value when they decline in public recognition or fade into obscurity within the duration of their contract. Organizations also have much to lose by using a celebrity endorser due to the possibility of negative publicity (Erdogan, 1999).

Effects of negative celebrity endorser publicity. Negative publicity is one of the biggest risks of employing celebrity endorsement (Erdogan, 1999). Negative publicity through media scandals occur "when private acts that disgrace or offend the idealized, dominant morality of a social community are made public and narrativized by the media, producing a range of effects from ideological and cultural retrenchment to disruption and change" (Lull & Hinerman, 1997, p. 3). Examples of recent media scandals involving celebrities include the racial discrimination accusations against Paula Deen, Lance Armstrong's doping confession, and Oscar Pistorius' murder charge.

Media scandals often evoke public outrage since negative information is a stronger influencer of evaluations than positive information. Moreover, negative information elicits stronger reactions, as individuals tend to elaborate more intensely on such news (Ito, Larsen, Smith, & Cacioppo, 1998). According to Smith and Petty (1996), this is especially true when the negative news is unexpected. Negative information is also remembered for a longer period of time than positive information (Kensinger & Corkin, 2003).

Media scandals concerning celebrity endorsers have negative implications for corporations. First, scandals negatively affect the stock market value of organizations that use

celebrity endorsers, and this effect is intensified when the endorser is perceived as responsible for the misdeed (Louie, Kulik, & Jacobsen, 2001). The Tiger Woods sex scandal is a clear example. By looking at stock market returns, Knittel and Stango (2014) estimated that within 10 to 15 trading days following the scandal, the market value of the companies Woods endorsed declined by 2 percentage points, translating to losses of between \$5 to \$12 billion. An industrywide examination of golf ball sales before and after the scandal also showed that Nike lost about 105,000 customers in 2009 due to Woods' misdeeds, which is the equivalent of \$1.3 million (Schultz, 2010). Although the major brands he represented, Electronic Arts (EA), Nike, and PepsiCo, suffered the most, competitors that also used celebrity endorsers at the time were negatively impacted by the scandal as well (Knittel & Stango, 2014). This was determined by analyzing the market returns of Woods' brands, those of their competitors, and the total stock market.

Moreover, negative celebrity endorser scandals can impact an organization's image due to the transference of negative consumer attitudes toward celebrities involved in scandals to the brands they endorse (White et al., 2009). This effect is magnified when the endorsed products are new or unfamiliar. This is because consumers base their evaluations on the associations that products and brands evoke, and since the meanings tied to these products solely relate to the offending celebrity endorser, product evaluations are likely to be highly negative (Till & Shimp, 1998). Monga and John (2008) also revealed that negative celebrity endorser publicity lowers consumers' positive brand attitudes.

Negative publicity involving a CRM endorser is unique in the fact that its impact transcends the disgraced celebrity and the sponsoring organization; it also affects the lives of the people in need who are the beneficiaries of the philanthropic effort. The Lance Armstrong

doping scandal is the most prominent illustration of the effect of negative CRM endorser publicity, which is the area of inquiry at the center of this study.

Armstrong was diagnosed with testicular cancer in 1996, the same year he signed an endorsement deal with Nike (Ziller, 2012). After successfully overcoming the disease the following year, the former cyclist established a foundation to support people living with cancer, which he named the Lance Armstrong Foundation. In 1999, Armstrong won his first of seven successive Tour de France tournaments, after which he was widely regarded as an inspirational figure (Karimi, 2013). Armstrong and Nike intensified their business partnership in 2004 when the company developed and released the now famous yellow wristband, which was sold to raise funds for Livestrong. As part of its corporate social responsibility, the company also launched several product lines over the years including apparel and footwear collections with proceeds benefitting the foundation (Rovell, 2013b). In 2012, it was estimated by the Livestrong Foundation that Nike had raised more than \$100 million for the organization and distributed more than 84 million wristbands globally (Ulm, 2012).

Rumors about Armstrong's use of performance-enhancing drugs had plagued him throughout his career, claims which he vehemently denied (Ziller, 2012). In 2012, the United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA) filed doping charges against Armstrong, which he attempted to have dismissed through a federal lawsuit. When this was unsuccessful, Armstrong decided not to contest the doping charges brought against him anymore, after which he was stripped of all seven Tour de France titles he had won, and banned for life from professional sporting activities (Ziller, 2012). One week later, Armstrong relinquished his position as chairman of the Livestrong Foundation (Vertuno, 2012). That same day, Nike announced the termination of its contract with the disgraced cyclist through a statement on its corporate website.

Other sponsors such as Anheuser-Busch, Trek Bicycles, Gyro, RadioShack, 24-Hour Fitness, FRS, and Honey Sting took a cue from Nike and ended their relationships with him as well (Petchesky, 2012).

It is estimated that Armstrong lost between \$150 million and \$200 million in future earnings due to this scandal (Levinson, Novy-Williams, & Duff, 2012). Afterward, Armstrong and his foundation took further steps to dissociate from each other, with Armstrong stepping down from the board of directors, and the foundation officially changing its name from the Lance Armstrong Foundation to the LIVESTRONG foundation (CNN, 2013). Armstrong finally admitted to his career-long use of performance-enhancing drugs during a televised interview with Oprah Winfrey which aired in January 2013. With his reputation in tatters, Armstrong not only faces criminal charges and public scorn, there are also demands for him to refund the prize money he has won over the years, amounting to about \$16 million (Levinson et al., 2012).

Organizations have adapted certain measures to preempt the fallout from negative celebrity endorser publicity like Armstrong's. First, certain organizations have resorted to using celebrities who have passed away as a means of receiving the benefits of celebrity endorsement, while avoiding the risk of a scandal (Goldman, 1994; Miller, 1993). Marilyn Monroe's endorsement of Chanel No.5 is a recent example. It is estimated that more than 50 years after her death, the actress earns \$10 million annually (O'Reilly, 2013). Other alternatives to using living celebrity endorsers include the use of animated characters (such as the Geico gecko or Mr. Peanut), and animals (such as the Aflac duck or Duke, the Bush's Baked Beans dog) (Till & Shimp, 1998).

Furthermore, as a measure to protect their reputations during media scandals, many organizations try to distance themselves from disgraced celebrity endorsers by terminating their

contracts. In fact many organizations include morals clauses in the contracts they sign with celebrity endorsers to ease this process.

Although organizations risk their reputations by maintaining relationships with disgraced celebrity endorsers, research has shown that it is sometimes more financially beneficial to do so. Following his 2009 marital infidelity scandal, Tiger Woods lost \$22 million worth of endorsement deals with Accenture, AT&T, Gatorade, General Motors, TAG Heuer, and Gillette (Wei, 2010). Despite this exodus of corporate sponsors, Nike remained loyal, which according to Carnegie Mellon's Tepper School of Business, was the right decision, as his termination would have cost the company an additional \$1.6 million in profits (Schultz, 2010). This conclusion was reached through the development of a consumer demand model, to which the calculated impact of Woods' scandal was applied.

Consumer reactions to negative endorser publicity are moderated by blame attribution, perceived consequences of the scandal (Fong & Wyer, 2012), gender (Edwards & La Ferle, 2009), celebrity endorser affinity (Johnson, 2005; Um, 2013), brand commitment (Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, & Unnava, 2000; Um, 2013), timing, and the strength of the association between endorser and product (Till & Shimp, 1998).

*Scandal type.* Although limited research has been conducted in this area, the negative information literature suggests that consumers differ in their reactions to negative information, depending on the characteristics of the media scandal.

Um (2013) found that when a celebrity endorser is held responsible for a scandal, consumers evaluate brands more negatively than when the scandal is perceived to be circumstantial. Additionally, Money, Shimp, and Sakano (2006) distinguished between

consumer reactions to negative celebrity endorser behavior that affected the celebrity alone (selforiented scandals) and behavior that affected others (other-oriented scandals). They found that consumer brand evaluations were more positive when the scandal impacted the celebrity alone.

The manner in which consumers respond to negative information also depends on whether they concern the morality or competence of the individuals or organizations involved (Votolato & Unnava, 2006; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Wojciszke, Brycz, & Borkenau, 1993). Negative information related to morality pertains to a person's or organization's ethics and principles (Votolato & Unnava, 2006), and consumers perceive such information as going against their established ethical standards (Ahluwalia, 1996). Michael Vick's involvement in a dogfighting ring is an example of a moral-based scandal concerning a celebrity endorser. Meanwhile, negative information related to competence pertains to a person's or organization's abilities in an area of expertise (Homer & Batra, 1994). Marion Jones' doping scandal falls under this category.

The influence of scandal type on consumer reactions to negative information has implications for brand alliances between organizations and celebrities. Research shows that when the misdeed is committed by the celebrity endorser, the negative effects of scandals are minimized when they are related to competence, as opposed to morality. The opposite is true for organizations. This is due to the different expectations that society has of individuals and organizations (Votolato & Unnava, 2006).

Based on this, two types of scandals will be examined in this study: competence-based scandals and moral-based scandals. The following hypothesis is proposed:

**H4:** Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of moral-based scandals than under conditions of competence-based scandals.

## **Attributes of Effective Celebrity Endorsers**

Marketing communications scholars have dedicated much attention to identifying the specific attributes that characterize successful celebrity endorsers (e.g. Friedman & Friedman 1979; Halonen-Knight & Hurmerinta, 2010; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Ohanian, 1990, 1991). Measures of celebrity endorser effectiveness include increased purchase intentions, message recall and brand recognition. Research in this area has produced two schools of thought: source credibility and attractiveness models (also known as the source models), and the match-up hypothesis.

Based on social psychology principles, the source models were developed to identify the conditions under which message senders are persuasive (McCracken, 1989). These posit that consumers are influenced by perceived celebrity endorser attributes such as expertise, trustworthiness, similarity, familiarity, and likeability (Ohanian 1990, 1991). Therefore, all aspects of persuasiveness rest on the celebrity endorser, and not the product (McCracken, 1989). Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953) explained that expertise and trustworthiness conveyed a sense of credibility, which increased the persuasiveness of a message. Moreover, McGuire (1985) argued that when a celebrity is perceived to be familiar, similar to oneself, and likeable, they are also perceived as attractive and compelling individuals. Although the source models have been widely supported (e.g. Atkin & Block, 1983; Kamen, Azhari, & Kragh, 1975), other studies have produced contrasting results (e.g. Friedman & Friedman, 1979). McCracken (1989) argued that these models are unable to explain why certain celebrity endorser campaigns spearheaded by

individuals who possess all the attributes put forward by the source models still fail. They also do not explain why the same celebrity can successfully promote one product, yet fail with another. For instance, Bill Cosby was successful at endorsing Jell-O, but failed as an endorser for E. F Hutton financial services (Mittelstaedt, Riesz, & Burns, 2000). The match-up hypothesis fills this gap.

According to the match-up hypothesis, celebrity endorser influence is at its peak when there is consistency between a celebrity's image and the nature of the endorsed product (Friedman & Friedman 1979; Kamins, 1990; Kamins & Gupta, 1994). A suitable match between an endorser and a product will produce greater perceptions of advertising effectiveness, as well as celebrity value (Hawkins, Best, & Coney, 1983). In contrast, a mismatch reduces message believability, which lowers advertising effectiveness and purchase intentions (Kamins & Gupta, 1994). The effects of the congruence between celebrities and brands can be explained by the schema theory, which is explained further along in this chapter.

Studies that have examined the link between source attributes and the match-up hypothesis have found that in order for celebrity endorsers to be effective, their positive attributes must align with the product features. For instance, celebrities promoting beauty products must be highly attractive (Kahle & Homer, 1985). Kamins (1990) supported this illustration, revealing that physically attractive celebrity endorsers had no advantage when promoting products that were unrelated to appearance.

#### The Meaning Transfer Model

McCracken (1989) proposed the meaning transfer model to explain the process through which consumer behavior is influenced by celebrity endorsement. Overall, the meaning transfer

model holds that the effect of celebrity endorsement results from celebrities' cultural meaning and the transference of that meaning (Miller & Allen, 2012).

In order to understand the processes involved in celebrity endorsement, it is essential to understand the general process of meaning transfer in the consumer society. Meaning originates from a cultural environment, which is both physical and social. McCracken (1988) explained that consumer products are assigned meaning through advertising, which is decoded by consumers through their own efforts. After marketing communication professionals decide which cultural meanings they intend to assign a product, they then go through the process of selecting objects, people, and contexts that already hold these meanings. Message effectiveness is enhanced by pairing products with cultural manifestations of desired meanings, and it is essential in this process for this pairing to be congruent. The process is complete when consumers evaluate the now culturally symbolic products against their sense of self in order to determine whether or not they are in alignment.

The meaning transfer model of celebrity endorsement has three phases. First, celebrities are assigned cultural symbols based on their societal roles and media portrayals. This happens over time. Each time a celebrity performs a new act on any kind of public platform, be it appearing in a new movie or television show, giving a media interview, or participating in an athletic competition, they add to or reinforce the meanings attached to their image. Celebrities embody a wide array of meanings pertaining to "status, class, gender, and age, as well as personality and lifestyle" (McCracken, 1989, p.312). This presents various angles in which their image can be shaped, examples of which include "the perfect dad," "the regal woman," and "the man of wisdom and experience" (McCracken, 1989).

During the second phase of the meaning transfer model, celebrity endorsers transfer the meanings they embody to the products they are paired with in marketing communication campaigns. At this point, communications professionals identify all the meanings they wish to be associated with a product. They then strive to bring out those meanings by emphasizing those specific qualities in the celebrity endorsers chosen to promote the product. McCracken (1989) noted, however, that since celebrities hold both desirable and undesirable meanings, it is imperative to avoid misinterpretation by ensuring that all elements of the message (all written content, objects, people, and contexts) support the desired meaning. The message must also evoke a sense of similarity between the endorser and product in order for consumers to believe that the product has now come to embody the qualities of the celebrity endorser, preparing them for the third and final phase of the meaning transfer model.

The third phase involves product consumption. It has been long established in the consumer behavior literature that individuals use products they consider to be symbolic to fulfill their ego needs, which pertain to a person's self-esteem (McCracken, 1988). During symbolic consumption, consumers purchase products as a means of developing their self-concept and conveying their self-image to the world (Connors, 2013). This process involves purchasing products which are viewed as consistent with consumers' perception of themselves, both their real and ideal selves. Celebrity endorsers "create a lifestyle image that fans can identify with, imitate, and adapt" (Bell, 2011, p.3). Celebrities represent many of the qualities ordinary individuals aspire to, which feeds into the construction of their ideal selves. Consumers therefore purchase celebrity endorsed products, which come to possess new meanings during the second stage of meaning transfer.



Figure 2: Meaning movement and the endorsement process (Source: McCracken, 1989)

Research by Langmeyer and Walker (1991) supported the meaning transfer model. First, the researchers found that, among other things, singer and actress Cher was perceived to represent attractiveness, fitness, hard work, sex, independence, and confidence. They also found that participants used the same symbolic language to describe Scandinavian Health Spas, which Cher endorsed. In contrast, when asked to evaluate bath towels as a consumer product, participants used generic descriptors such as soft, gentle, clean, and comfortable.

In the same vein, Miller and Allen (2012) argued that pairing a celebrity with a brand alters brand meanings and attitudes. This is true even when there is no explicit message. They also reported that participants were unable to accurately recall endorser-brand pairings, suggesting that meaning transfer still occurs when there is minimal conscious processing. Halonen-Knight and Hurmerinta (2010) also proposed that meaning transfer between celebrities and brands is reciprocal. As such, in addition to the original celebrity-product roles theorized by the meaning transfer model, the image created by a product also has the ability to assign meaning to an endorser.

One of the goals of this study is to discover whether the meaning transfer process occurs when CRM endorsers take on negative symbols. Apart from the impact on brand attitudes and

purchase intentions, this study also aims at determining whether the meanings attached to an endorser involved in a scandal have some bearing on organizational attitudes, and whether these translate into purchase intentions. Research on the association between celebrity endorsement and organizational perceptions is scarce. However, findings by Agrawal and Kamakura (1995) suggested that this relationship exists, as they found a positive correlation between the announcement of an endorsement deal and increased perceptions of firm value. Langmeyer and Shank (1993) also found a positive correlation between perceptions of a celebrity endorser and the nonprofit organization with which they were affiliated.

The predictive effect of attitudes on behavioral intentions is well-established. This has theoretical underpinnings in the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) and the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Research shows that consumer attitudes toward negative organizational publicity have an impact on behavioral intentions (Einwiller, Fedorikhin, Johnson, and Kamins, 2006). Thus, based on the meaning transfer model, the following hypothesis will be tested:

**H5**: Product attitudes and organizational attitudes will mediate the positive predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on purchase intentions, such that (a) CRM endorser attitudes will positively predict product attitudes and organizational attitudes, and (b) product attitudes and organizational attitudes will positively predict purchase intentions.

## **Cause-Related Marketing and Celebrity Endorsement**

CRM and celebrity endorsement campaigns are both strategic brand alliances. As the name suggests, strategic brand alliances form partnerships between brands with other entities such as other brands, organizations, prominent people, and events in order to achieve a goal. The

use of celebrity endorsers in CRM campaigns is a tactical move to boost brand awareness and recall, as well as enhance brand differentiation.

The involvement of celebrities in CRM alludes to the proper management of campaigns, the legitimacy of philanthropic goals, and the viability of the solution. It also contributes to the "cool quotient" of CRM campaigns (Richey & Ponte, 2008). Moreover, celebrity CRM endorsers highlight "the relationship between pleasure, entertainment, and charity" (Davis, 2010, p.114). In doing so, they help consumers negotiate the conflict between individualism and communality (Bell, 2011). Consumer products are by their nature individualistic, as they promote self-gratification. Celebrity endorsers help consumers make the leap from considering product purchase as materialistic to viewing it as a humanitarian act. They do this by propagating a philanthropic lifestyle that is achieved through consumption. The words of celebrities carry rhetorical power, and, to fans, hold more credence than those of ordinary individuals (Bell, 2011). Therefore, fans are more likely to adopt the attitudes and behavior of the celebrities they idolize. Celebrity power is therefore "derived from linkages between individual and culture industry presentation, and audience affinity" (Bell, 2011, p. 3).

The connection between celebrities and their fans is an emotional one, and stems from the belief that fans know celebrities on a personal level (Dyer, 1986). Celebrity CRM endorsers are effective because charitable giving is considered a private act performed publicly, and fans' perceptions of celebrities' "true selves" are reinforced by their involvement in CRM campaigns. Consumer engagement in these campaigns is therefore based on their desire to shape their ideal selves according to these perceptions (Bell, 2011).

Celebrities have been linked to many CRM campaigns over the years, among which include disgraced cyclist Lance Armstrong for Nike's Livestrong campaign; Jennifer Aniston,

Penelope Cruz, and Gwyneth Paltrow for the Entertainment Industry Foundation and Saks Fifth Avenue's *Key to the Cure*; Kelly Clarkson and Gilles Marini for Ford's *Warriors in Pink*, which supports various breast cancer charities; and Sheryl Crow for One a Day and Feeding America's *Nutrition Mission*.

(Product) RED is arguably the most celebrity-driven nonprofit organization that engages in CRM. Founded in 2006 by Bono, the lead singer of rock band U2, and activist-politician Bobby Shriver, (Product) RED is an organization that raises money for The Global Fund primarily through CRM with the goal of helping prevent and treat AIDS. (RED) partners with corporations such as Coca-Cola; Apple; Starbucks; Beats Electronics; Bed, Bath and Beyond; and Belvedere Vodka in CRM initiatives, where special products are manufactured and sold, with up to 50% of the proceeds going toward the cause. Celebrities who promote (RED) products "use their fame to help style consumers as legitimately acquisitive, and politically motivated as citizen-consumers" (Bell, 2011, p. 3). Through print and television advertisements and other promotional materials, online channels, billboards, and events, the organization and its affiliated products have been promoted by celebrities such as David Beckham, Usher, Anne Hathaway, Chris Rock, Steven Spielberg, Oprah Winfrey, Jennifer Garner, Mary J. Blige, Gisele Bundchen, among others. This strategy has proved successful over the years, as (RED) has raised about \$215 million for The Global Fund since its inception (Barker, 2013). As much as (RED) has been lauded for its efforts, it has been criticized for commodifying and stereotyping Africans (Bell, 2011), promoting hegemony (Phu, 2010), and using an opaque business model (Dadush, 2010).

**Relationships between endorsers, causes, and brands.** The success of strategic brand alliances rests on the relationship between parties. Most importantly, there should be consistency in image or function among elements, also known as fit. Fit can be described as the degree to which a set of associated entities is perceived to be consistent in relation to mission, target audience, and / or values (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006). Historically, it has been studied in terms of perceived congruence between a brand and cause (e.g. Drumwright, 1996), or between a celebrity endorser and a brand (e.g. Kamins & Gupta, 1994). Since there are three factors that contribute to fit in this study, the perceived congruence between an endorser, brand, and cause as one entity will be assessed.

Gwinner (1997) identified two types of fit: image-based and function-based. Image-based fit occurs when there is some similarity in what the elements in a partnership represent. For example, both Subway and its celebrity endorser Michael Phelps represent a healthy lifestyle. Moreover, Coca-Cola's collaboration with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) on their *Arctic Home* campaign is another example of image-based fit since both organizations are known for their environmental conservation efforts. Congruence in image between a charitable organization and a celebrity is also achieved when the celebrity is personally connected to the cause. For instance, Star Jones' affiliation with the American Heart Association is based on her history as a survivor of heart disease.

Function-based fit however occurs when the elements in a partnership complement each other in practical ways. Nike's sponsorship of various athletes, Jennifer Hudson and Jessica Simpson's endorsement of Weight Watchers, and Habitat for Humanity's partnership with Home Depot are good examples. One difference between the types of fit relates to how they are perceived. The perception of image-based fit is contingent on consumer knowledge of the history

of the parties involved, as well as what they represent, while function-based fit can be communicated to consumers through promotional materials (Trimble & Rifon, 2006).

The influence of fit on the success of strategic brand alliances has been of great interest to scholars (e.g. Nan & Heo, 2007; Kamins, 1990). Fit has been shown to elicit more positive consumer reactions with both celebrity endorsement and cause-related marketing (Pracejus & Olsen, 2004; Trimble & Rifon, 2006). Fit positively impacts corporate credibility, attitudes toward causes (Rifon, Choi, Trimble, & Li, 2004), and brand recall (Cornwell & Coote, 2005). Basil and Herr (2003) found that in a cause-brand alliance, consumer perception of fit is a stronger predictor of attitude toward the charity involved than attitude toward the organization. This suggests that partnering with organizations with poor reputations on CRM campaigns may still succeed if there is a strong cause-brand fit.

Positive fit effects result from the fact that individuals value consistency, and as a result, they react positively when cognitive consistency is experienced. Poor fit, on the other hand, causes consumers to be skeptical about organizations' motives, which induces negative CRM reactions and weakens brand image (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006). This explanation is backed by schema theory (Bartlett, 1932). In 2010, KFC's *Buckets for the Cure* campaign to raise funds for the Susan G. Komen Foundation was met with public outrage, as consumers could not make the connection between the fast food restaurant, which many perceived as promoting an unhealthy lifestyle, and the cause. This led to notions of cause exploitation (termed "pinkwashing") among consumers and watchdog organizations (Watson, 2010).

*Schema theory.* Schema theory reveals the mechanisms behind consumer reactions to congruent and incongruent information. As such, among other things, it is able to explain the outcomes predicted by the match-up hypothesis (Lynch & Schuler, 1994).

Schema theory is based on research indicating that memory is not solely made up of precise records of one's experiences; it also includes generalizations of people, activities, and objects (Barlett, 1932; Gwinner & Eaton, 1999). These generalizations are known as schemas. A schema is defined as "a cognitive structure that represents knowledge about a type of stimulus, for example, a person, event, or object" (Gwinner & Eaton, 1999, p. 49). Schemas develop over time through life experiences, and affect cognitive processing (Trimble & Rifon, 2006). The main assumption proposed by the schema theory is that individuals' attention and behaviors are guided by a set of these knowledge structures.

Schemas make it possible for individuals to function in a complicated world. During decision-making, instead of having to clearly remember what is appropriate for specific situations (e.g. staying at the Holiday Inn), or attitudes toward specific individuals (e.g. one particular police officer), or objects (e.g. Nike shoes), people are able to tap into their knowledge of the general type of situation (staying at hotels), individual (police officers), or object (athletic shoes), simplifying the cognitive process (Gwinner & Eaton, 1999).

According to the schema theory, people try to fit new information they encounter into associated knowledge structures, and congruence between these facilitates the process. However, when information is incongruent, it receives greater elaboration which is likely to lead to motive questioning, which in turn produces skepticism and other negative attitudes (Trimble & Rifon, 2006). In a cause-brand alliance, incongruence enhances sponsor recall, albeit for negative reasons (Hastie, 1984).

Fit also functions in the transfer of attitudes from one entity to another (Nan & Heo, 2007). The greater the congruence, the easier it is to transfer attitudes. As previously noted, consumers with a high cause affinity are likely to have positive attitudes toward the cause, which transfer on to its associated entities; however this is moderated by fit.

Moreover, in relation to the effects of negative endorser publicity, when the congruence between a celebrity and a brand is high, negative publicity affects the endorser's attractiveness and credibility, regardless of the source of information (Thwaites, Lowe, Monkhouse, & Barnes, 2012).

This study examines the effect of fit within the CRM endorser domain. The following hypotheses were formed:

**H6:** The better the endorser-brand-cause fit, the stronger the predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on (a) product attitudes and (b) organizational attitudes.

**H7:** Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of good fit than under conditions of poor fit.

# The Moderating Role of Gender in Strategic Brand Alliances and Reactions to Negative Information

Studies have established differences in consumer reactions to strategic brand alliances such as CRM and celebrity endorsement based on gender. The selectivity hypothesis (Putrevu, 2001) posits that information processing is impacted by gender differences, which, in turn, affects interpretation. Females elaborate more on messages, make more inferences about the message source, and tend to focus more on details, while males are more inclined to focus on broad themes (Murray & Price, 2012). Vilela and Nelson (2013) confirmed these arguments through research they conducted on the influence of gender on CRM effects among Millennials. According to them CRM elicits more favorable outcomes among females than males. Moreover, in line with the theoretical framework, females based their purchase decisions on multiple cues. The researchers also revealed that females' purchase intentions increased immediately after message exposure, but declined after two weeks, while the opposite was true for males. This has implications for shortand long-term persuasion.

Berger et al. (1999) also found evidence to support these findings. Through two lab experiments, the researchers determined that females had more positive attitudes toward CRM messages than males. The effect of fit on CRM effects is however not moderated by gender (Lafferty et al., 2004; Pracejus & Olsen, 2004; Rifon et al., 2004).

In terms of celebrity endorsement effects, Klaus and Bailey (2008) determined that female consumers respond more favorably to messages featuring celebrity endorsers than males.

Gender differences in consumer responses also extend to negative information. Studies have shown that females have stronger adverse reactions to negative celebrity endorser publicity than males. In a study examining consumer responses to negative endorser publicity, Murray and Price (2012) recorded more unfavorable attitudes and purchase intentions among females than males. In addition to this, Edwards and La Ferle (2009) found that although the congruence in gender between consumers and celebrity endorsers influences attitudes, it does not impact negative information processing. In other words, male consumers do not perceive male celebrity endorsers as any better or worse than female celebrity endorsers. The same is true for females. Murray and Price (2012) also suggested that when processing negative information, females base their evaluations on elements which are external to the message, while males focus on the

message. Thus, during product evaluation, females are more likely to fixate on the endorser associated with a product and the details of their negative act, while males are more likely to focus on the product itself.

The literature leads to the conclusion that gender differences could have some bearing on the present study. Gender may influence purchase intentions, as well as endorser attitudes, which, in turn, may affect product and organizational attitudes. In order to ensure internal validity, it is therefore essential to eliminate the effect of this potential confound through statistical methods (i.e. Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA)).

### **Relationship Management Theory**

Relationship management theory has its foundations in Ferguson's (1984) call for a focus on organization-public relationships (OPR) in the field of public relations, moving away from its traditional emphasis on communication output. From the standpoint of relationship management, managing OPR helps organizations balance their interests with those of their key publics, leading to mutual benefits. This paradigm describes public relations as "the management function that identifies, establishes, and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the various publics on whom its success or failure depends" (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 1985, p.4).

The basic assumption of relationship management theory is that over time, the effective management of organizational relationships with publics that share its interests and goals leads to mutual understanding and benefits (Ledingham, 2003). Relationships between an organization and its stakeholders begin when the outcomes of organizational decision-making affect publics, or when stakeholder actions affect organizations (Hon & Grunig, 1999), and long-term OPR is

built on the concept of mutuality (Ledingham & Bruning, 2000). OPR involves the exchange of needs, expectations, and fulfillment, and the state of a relationship between an organization and its key publics is an indicator of whether or not these needs and expectations have been fulfilled. Common interests and shared goals are also important to the quality of OPR.

Ledingham (2006) argued that relationship management theory can be defined as a general theory of public relations, as it meets the criteria put forward by Littlejohn (1983) regarding the functions of a theory: organizing and summarizing, focus, clarifying, observation, predictability, heuristic, communicative, and control. First, Ledingham states that relationship management theory helps organize research in the area of public relationships. It also directs public relations research on relationships, providing a research goal. Moreover, it explains the field of study, as well as its research observations. It also points out the concepts at play within the area of OPR and how they interact. Furthermore, relationship management theory, through operationalization and the development of models, lays out the manner in which the process of relationship management can be observed. Also, by identifying concepts and how they interact, the theory lays a good foundation for future research. Finally, the theory controls the observed outcomes by specifying its requirements for performance: expectation fulfillment, and mutuality of understanding and benefit.

Ledingham (2006) proposed that apart from Ferguson's influence, three other conditions have led to the emergence of relationship management as a major public relations paradigm both in theory and practice. First, the reconceptualization of public relations as a management function facilitated the incorporation of management concepts in public relations practice, which were helpful in executing OPR concepts. Second, a greater understanding of OPR came from incorporating concepts from the interorganizational and interpersonal relationship literature,

especially with regards to the identification of relationship attributes. This led to a greater interest in considering OPR as a predictor of public behaviors, as well as in how to measure OPR quality. Finally, the development of relationship management theory was also facilitated by the construction of models of relationship management which included OPR antecedents, processes, and consequences. These models created a deeper understanding of OPR management.

The development of relationship management theory has resulted from contributions by OPR scholars in a number of areas, including OPR definitions, dimensions and types of OPR, strategies and maintenance of OPR, as well as developmental and process models of OPR.

## **Organization-Public Relationships**

Organization-Public Relationship is a major construct within relationship management theory and one of the most examined constructs in public relations research. According to Sallot, Lyon, Acosta-Alzuru, and Jones (2003), OPR research is the second most popular stream in public relations scholarship. Huang and Zhang (2013), in a review of OPR research, determined that quantitative research methods were most frequently used in the study of OPR, followed by qualitative approaches, and meta-analyses. A majority of studies using quantitative approaches relied on surveys, while a relatively small percentage used experiments.

Relationship management theory has great heuristic value. OPR has been examined across a wide variety of topic areas in the field of public relations including crisis communication (Coombs, 2000; Park & Reber, 2011), intercultural communication (Ni & Wang, 2008), corporate reputation management (Yang, 2007), social media (Haigh, Brubaker, & Whiteside, 2011; Sweetser, 2010), and digital corporate communication (Vorvoreanu, 2008). It also has utility across different kinds of organizations including PR agencies (Bruning & Ledingham, 2002), telephone companies (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998), banks (Bruning &

Ledingham, 1999), electronic companies (Jo, 2003), museums (Schoen, 2005), and healthcare providers (Lucarelli-Dimmick, Bell, Burgiss, & Ragsdale, 2000).

The OPR framework was developed through an interdisciplinary approach, integrating theories and concepts from a number of fields: interpersonal communication, organizational behavior, social psychology, marketing, and management (Bruning & Ledingham, 1999).

**Definition**. Public relations theorists have provided diverse definitions of OPR, however this study relies on the definition provided by Ledingham and Bruning (1998). In reaction to an appeal by Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (1997) for a definition of the concept of OPR, Ledingham and Bruning (1998) furnished this statement describing it as "the state which exists between an organization and its key publics, in which the action of either can impact the economical, social, cultural or political wellbeing of the other" (p. 62). This definition focuses on the impact of organization-public relationships.

Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (2000) later offered an alternate definition. According to them, relationships involve the exchange of resources between organizations resulting in mutual benefit and achievement. Thus, drawing from this definition, OPR develops through reciprocity and can be regarded as a transaction.

Finally, Huang (1998) also defines OPR according to relationship features. Relationships are defined as the extent to which organizations and key publics trust each other, agree on power relations, are mutually satisfied, and are committed to each other.

**Dimensions of organization-public relationships.** OPR is multidimensional, can be observed over time, and described at a single point in time (Broom et al., 1997). Public relations scholars have uncovered a number of relationship dimensions linked to measuring its quality.

These come in two forms: those based on relationship outcomes, and those based on relationship characteristics.

In terms of measures linked to relationship outcomes, Ledingham and Bruning (1998) identified five relationship dimensions linked to OPR management: (1) *trust* (when an organization is honorable and does not renege on its promises), (2) *openness* (sharing future plans with key publics), (3) *involvement* (participating in community welfare activities), (4) *investment* (financially contributing to the welfare of a community), and (5) *commitment* (dedication to the well-being of a community). These five dimensions influence consumer attitudes toward an organization, which in turn lead to behavioral intentions. According to Ledingham (2006), there is a positive correlation between perceptions of OPR and organizational attitudes, indicating that the stronger consumers' OPR perceptions, the more favorable their attitudes, and vice versa. High scores on these dimensions have also been linked to greater customer satisfaction.

Bruning and Galloway (2003) expanded this OPR scale by adding two subcategories to the commitment dimension: *personal* and *structural*. Personally committed individuals choose to be in relationships due to the mutual benefits reaped out of a positive arrangement. However, those who are structurally committed have to be in relationships either because there are no other alternatives, or circumstances prevent them from leaving. The researchers also introduced five OPR dimensions: (1) *anthropomorphism* (reflection of positive, human qualities), (2) *professional benefits/expectations*, (3) *personal commitment*, (4) *community improvement*, and (5) *comparison of alternatives* (public perception of organization's competitors).

In terms of measures linked to relationship characteristics, Ferguson (1984) identified five relationship attributes: *dynamic* versus *static*, *open* versus *closed*, *mutual satisfaction*, *power* 

*distribution*, and *mutual understanding*, *agreement*, and *consensus*. Based on this, Grunig, Grunig, and Ehling (1992) offered these relationship dimensions: *reciprocity*, *trust*, *mutual legitimacy*, *openness*, *mutual satisfaction*, and *mutual understanding*. Vercic and Grunig (1995) identified trust as the attribute that enables the existence of organizations. Huang (1997) also proposed the following OPR dimensions: *control mutuality*, *trust*, *commitment*, and *satisfaction*. Hon and Grunig (1999) extended this to consider communal and exchange relationships. Huang (2001) added *face* and *favor* to this as dimensions in order to expand the scale to include Eastern cultural values. Finally, Kim (2001) has also proposed the following dimensions: *trust*, *commitment*, *involvement*, and *reputation*.

**Types of organization-public relationships.** Grunig (1993) distinguished between two types of relationships: symbolic and behavioral. Symbolic relationships are communication-based and focus on image, while behavioral relationships consist of the actual dealings between an organization and its key publics, and are based on actions and events. In order to make organizations more effective, these two relationships must be linked.

Moreover, Bruning and Ledingham (1999) identified three types of OPR: personal, professional, and community. Based on these three categories, the scholars created a 16-item relationship quality measurement scale, which will be used in this study.

Personal relationships are most closely linked to the following dimensions: *trust*, *involvement*, *investment*, and *commitment*, while professional relationships are mainly associated with *involvement*, *trust*, and *investment*. Also, community relationships are mostly concerned with the *openness*, *involvement*, and *commitment* dimensions.

Managing personal relationships involves developing a sense of trust between the organization and its key publics, investing time, energy, thought and feelings into organization-public interactions, taking a personal interest in key publics and demonstrating commitment to meeting their needs. Moreover, managing professional relationships involves delivering services in a business-like and satisfactory manner, and demonstrating an interest in investing financially in the relationship. Finally, managing community relationships involves being open with community members and supporting community events, improving social and economic lives of community members, and engaging in community development.

Hon and Grunig (1999) also discussed two types of OPRs: exchange and communal. Exchange relationships are described as the situation where one party helps the other only because the other has done so in the past, or will likely do so in the future. Meanwhile, in communal relationships, one party helps the other purely out of concern. Communal relationships lend themselves better to effective public relations practice than exchange relationships. Hung (2005) expanded Grunig's communal/exchange dichotomy to include exploitative, manipulative, symbiotic, contractual, covenantal, and mutual communal relationships. These are arranged on a continuum.

Furthermore, Bruning (2001) distinguished between complementary and symmetric relationships. Complementary relationships describe the situation where one party is able to meet the other's needs as a result of the knowledge and skill they possess. In order for the relationship to be mutually beneficial, both sides have to work together. On the other hand, symmetric relationships describe the situation where an affinity is created between relationship partners in which one party's achievement is considered the other's. These parties create mutually beneficial relationships through communication.

Benefits of positive organization-public relationships. High quality relationships between organizations and their key publics result in positive outcomes for organizations such as mutual understanding and benefits (Ledingham, 2006). Favorable perceptions of OPR lead to relational satisfaction, loyalty, positive organizational attitudes, and supportive behaviors (Grunig, Grunig, & Dozier, 2002; Ledingham, 2006; Ledingham & Bruning, 1998). They also serve as a buffer against reputational damage among organizations going through crises by making publics more sympathetic to crisis response strategies (Park & Reber, 2011). In order to reap these benefits, OPRs must be cultivated and maintained. Bruning, DeMiglio, and Embry (2006) argued that developing mutually beneficial relationships is the key to building and sustaining high quality OPRs. Moreover, publics' awareness of the existence of a relationship with an organization is an antecedent to positive relationship outcomes. Communication is also a crucial part of building and maintaining OPR, as this process facilitates information exchange between organizations and their key publics. Broom and Dozier (1990) also suggested that the quality of OPR is determined by the degree to which an organization and its public agree on key issues, as well as how well one party can predict the other party's position on those issues.

**Organization-public relationship models.** Recently, PR scholars have proposed models to conceptualize OPR theory. First, Broom et al. (1997) put forward a three-stage model consisting of relationship antecedents (which explain the reasons for the development of relationships with particular publics), relationship concepts (characteristics of exchanges, transactions, communications and other related activities), and consequences (identified as loss of autonomy/ dependence, goal attainment, and routine / conventional behavior). Broom et al.'s (1997) pioneering model also proposed three dimensions of relationship states: formalization

(the extent to which policies are contractual), standardization (the extent to which interactions are institutionalized), and complexity (the variety of linkages between an organization and each public). The model also considers the intensity and reciprocity of information and resource flow.

Grunig and Huang (2000) reconceptualized Broom et al.'s (1997) model and recommended monitoring strategies for each stage: environmental scanning, observation, and coorientational measurement respectively.

Ledingham (2000) proposed the SMARTS Public Relations model for managing OPR. SMARTS is an acronym for Scan, Map, Act, Rollout, Track, and Steward. This model outlines specific steps organizations must take in order to manage stakeholder relationships. The SMARTS PR model also involves strategies to monitor organization-public relationships, pretest methods for campaigns, as well as execute and evaluate campaigns.

Scanning involves investigating the antecedents of OPRs. This step involves gathering information on the relational history between an organization and the public with whom it seeks to build or maintain a relationship. Stakeholder perceptions about issues concerning the organization are also determined. The information uncovered during the scanning period informs the entire campaign. Next, Mapping involves planning the relationship building or maintenance campaign. At this point, goals are set and strategies are formulated. Acting involves pretesting campaign elements, such as promotional messages, to determine effectiveness. Here, focus groups, interviews or surveys may be conducted. The Rollout phase involves campaign implementation, while the success of the campaign is evaluated during the Track phase. Measures of success vary widely and depend on the objectives of the campaign. Finally, Stewarding involves modifying campaign strategies to increase the effectiveness of present or future efforts. This is based on the information gathered during tracking (Tucker, 2009).

Drawing from Knapp's (1984) model of the five stages of coming together and apart in interpersonal relationships, Bruning and Ledingham (2002) also created a developmental model of OPR. This model was constructed by drawing parallels between what happens during the course of interpersonal relationships and during the course of OPRs. During this process, the researchers detected a link between shifts in symbolic and behavioral patterns within OPRs and relationship quality. This model provides a foundation for "developing strategies to initiate, nurture, and maintain" OPR (Ledingham, 2006, p. 475).

Maintenance strategies. Organization-public relationships are dynamic (Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 1997; Ledingham, 2003; Hung, 2005). In other words, they change over time. There is therefore the need to constantly maintain the quality of OPR throughout its life cycle. Drawing from the interpersonal communication literature, public relations scholars have proposed certain strategies for maintenance of the relationships between organizations and their key publics (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Grunig & Huang, 2000; Hung, 2006). These include access, positivity, openness, assurances of legitimacy, task sharing, networking, unconditional support, and cooperation. Other researchers have posited the following relationship maintenance strategies: responsiveness, continued dialogue, visible leadership, and political and social accommodation (Rhee, 2004; Chen, 2005). Hung (2006) argued that selection of relationship management strategy should be based on organizations' motives and goals.

**Organization-public relationships and negative information.** Although research in this area is limited, the state of the relationship between an organization and its key stakeholders has implications for consumer reactions to negative information. Stakeholder perceptions of OPR

influence their views of a specific incident or event that the organization experiences (Hung-Baesecke & Chen, 2013). Studies have shown that when consumers encounter negative organizational information such as during crises, those with more favorable relationships with organizations have more positive reactions in terms of blame attribution, trust, and perceptions of crisis response strategies (Brown & White, 2011; Park & Reber, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2005). Stakeholders with positive relationships with organizations involved in crises are more likely to overlook the negative information that has emerged, while those with unfavorable relationships with organizations are more likely to focus on this information, resulting in reputational damage (Coombs & Holladay, 2001).

Moreover, according to Marra (1992), the quality of the relationship between an organization and its stakeholders determines the likelihood that it will suffer financial, emotional, or perceptual damage during crises. High quality relationships reduce the risk of these outcomes and build organizations' ability to handle negative stakeholder reactions over time. Kim and Lee (2005) also argue that organizational crises can be avoided by maintaining high quality relationships. However, if these cannot be avoided, strong OPRs mitigate their adverse effects. Furthermore, in crisis communication research, Coombs (1998) supports this assertion, stating that an organization's relationship history can "offset the reputational damage generated by [a] crisis" (p. 182). On the other hand, poor or mismanaged organization-public relationships exacerbates the fallout from negative publicity (Coombs, 2000).

As discussed previously, the celebrity endorsement literature suggests a link between consumer evaluations of celebrity endorsers and their sponsoring organizations (Langmeyer & Shank, 1993; Agrawal & Kamakura, 1995). This study aims to determine whether OPR's moderating function applies within the context of negative endorser publicity. Thus, it

contributes to public relations theory development by extending the OPR literature. The following hypothesis will be tested:

**H8:** Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable consumer (a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of negative OPR perceptions than under conditions of positive OPR perceptions.

# **Summary of Hypotheses**

In review, the following hypotheses will be tested in this study:

**H1:** Consumers' post-scandal (a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions will be less favorable than their pre-scandal ones.

**H2:** Under conditions of good fit, negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) endorser, (b) product, and (c) organizational attitudes among consumers with low cause involvement than those with high cause involvement.

**H3**: Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in lower purchase intentions under conditions of low cause involvement than under conditions of high cause involvement.

**H4**: Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of moral-based scandals than under conditions of competence-based scandals.

H5: Product attitudes and organizational attitudes will mediate the positive predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on purchase intentions, such that (a) CRM endorser attitudes will positively predict product attitudes and organizational attitudes, and (b) product attitudes and organizational attitudes will positively predict purchase intentions.
H6: The better the endorser-brand-cause fit, the stronger the predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on (a) product attitudes and (b) organizational attitudes.

H7: Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of good fit than under conditions of poor fit.H8: Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable consumer (a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of negative OPR perceptions than under conditions of positive OPR perceptions.

#### CHAPTER 3

# METHODOLOGY

Through experimental research, this study tested the hypothesized relationships between variables, as proposed in the previous chapter. This section describes the procedures involved in developing and conducting the study.

#### **Research Design**

The entire study was conducted through self-administered online surveys using the Qualtrics survey system. A convenience sample of undergraduate students from a large Southeastern university was used in this study. A student sample was appropriate for the purposes of this study, as it focused on the Millennial generation. As mentioned previously, research has shown that Millennials are a significant CRM consumer group (Cone Inc., 2010), therefore this study relates to a large segment of actual consumers who will be affected by negative CRM endorser publicity.

Two pretests were first conducted to identify appropriate independent variable stimuli for the main study. The pretests also served to test the reliability of the scales used. During these pretests, participants assessed celebrity endorsers, products, organizations, causes, and negative events according to a range of factors, including familiarity, attitude, fit, OPR, and cause involvement. Actual entities were evaluated, as in order to effectively measure the impact of fit, OPR, and cause involvement, subjects need to potentially have real knowledge of these (see Trimble & Rifon, 2006). This decision was also based on the fact that actual information has been used in previous studies examining the impact of negative celebrity endorser publicity on

consumer perceptions (e.g. Money et al., 2006; Thwaites et al., 2012; Um, 2013). The partnerships between celebrity endorsers, organizations, and causes, as well as the negative event involving celebrity endorsers were however hypothetical in order to facilitate the manipulation, and ensure that participants were not influenced by external factors such as previous knowledge.

The main study used a 2 (Endorser-Product-Cause Fit)  $\times$  2 (Cause Involvement)  $\times$  2 (Scandal Type) pretest-posttest factorial design. The dependent variables consisted of attitudes and purchase intentions, while OPR served as the main moderating variable. The influence of gender was also controlled for in this study through statistical means since it has been found to moderate CRM effects and consumer reactions to negative celebrity endorser publicity (Berger et al., 1999; Edwards & La Ferle, 2009; Ross, Patterson, & Stutts, 1992). Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions and exposed to two fictitious tweets and news articles, after which their perceptions and behavioral intentions were measured.

## **Stimuli Development**

This section outlines the process of developing the main study's stimuli through two pretests.

## Pretest 1

Based on pre-established parameters, the first pretest identified suitable celebrity endorsers, products, organizations, causes, and scandals for the study, which were then evaluated further in the second pretest.

The criteria for selection were as follows: (1) All cases must have a high degree of familiarity, (2) Attitude toward celebrity endorsers must not be predominantly low<sup>a</sup>, (3) Product and organizational attitudes must neither be predominantly low nor high, (4) OPR scores must neither be predominantly low nor high, (5) Products must not have low hedonic product scores, (6) Cause involvement scores must either be high or low<sup>b</sup>, (7) Scandal type must be correctly identified by a majority of participants, and (8) There must be no significant difference in perceived scandal severity between the moral-based scandal and the competence-based scandal selected.

**Sample.** The sample consisted of 125 undergraduate students enrolled in mass communication classes at a large Southeastern university. Four incomplete responses were discarded, resulting in a total sample size of 121. Of the participants, 77.7% (n = 94) were female and 22.3% (n = 27) were male. Participants were Millennials ranging in age from 18 to 27 (M = 20.20, SD = 1.42), and were offered course credit in return for volunteering for the pretest. A majority of participants were White or Caucasian (82.6%). Moreover, most respondents (37.2%) were sophomores. Table 2 presents a summary of the sample characteristics of Pretest 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Marketing communications professionals have identified familiarity and likeability as crucial factors in selecting celebrity endorsers for hedonic products (Erdogan et al., 2001). These criteria were therefore set for the sake of ecological validity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Extreme OPR and cause involvement scores will be excluded from the main study in order to ensure variance in responses.

## Table 2

Sample	п	%	Sample	п	%
Characteristics			Characteristics		
Age (N =121)			Class Standing (N =121)		
18	2	1.7	Freshman	13	10.7
19	40	33.1	Sophomore	45	37.2
20	44	36.4	Junior	39	32.2
21	17	14.0	Senior	24	19.9
22	12	9.9	Ethnicity (N =121)		
23	2	1.7	White / Caucasian	100	82.6
24	2	1.7	Black / African American	10	8.3
26	1	.8	Hispanic / Latino	7	5.8
27	1	.8	Asian / Pacific Islander	3	2.5
			Other	1	.8

Pretest 1 sample characteristics and frequencies

**Procedures.** Pretest 1 was conducted in October 2013 through a self-administered online survey. Participants were recruited through an announcement posted to the students' course management website (see Appendix A).

After reading and agreeing to the terms of the consent form (see Appendix B), participants were presented with a list of 7 celebrity endorsers, which they evaluated in terms of familiarity, attitude, and physical attractiveness. Participants who were totally unfamiliar with a particular celebrity endorser were excluded from evaluating them further.

Next, 10 products and the 8 organizations that manufactured them were also assessed in terms of familiarity, attitude, product type, and perceptions of OPR. Again, any completely unfamiliar product or organization was exempt from further assessment.

Subsequently, a list of 15 charities was presented, with which participants indicated their level of familiarity and involvement. Measuring cause involvement and familiarity through evaluations of charities is supported by previous studies (e.g. Lafferty & Goldsmith, 2005).
This was followed by 19 hypothetical negative events, 11 of which were moral-based, and 8 of which were competence-based. Participants were then asked to classify these according to scandal type, as well as indicate their perceived level of severity.

In order to increase the external validity of this study, the main study stimuli were designed to simulate the process through which participants normally receive information on current events. Thus, during the first pretest, information on participants' primary news source was collected.

Finally, the following demographic information was recorded: age, gender, ethnicity, and class standing.

Instrument. This section discusses the stimuli and measures used in Pretest 1.

*Stimuli.* To boost the external validity of this study, it was ensured that all celebrities evaluated in Pretest 1 actively supported philanthropic causes. This was achieved by selecting celebrities whose philanthropic activities were documented on Look to the Stars, a website that chronicles celebrity giving. Moreover, all the celebrities chosen for the first pretest were or had acted as celebrity endorsers in some capacity. Their selection was also based on anticipated participant familiarity and likeability. The following celebrity endorsers were selected: singer Adam Levine, actress Anne Hathaway, singer Beyoncé, NFL quarterback Eli Manning, actress Jennifer Lawrence, singer Rihanna, and professional tennis player Serena Williams.

Moreover, a majority of the 8 organizations selected for review were listed on the 2013 *Fortune* 500 list to increase the likelihood that participants would be familiar with them. Ten products manufactured by these organizations were also selected for evaluation based on

anticipated familiarity with participants, as well as their perceived role as hedonic products. The choice of products and organizations was also influenced by reports on top brands among Millennials (e.g. Halpert, 2013). It was ensured that this selection covered a broad range of products based on a study that indicated that Millennials' most-loved brands cut across different product categories (see Greenberg, 2013). The following organizations and products were selected: Abercrombie & Fitch (Abercrombie & Fitch T-Shirts), Apple, Inc. (iPhone), Beats Electronics LLC (Beats by Dre headphones), Gap, Inc. (Gap jeans), General Mills, Inc. (Cheerios cereal, Häagen-Dazs ice cream), Nike, Inc. (Nike shoes), PepsiCo (Doritos chips, Pepsi soda), and Starbucks Coffee Company (Starbucks coffee).

Furthermore, 15 charities were selected for evaluation from Look to the Stars. This ensured that they were nonprofits that regularly partnered with celebrities. The campus organization website of the university from which the student sample was drawn was also a useful resource in selecting these charities, as it ensured the inclusion of some organizations with which participants were likely to be highly involved. The following charities were selected: the American Cancer Society, the American Red Cross, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), Amnesty International, Autism Speaks, Feeding America, Habitat for Humanity, Make-A-Wish Foundation, March of Dimes, ONE Campaign, Product (RED), Susan G. Komen for the Cure, The Nature Conservancy, the United Negro College Fund, and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

Finally, 19 brief descriptions of hypothetical negative events involving the 7 celebrity endorsers selected were also presented for evaluation (see Appendix B). It was ensured that none of the situations described could actually be tied to the celebrities selected in order to eliminate the influence of prior knowledge on participant responses.

*Measures.* Familiarity was measured with a three-item, 7-point semantic differential scale. The first two items were adapted from Becker-Olsen and Hill (2006) ( $\alpha$  = .96): "*unfamiliar* / *familiar*," and "*did not recognize* / *recognized*," while the final item, "*not knowledgeable* / *knowledgeable*," was adapted from a familiarity scale developed by Kent and Allen (1994) which reported a reliability coefficient exceeding .85. Overall, the familiarity scale used in this pretest proved highly reliable ( $\alpha$  = .91), as did the individual scales which measured celebrity endorser ( $\alpha$  = .87), product ( $\alpha$  = .84), organization ( $\alpha$  = .85), and cause familiarity ( $\alpha$  = .93).

Attitude toward celebrity endorser was measured with three items adapted from a 7-point semantic differential scale used by Till and Shimp (1998) ( $\alpha = .98$ ): "My overall feelings about [*celebrity endorser's name*] are . . ." This was anchored at -3 and +3 by "*bad / good*," "*unfavorable / favorable*," and "*negative / positive*." The celebrity endorser attitude scale used in this pretest was shown to be highly reliable ( $\alpha = .98$ )

Moreover, attitude toward product was measured by three items (which recorded an alpha of .98) adapted from a 7-point semantic differential scale used by Till and Shimp (1998) ( $\alpha =$  .81). "My overall feelings about [*brand name and product*] are ..." This was anchored at -3 and +3 by "*unfavorable / favorable*," "*negative / positive*," and "*strongly dislike / strongly like*."

Attitude toward organization was also measured with a 7-point semantic differential scale (which recorded a reliability coefficient of .99) adapted from MacKenzie and Lutz (1989) ( $\alpha$  = .93) anchored at -3 and +3 by "*bad / good*," "*unpleasant / pleasant*," and "*unfavorable / favorable*."

Celebrity endorser attractiveness was evaluated with a single-item, 7-point semantic differential scale adapted from Kamins (1990): "How physically attractive do you find [*celebrity endorser name*]?" This scale had the anchors "*extremely unattractive / extremely attractive*."

Product type was assessed with the HED-UT Scale, a 7-point semantic differential scale adapted from Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann (2003). The hedonic items ( $\alpha = .95$ ) used were: "*dull / exciting*," "*not fun / fun*," and "*not enjoyable / enjoyable*." This scale recorded a reliability coefficient of .97.

Organization-public relationship was measured with three items (which recorded a reliability coefficient of .91) from the 7-point Likert scale developed by Ledingham and Bruning (1998, 1999) ( $\alpha$  = .91): I feel that I can trust [*organization name*] to do what it says it will do," "[*Organization name*] demonstrates an interest in me as a person," and "I think that [*organization name*] strives to improve the communities of its customers." This was anchored by "strongly disagree / strongly agree."

Cause involvement was measured with the following three-item, 7-point semantic differential scale ( $\alpha = .96$ ) adapted from Grau and Folse (2007) ( $\alpha = .94$ ) and anchored at -3 and +3 by: "*unimportant / important to me*," "*means nothing to me / means a lot to me*," and "*is personally relevant / irrelevant to me*."

Scandal type was assessed by asking participants to place each scandal under one of two categories: "This act mainly concerns the celebrity endorser's morality, and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent / This act mainly concerns the celebrity endorser's professional competence, and has everything to do with their talent or abilities."

Scandal severity was measured with a single-item, 7-point semantic differential scale asking participants to indicate the extent to which they considered the listed events as serious. This was anchored by "*very trivial / very serious*." Level of severity has previously been assessed using a similar measure (e.g. Hinson & Swanson, 1993).

Finally, primary news source was measured by asking participants to select their main source of information on current events from the following list: "*Print Newspapers / Magazines*," "*Television*," "*Radio*," "*News Websites*," "*Social Media*," "*Word-of-mouth*," and "*Other*." Participants also specified exactly where they got their news if "*News Websites*," "*Social Media*," or "*Other*" were selected.

### **Data Analysis**

*Celebrity endorsers*. The selection of celebrity endorsers for further evaluation was based on descriptive statistical analysis using means and standard deviations. Composite scores of scale items were calculated for each variable measured per participant.

The results from Pretest 1 showed that participants were most familiar with Beyoncé (M = 6.17, SD = 1.03) and least familiar with Eli Manning (M = 4.78, SD = 1.72). As one of the goals of Pretest 1 was to select celebrity endorsers subjects were very familiar with, the two lowest ranking endorsers were eliminated.

Furthermore, of those familiar with the celebrity endorsers listed, participants had the most positive attitude toward Beyoncé (M = 6.14, SD = 1.24), and the least favorable regard for Rihanna (M = 4.77, SD = 1.59). Rihanna was therefore excluded from further review.

Moreover, in terms of physical attractiveness, participants considered Beyoncé most attractive (M = 5.78, SD = 1.47), and Serena Williams least attractive (M = 3.41, SD = 1.54). As a result, Serena Williams was ineligible to be selected for Pretest 2.

Therefore, based on the previously discussed criteria for Pretest 2 selection, and considering the sample characteristics, Anne Hathaway, Beyoncé, and Jennifer Lawrence were

deemed the most appropriate celebrity endorsers for further evaluation. Table 3 presents a

summary of these results.

# Table 3

# Means and standard deviations for celebrity endorsers

Celebri	Celebrity Endorser Familiarity					
Rank	Celebrity Endorser	N	M	SD		
1	Beyoncé	121	6.17	1.03		
2	Rihanna	121	5.93	1.08		
3	Anne Hathaway	121	5.52	1.40		
4	Serena Williams	121	5.30	1.38		
5	Jennifer Lawrence	121	5.26	1.82		
6	Adam Levine	121	5.23	1.80		
7	Eli Manning	121	4.78	1.72		
Celebrity Endorser Attitude						
Rank	Celebrity Endorser	N	M	SD		
1	Beyoncé	120	6.14	1.24		
2	Jennifer Lawrence	112	6.03	1.36		
3	Anne Hathaway	120	5.84	1.40		
4	Adam Levine	115	5.83	1.27		
5	Serena Williams	116	5.50	1.29		
6	Eli Manning	117	5.36	1.32		
7	Rihanna	121	4.77	1.59		
Celebri	ty Endorser Attractiven	ess				
Rank	<b>Celebrity Endorser</b>	N	M	SD		
1	Beyoncé	120	5.78	1.47		
2	Jennifer Lawrence	112	5.41	1.55		
3	Adam Levine	115	5.39	1.90		
4	Anne Hathaway	120	4.72	1.61		
5	Rihanna	121	4.67	1.76		
6	Eli Manning	117	4.40	1.82		
7	Serena Williams	116	3.41	1.54		

*Products and organizations.* The selection of products for further analysis was also determined through descriptive statistical analysis using means and standard deviations. Again, composite measures were calculated for each variable.

Participants ranked the iPhone number one in familiarity (M = 6.63, SD = .73), while Gap jeans had the lowest ranking (M = 4.91, SD = 1.71), and was eliminated from further review.

Moreover, in terms of product attitude, the iPhone once again came first (M = 6.44, SD = .97), while Abercrombie & Fitch T-Shirts recorded the least favorable attitudes (M = 2.89, SD = 1.46). As both products recorded predominantly high or low attitude scores, they were both deemed ineligible for Pretest 2 selection.

Lastly, with regards to product type, the results showed that the iPhone was considered the most pleasure-oriented product by participants (M = 6.48, SD = .87), while Abercrombie & Fitch T-Shirts (M = 2.91, SD = 1.52) scored the lowest on the hedonic product scale. Pepsi soda was eliminated from further review due to its low scores on this scale. Table 4 presents a summary of these findings.

The results revealed that respondents' product evaluations were largely in line with their views of the organizations that manufactured them. Participants were most familiar with Apple, Inc. (M = 6.37, SD = .84) and least familiar with Gap, Inc. (M = 5.10, SD = 1.54). Moreover, they had the most favorable attitude toward Apple, Inc. (M = 6.35, SD = 1.0), and the least favorable attitude toward Abercrombie & Fitch (M = 3.11, SD = 1.66). Finally, with regards to perception of OPR, the results revealed that participants perceived the strongest relationship with Apple, Inc. (M = 4.12, SD = .75), and the weakest relationship with Abercrombie & Fitch (M = 2.28, SD = .84). Table 5 presents a summary of these findings.

Means and standard deviations for products

Produc	Product Familiarity						
Rank	Product	N	M	SD			
1	iPhone	121	6.63	.73			
2	Nike shoes	121	6.47	.89			
3	Cheerios cereal	121	6.24	.92			
4	Starbucks coffee	121	6.21	1.11			
5	Doritos chips	121	6.20	.95			
6	Pepsi soda	121	5.64	1.34			
7	Abercrombie & Fitch T-Shirts	121	5.49	1.46			
8	Beats (by Dre) Headphones	121	5.44	1.46			
9	Häagen-Dazs ice cream	121	5.23	1.60			
10	Gap jeans	121	4.91	1.71			
Produc	t Attitude						
Rank	Product	N	M	SD			
1	iPhone	120	6.44	.97			
2	Nike shoes	120	6.40	.91			
3	Starbucks coffee	120	5.86	1.52			
4	Cheerios cereal	120	5.79	1.05			
5	Doritos chips	120	5.70	1.36			
6	Häagen-Dazs ice cream	114	5.70	1.17			
7	Beats (by Dre) Headphones	117	5.30	1.32			
8	Gap jeans	115	4.41	1.53			
9	Pepsi soda	120	3.86	1.89			
10	Abercrombie & Fitch T-Shirts	119	2.89	1.46			
Produc	t Туре						
Rank	Product	N	M	SD			
1	iPhone	120	6.48	.87			
2	Nike shoes	120	6.35	.94			
3	Starbucks coffee	120	5.72	1.56			
4	Doritos chips	120	5.51	1.28			
5	Häagen-Dazs ice cream	114	5.49	1.24			
6	Beats (by Dre) Headphones	117	5.40	1.40			
7	Cheerios cereal	120	5.02	1.34			
8	Gap jeans	115	4.04	1.32			
9	Pepsi soda	120	3.88	1.81			
10	Abercrombie & Fitch T-Shirts	119	2.91	1.52			

Based on the above-discussed criteria, the following six products were therefore selected

for further evaluation in the second pretest: Nike shoes, Cheerios cereal, Starbucks coffee,

Doritos chips, Beats (by Dre) Headphones, and Häagen-Dazs ice cream.

# Table 5

# Means and standard deviations for organizations

Organiz	zation Familiarity			
Rank	Organization	N	М	SD
1	Apple, Inc.	121	6.37	.84
2	Nike, Inc.	121	6.21	.98
3	Starbucks Coffee Company	121	6.01	1.16
4	PepsiCo	121	5.45	1.33
5	General Mills, Inc.	121	5.43	1.36
6	Abercrombie & Fitch	121	5.32	1.53
7	Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC	121	5.19	1.55
8	Gap, Inc.	121	5.10	1.54
Organiz	zational attitude			
Rank	Organization	N	M	SD
1	Apple, Inc.	121	6.35	1.0
2	Nike, Inc.	121	6.34	.95
3	Starbucks Coffee Company	121	5.96	1.43
4	General Mills, Inc.	119	5.68	1.16
5	Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC	117	5.25	1.38
6	Gap, Inc.	117	4.80	1.44
7	PepsiCo	121	4.34	1.87
8	Abercrombie & Fitch	119	3.11	1.66
Organiz	zation-Public Relationship (OPR)	_		
Rank	Organization	N	М	SD
1	Apple, Inc.	121	4.12	.75
2	Nike, Inc.	121	4.04	.81
3	General Mills, Inc.	119	3.94	.76
4	Starbucks Coffee Company	121	3.91	.86
5	Gap, Inc.	117	3.53	.80
6	Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC	117	3.43	.75
7	PepsiCo	121	3.36	.81
8	Abercrombie & Fitch	119	2.28	.84

*Causes*. Pretest 1 sought to identify causes with which participants were highly and less involved for further review in the second pretest. The method of identifying and comparing highly and less involved respondents, while excluding neutral participants, is effective in measuring the impact of involvement (see Richins, 1994). The selection of causes was initially determined through descriptive statistical analysis using means and standard deviations. Composite scores of each scale were used in this analysis.

The results indicated that participants were most familiar with the American Red Cross (M = 5.76, SD = 1.19), and least familiar with Amnesty International (M = 2.43, SD = 1.50) and The Nature Conservancy (M = 2.43, SD = 1.59). The six lowest ranking charities were eliminated from further review.

Moreover, participants indicated the highest level of cause involvement with the American Cancer Society (M = 5.55, SD = 1.38), and the lowest level of cause involvement with the United Negro College Fund (M = 2.80, SD = 1.94).

Based on the pre-established parameters for Pretest 2 selection, and considering the sample characteristics, the following high cause involvement charities were selected: Make-A-Wish foundation (MAW), Habitat for Humanity (HH), American Red Cross (ACR), and Susan G. Komen for the Cure (SGK). These low cause involvement charities were also chosen: March of Dimes, Product (RED), and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) (see Table 6).

Cause H	amiliarity			
Rank	Charity	N	M	SD
1	American Red Cross	121	5.76	1.19
2	Make-A-Wish Foundation	121	5.58	1.40
3	Habitat for Humanity	121	5.50	1.35
4	American Cancer Society	121	5.42	1.50
5	Susan G. Komen for the Cure	121	5.05	2.04
6	March of Dimes	121	4.58	1.78
7	American Society for the Prevention of	121	4.03	1.93
	Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)			
8	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	121	3.79	1.95
9	Product (RED)	121	3.73	1.90
10	Autism Speaks	121	3.35	1.69
11	Feeding America	121	3.33	1.77
12	ONE Campaign	121	2.60	1.61
13	United Negro College Fund	121	2.45	1.70
14	Amnesty International	121	2.43	1.50
15	The Nature Conservancy	121	2.43	1.59
Cause I	nvolvement			
Rank	Charity	N	M	SD
1	American Cancer Society	121	5.55	1.38
2	American Red Cross	121	5.50	1.18
3	Make-A-Wish Foundation	121	5.37	1.40
4	Habitat for Humanity	121	5.19	1.39
5	Susan G. Komen for the Cure	121	5.14	1.86
6	American Society for the Prevention of	121	4.61	1.74
	Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)			
7	Feeding America	121	4.37	1.59
8	March of Dimes	121	4.34	1.63
9	Autism Speaks	121	4.31	1.54
10	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	121	3.85	1.85
11	Product (RED)	121	3.71	1.71
12	The Nature Conservancy	121	3.35	1.82
13	ONE Campaign	121	3.15	1.74
14	Amnesty International	121	2.89	1.64
15	United Negro College Fund	121	2.80	1.94

Means and standard deviations for causes

A one-way within subjects Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in cause involvement between the high and low involvement charities selected. The results revealed overall significant differences between the chosen charities (F(6,720) = 42.39, p < .01). Pairwise comparisons (using the Bonferroni correction method for multiple comparisons) showed that the participants' level of involvement with the high involvement causes selected significantly differed from that of the low involvement causes chosen. The results also showed that in all but one case, there were no significant differences in involvement among causes of the same level (see Table 7).

#### Table 7

		Hi	gh Involv	ement Ca	auses	Low ]	Involveme	nt Causes
		ARC	HH	MAW	SGK	MD	RED	WWF
	MD	1.165*	$.848^{*}$	$1.033^{*}$	$.802^{*}$		631*	490
Low		.000	.000	.000	.001		.006	.096
Involvement	RED	1.796*	$1.479^{*}$	1.664*	1.433*	.631*		.140
Causes		.000	.000	.000	.000	.006		1.000
	WWF	1.656*	1.339*	$1.523^{*}$	$1.292^{*}$	.490	140	
		.000	.000	.000	.000	.096	1.000	
	ARC		317	132	364	-1.165*	-1.796*	-1.656*
			.180	1.000	.598	.000	.000	.000
High	HH	.317		.185	047	848*	-1.479 <sup>*</sup>	-1.339 <sup>*</sup>
Involvement		.180		1.000	1.000	.000	.000	.000
Causes	MAW	.132	185		231	-1.033*	-1.664*	-1.523*
		1.000	1.000		1.000	.000	.000	.000
	SGK	.364	.047	.231		802*	-1.433 <sup>*</sup>	-1.292*
		.598	1.000	1.000		.001	.000	.000

#### Pairwise comparisons: Cause involvement

\*Mean difference is significant at the .05 level

*Scandals.* As previously mentioned, Pretest 1 aimed at identifying negative events which could be accurately classified by a majority of participants. A one-sample Chi-square test determined whether significant differences existed between the proportion of participants who considered a particular negative event as moral-based, as opposed to those who considered it competence-based.

Based on frequencies, all 19 negative events were correctly categorized by most subjects (see Appendix C), however the Chi-square test revealed that in two cases there were no significant differences between participants who considered the scandal moral-based versus those who considered it competence-based. As one of these scandals was tied to Beyoncé (see Table 8), it was determined that the scandal would not be used as a stimulus if she was selected for the main study in the second pretest. Table 8 presents a summary of these results as they pertain to the three celebrity endorsers selected.

#### Table 8

Scandal ty	pe: Frequ	encies
------------	-----------	--------

Celebrity	Negative Event	Scandal Type	п	%	$\chi^2$
Endorser					
Anne Hathaway	Anne Hathaway has	Moral-based	34	28.1	23.22*
-	meltdown, stalls	Competence-based	87	71.9	
	production			01.0	1 6 10 1
	Anne Hathaway has an	Moral-based	98	81.0	46.49*
	open marriage, and	Competence-based	23	19.0	
	approves of cheating in a				
	relationship				
	Anne Hathaway is a	Moral-based	90	74.4	28.77*
	shoplifter	Competence-based	31	25.6	
Beyoncé	Beyoncé throws out	Moral-based	91	75.2	30.75*
	mother and child at	Competence-based	30	24.8	
	charity event	-			
	Backup singer sues	Moral-based	43	35.5	10.12*
	Beyoncé for credit and	Competence-based	78	64.5	
	royalties	-			
	Beyoncé sabotaged Kelly	Moral-based	63	52.1	.21
	Rowland's career years	Competence-based	58	47.9	
	ago	•			
Jennifer	Jennifer Lawrence uses	Moral-based	87	71.9	23.22*
Lawrence	"molly"	Competence-based	34	28.1	
	Jennifer Lawrence uses	Moral-based	39	32.2	15.28*
	body double and takes	Competence-based	82	67.8	
	credit	1			
	or cart				

Perceived scandal severity was determined through descriptive statistical analysis using

means and standard deviations. Table 9 presents a summary of the results as they relate to the

three celebrity endorsers selected for further review (see Appendix D for the complete

summary).

### Table 9

Celebrity Endorser	Negative Event	M	SD
Anne Hathaway	Anne Hathaway is a shoplifter	5.57	1.37
	Anne Hathaway has an open	4.55	1.67
	marriage, and approves of		
	cheating in a relationship		
	Anne Hathaway has	4.17	1.68
	meltdown, stalls production		
Beyoncé	Beyoncé sabotaged Kelly	5.22	1.39
	Rowland's career years ago		
	Backup singer sues Beyoncé	4.70	1.45
	for credit and royalties		
	Beyoncé throws out mother	4.36	1.67
	and child at charity event		
Jennifer Lawrence	Jennifer Lawrence uses	4.87	1.84
	"molly"		
	Jennifer Lawrence uses body	4.04	1.50
	double and takes credit		

Perceived scandal severity: Means and standard deviations

Similar to Um's (2013) research on the impact of negative celebrity endorser publicity on consumer perceptions, perceived level of scandal severity was controlled for in this study. Therefore, the criterion for selection of scandals was that there should be no significant differences in perceived severity between the scandal pair selected. A one-way within subjects ANOVA revealed overall significant differences in perceived scandal severity in relation to Anne Hathaway (F(2,238) = 42.11, p < .01), Beyoncé (F(2,238) = 22.41, p < .01), as well as Jennifer Lawrence (F(1,111) = 20.52, p < .01).

Pairwise comparisons (using Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons) determined that two scandal pairs involving Anne Hathaway and Beyoncé met the criterion for selection (see Table 10). The scandal pairs are as follows:

*Pair 1*: Anne Hathaway has a meltdown on a movie set, stalling production (M = 4.17, SD = 1.68), and Anne Hathaway approves of cheating in relationships and has an open marriage (M = 4.55, SD = 1.67) (p = .08).

*Pair 2*: Beyoncé mistreats a mother and her 6-year-old daughter at a charity event (M = 4.36, SD = 1.67), and Beyoncé is sued by a backup singer for credit and royalties (M = 4.70, SD = 1.45) (p = .06).

These scandal pairs were therefore selected as potential stimuli for the main study. As there were no scandals of equal perceived severity associated with Jennifer Lawrence, it was determined that additional hypothetical negative events would be developed and presented for evaluation in the second pretest.

#### Table 10

Celebrity Endorser	Negative Event				
		Meltdown	Open marriage	Shoplifting	
Anne Hathaway	Meltdown		383	-1.400*	
			.076	.000	
	Open marriage	.383		-1.017*	
		.076		.000	
	Shoplifting	1.400*	1.017*		
		.000	.000		
		Mother / child	Backup singer	Sabotage	
Beyoncé	Mother / child		342	858*	
			.055	.000	
	Backup singer	.342		517*	
		.055		.000	
	Sabotage	.858*	.517*		
		.000	.000		

Pairwise comparisons:	Perceivec	l scandal	l severity
-----------------------	-----------	-----------	------------

Jennifer Lawrence	"Molly"	"Molly"	Body double .830* 000	
	Body double	830*		
		.000		

\*Mean difference is significant at the .05 level

(See Appendix E for complete summary)

**Primary news source.** Finally, a majority of participants indicated that they relied primarily on social media for news (n = 51, 42.1%). Of the social networking websites, Twitter was shown to be the most popular among participants (n = 29, 56.9%), and was therefore selected to be used in the design of the main study's stimuli. Table 11 presents a summary of the results.

Table 11

Primary News	n	%	Social Networking	п	%
Source			Website		
Social Media	51	42.1	Twitter	29	56.9
Television	34	28.1	Facebook	18	35.3
News Websites	22	18.2	Reddit	2	3.9
Word-of-mouth	11	9.1	Instagram	1	2.0
Print Newspapers /	2	1.7	LinkedIn	1	2.0
Magazines					
Radio	1	.8			
Total	121	100.0	Total	51	100.0

Frequencies of primary news sources and social networking websites used

## Pretest 2

The second pretest determined the most suitable groupings of entities for each experimental condition, depending on fit. High and low fit pairings of celebrity endorsers, products, and causes were identified for use in the main study. Moreover, due to the fact that none of the scandals related to Jennifer Lawrence were perceived to have the same level of severity in Pretest 1, additional scandals were presented for evaluation. **Sample.** A convenience sample consisting of 134 undergraduate students enrolled in mass communication classes at a large Southeastern university was used in this pretest. Of the participants, 79.1% (n = 106) were female and 20.9% (n = 28) were male. As with Pretest 1, all participants were Millennials. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 24 (M = 20.25, SD = 1.11), a majority of whom belonged to the White or Caucasian ethnic group (n = 106, 79.1%). Furthermore, most participants were either sophomores (n = 47, 35.1%) or juniors (n = 49, 36.6%). Course credit was again offered in return for participation. Table 12 presents a summary of the sample characteristics for Pretest 2.

Table 12

Sample	n	%	Sample Characteristics	n	%
Characteristics			_		
Age ( <i>N</i> =134)			Class Standing (N =134)		
18	3	2.2	Freshman	3	2.2
19	35	26.1	Sophomore	47	35.1
20	42	31.3	Junior	49	36.6
21	39	29.1	Senior	35	26.1
22	11	8.2	Ethnicity (N =134)		
23	3	2.2	White / Caucasian	106	79.1
24	1	.7	Black / African American	12	9.0
			Hispanic / Latino	6	4.5
			Asian / Pacific Islander	9	6.7
			Other	1	.7

Pretest 2 sample characteristics and frequencies

**Procedures**. Pretest 2 was conducted in November 2013 through self-administered online surveys. Participants were either contacted via email or reached through an announcement posted to their course management website (see Appendix F).

Based on the results of Pretest 1, participants were presented with pairings of celebrity endorsers, products, and charities for evaluation according to the extent to which they perceived the entities to be congruent with each other (see Appendix G).

After granting their consent to participate in the survey (see Appendix G), Celebrity Endorser-Product Fit was first evaluated by asking subjects to indicate the extent to which they perceived three celebrity endorsers (Anne Hathaway, Beyoncé, and Jennifer Lawrence) to be congruent with each of the following six products: Starbucks coffee, Häagen-Dazs ice cream, Nike shoes, Cheerios cereal, Doritos chips, and Beats (by Dre) Headphones. Subsequently, Celebrity Endorser-Cause Fit was measured by asking participants to evaluate pairings of the same celebrity endorsers with four high involvement causes (Make-A-Wish Foundation, Susan G. Komen for the Cure, American Red Cross, and Habitat for Humanity), as well as three low involvement causes (March of Dimes, Product (RED), and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)). Next, Product-Cause Fit was measured by evaluating each of the aforementioned products against the previously mentioned high and low involvement causes.

Finally, scandals involving actress Jennifer Lawrence were further evaluated in Pretest 2, as Pretest 1 data on the subject yielded unsatisfactory results. Similar to Pretest 1, participants were presented with seven brief hypothetical scenarios describing negative events involving Lawrence. Participants were first asked to categorize the scenarios according to whether they believed they primarily spoke to the actress' moral values, or professional competence. They were then asked to indicate their perceived level of scandal severity.

The following demographic information was collected at the end of the survey: Age, gender, ethnicity, and class standing.

**Instrument**. The first part of the instrument consisted of individual listings of celebrity endorsers, products, and causes, followed by a list of the other entities against which each listing was to be evaluated.

Fit was measured with a 7-point semantic differential scale adapted from Keller and Aaker (1992) ( $\alpha$  = .96) anchored at -3 and +3 ("*Bad fit / Good fit*," "*Not at all logical / Very logical*," "*Totally inappropriate / Very appropriate*"). Overall, this scale proved reliable ( $\alpha$  = .87), as did the individual scales for the three types of fit considered: Celebrity Endorser-Product Fit ( $\alpha$  = .88), Celebrity Endorser-Cause Fit ( $\alpha$  = .87), and Product-Cause Fit ( $\alpha$  = .86).

The second part of the instrument consisted of a list of 7 hypothetical scandals involving Lawrence. This pretest used the same measures of scandal type and perceived severity as were used in Pretest 1.

### **Data Analysis**

*Scandals.* A one-sample Chi-square test was used to determine whether there were significant differences between the proportion of subjects who categorized a particular scandal as moral-based versus those who categorized it as competence-based. All seven scandals assessed were placed under the right category by a majority of participants, with the Chi-square tests showing significant differences between proportions in all cases (see Table 13).

Celebrity Endorser	Negative Event	Scandal Type	п	%	$\chi^2$
Jennifer Lawrence	Jennifer Lawrence busted	Moral-based	119	88.8	80.72*
	for DUI and weed	Competence-based	15	11.2	
	possession				
	Jennifer Lawrence has	Moral-based	22	16.4	60.45*
	meltdown, stalls production	Competence-based	112	83.6	
	Jennifer Lawrence is a	Moral-based	111	82.8	57.79*
	shoplifter	Competence-based	23	17.2	
	Jennifer Lawrence uses	Moral-based	90	67.2	15.79*
	"molly"	Competence-based	44	32.8	
	Jennifer Lawrence uses	Moral-based	37	27.6	26.87*
	body double and takes	Competence-based	97	72.4	
	credit	-			
	Jennifer Lawrence keeps	Moral-based	103	76.9	38.69*
	silent auction item	Competence-based	31	23.1	
	Hunger Games director	Moral-based	29	21.6	43.10*
	speaks out	Competence-based	105	78.4	

Jennifer Lawrence scandal type: Frequencies and Chi-square results

\**p* < .05

In terms of scandal severity, descriptive statistical analyses revealed that the hypothetical scandal in which the former Hunger Games director revealed Lawrence's reliance on illegal drugs for acting was deemed most severe (M = 5.54, SD = 1.39). On the other hand, the scandal in which Lawrence takes credit for action scenes actually done by a body double was perceived as least severe (M = 4.04, SD = 1.78). Table 14 presents a summary of these findings.

<b>Celebrity Endorser</b>	Negative Event	M	SD
Jennifer Lawrence	Hunger Games director speaks	5.54	1.39
	out		
	Jennifer Lawrence uses	5.17	1.55
	"molly"		
	Jennifer Lawrence is a	4.98	1.46
	shoplifter		
	Jennifer Lawrence keeps silent	4.82	1.63
	auction item		
	Jennifer Lawrence busted for	4.75	1.64
	DUI and weed possession		
	Jennifer Lawrence has	4.12	1.48
	meltdown, stalls production		
	Jennifer Lawrence uses body	4.04	1.78
	double and takes credit		

Jennifer Lawrence scandal severity: Means and standard deviations

As mentioned previously, the pretests aimed at identifying two scandals (one moralbased, and one competence-based) to serve as stimuli in the main study. In order to be eligible to be selected for the main study, there should be no significant difference in perceived scandal severity between the two scandals selected. This controls for the influence of the variable on the results.

A one-way within subjects ANOVA revealed overall significant differences in perceived scandal severity (F(6,798) = 21.85, p < .01). Pairwise comparisons (using Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons) determined that only one scandal pair met the above-stated criterion: the scandal involving Lawrence's use of "Molly" (M = 5.17, SD = 1.55) and the one in which her drug dependence was revealed by the former Hunger Games director (M = 5.54, SD = 1.39) (p = .10) (see Table 15). These two scandals were therefore chosen as potential negative events contingent on Lawrence's selection for the main study.

		Negative Event							
		Compete	nce-base	d scandals		Moral-based scandals			
		Meltdown	Body	Director	DUI/	"Molly"	Silent	Shoplifting	
			double	speaks	weed	-	auction		
	DUI/weed	.627*	.709*	791*		425	075	231	
Moral-based		.024	.010	.000		.186	1.000	1.000	
scandals	"Molly"	1.052*	1.134*	366	.425		.351	.194	
		.000	.000	.103	.186		.604	1.000	
	Silent auction	.701*	.784*	716*	.075	351		157	
		.001	.000	.000	1.000	.604		1.000	
	Shoplifting	.858*	.940*	560*	.231	194	.157		
		.000	.000	.003	1.000	1.000	1.000		
	Meltdown		.082	-1.418*	627*	-1.052*	701*	858*	
Competence-			1.000	.000	.024	.000	.001	.000	
based scandals	Body double	082		-1.500*	709*	-1.134*	784*	940*	
		1.000		.000	.010	.000	.000	.000	
	Director speaks	s 1.418*	1.500*		.791*	.366	.716*	.560*	
		.000	.000		.000	.103	.000	.003	

Pairwise comparisons: Jennifer Lawrence scandal severity mean differences and p-values

\* Mean difference is significant at the .05 level

*Celebrity Endorser-Product-Cause Fit.* Fit was first evaluated through descriptive statistical analysis. Means and standard deviations determined the ranking order of the fit between celebrity endorsers, products, and causes. It was determined that Starbucks coffee was the best fit for celebrity endorser Anne Hathaway (M = 5.47, SD = 1.21), while Beats (by Dre) Headphones was determined to be the worst fit for her (M = 2.32, SD = 1.43). Also, the results indicated that Beats (by Dre) Headphones was the best fit for Beyoncé (M = 6.38, SD = .97), while Doritos chips was the worst fit for her (M = 3.72, SD = 1.52). Finally, Jennifer Lawrence was determined to be most congruent with Starbucks coffee (M = 5.02, SD = 1.29), and least congruent with Beats (by Dre) Headphones (M = 2.91, SD = 1.55). Table 16 presents a summary of the means and standard deviations for Celebrity Endorser-Product Fit.

	Celebrity Endorser			
Product	Anne	Beyoncé	Jennifer	
	Hathaway	-	Lawrence	
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	2.32*	6.38**	2.91*	
	(1.43)	(.97)	(1.55)	
Cheerios cereal	4.16	4.22	4.24	
	(1.31)	(1.46)	(1.31)	
Doritos chips	3.39	3.72*	3.98	
	(1.24)	(1.52)	(1.48)	
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	4.72	4.44	4.82	
	(1.23)	(1.23)	(1.26)	
Nike shoes	3.87	4.88	4.54	
	(1.43)	(1.34)	(1.43)	
Starbucks coffee	5.47**	4.70	5.02**	
	(1.21)	(1.37)	(1.29)	

Celebrity endorser-product fit: Means and standard deviations

Notes: \* Worst fit, \*\* Best fit

Standard deviations are in parentheses

In terms of Celebrity Endorser-Cause Fit, among the high involvement causes, Anne Hathaway was perceived to be best suited to represent the Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 5.46, SD = 1.19), and least suitable for Habitat for Humanity (M = 5.02, SD = 1.30). Meanwhile, among the low involvement causes, Hathaway was perceived as the most appropriate representative of March of Dimes(M = 5.14, SD = 1.14), and least appropriate for WWF (M =4.97, SD = 1.31).

Moreover, among the high involvement causes, Beyoncé was deemed most appropriate for the Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 5.88, SD = 1.07), and least appropriate for Habitat for Humanity (M = 5.19, SD = 1.27). Meanwhile, among the low involvement causes, she was perceived as most suitable representative of Product (RED) (M = 5.48, SD = 1.22), and least suitable for WWF (M = 4.71, SD = 1.49). In addition, of the high involvement causes, Jennifer Lawrence was considered the most fitting representative of the Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 5.69, SD = 1.17), and the least fitting representative of the American Red Cross (M = 5.42, SD = 1.24). Of the low involvement causes, she was considered most appropriate for WWF (M = 5.35, SD = 1.27), and least appropriate for March of Dimes (M = 5.30, SD = 1.16). Table 17 presents a summary of the means and standard deviations for Celebrity Endorser-Cause Fit.

#### Table 17

Charity	Ce	Celebrity Endorser				
•	Anne	Beyoncé	Jennifer			
High Involvement	Hathaway	U	Lawrence			
American Red Cross	5.25	5.33	5.42*			
	(1.28)	(1.20)	(1.24)			
Habitat for Humanity	5.02*	5.19*	5.52			
	(1.30)	(1.27)	(1.14)			
Make-A-Wish Foundation	5.46**	5.88**	5.69**			
	(1.19)	(1.07)	(1.17)			
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	5.44	5.44	5.53			
	(1.22)	(1.29)	(1.20)			
Low Involvement						
March of Dimes	5.14**	5.29	5.30*			
	(1.14)	(1.16)	(1.16)			
Product (RED)	5.04	5.48**	5.32			
	(1.20)	(1.22)	(1.21)			
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	4.97*	4.71*	5.35**			
	(1.31)	(1.49)	(1.27)			

Celebrity endorser-cause fit: Means and standard deviations

Notes: \* Worst fit, \*\* Best fit

Standard deviations are in parentheses

With regards to Product-Cause Fit, the Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 4.89, SD =

1.46) and Product (RED) (M = 4.95, SD = 1.40) were considered the best fit for Beats (by

Dre) Headphones, while Habitat for Humanity (M = 4.11, SD = 1.55) and WWF (M = 3.93,

SD = 1.61) were deemed the worst fit for the product.

The American Red Cross (M = 5.39, SD = 1.38) and March of Dimes (M = 5.03, SD = 1.26) were perceived to be the most appropriate fit for Cheerios cereal, while Habitat for Humanity (M = 4.79, SD = 1.28) and WWF (M = 4.38, SD = 1.42) were perceived as the least appropriate fit for the product.

The Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 4.50, SD = 1.53) and Product (RED) (M = 4.42, SD = 1.53) were viewed as the best fit for Doritos chips, while the American Red Cross (M = 4.16, SD = 1.63) and WWF (M = 3.96, SD = 1.59) were viewed as the least fitting charities for the product.

A partnership between the Make-A-Wish Foundation (M = 4.84, SD = 1.36) or March of Dimes (M = 4.64, SD = 1.43) and Häagen-Dazs ice cream was deemed most appropriate, while one between Häagen-Dazs and Habitat for Humanity (M = 4.45, SD = 1.45) or WWF (M = 4.28, SD = 1.47) was deemed least appropriate.

Moreover, Susan G. Komen for the Cure (M = 5.26, SD = 1.47) and March of Dimes (M = 5.25, SD = 1.31) were regarded as best suited for a partnership with Nike shoes, while Habitat for Humanity (M = 5.03, SD = 1.39) and WWF (M = 4.40, SD = 1.52) were considered least suitable.

Finally, Susan G. Komen for the Cure (M = 4.91, SD = 1.47) and Product (RED) (M = 4.80, SD = 1.27) were considered the best fit for Starbucks coffee, while the American Red Cross (M = 4.71, SD = 1.50) and WWF (M = 4.55, SD = 1.56) were considered the worst fit for the product. Table 18 presents a summary of the means and standard deviations for Product-Cause Fit.

Charity	Product					
	Beats (by Dre)	Cheerios	Doritos	Häagen-Dazs	Nike shoes	Starbucks
High Involvement	Headphones	cereal	chips	ice cream		coffee
American Red Cross	4.27	5.39**	4.16*	4.46	5.10	4.71*
	(1.58)	(1.38)	(1.63)	(1.47)	(1.35)	(1.50)
Habitat for Humanity	4.11*	4.79*	4.32	4.45*	5.03*	4.80
	(1.55)	(1.28)	(1.50)	(1.45)	(1.39)	(1.39)
Make-A-Wish	4.89**	5.00	4.50**	4.84**	5.15	4.76
Foundation	(1.46)	(1.28)	(1.53)	(1.36)	(1.26)	(1.38)
Susan G. Komen for	4.34	5.10	4.22	4.70	5.26**	4.91**
the Cure	(1.53)	(1.28)	(1.60)	(1.57)	(1.47)	(1.47)
Low Involvement						
March of Dimes	4.40	5.03**	4.24	4.64**	5.25**	4.73
	(1.47)	(1.26)	(1.50)	(1.43)	(1.31)	(1.37)
Product (RED)	4.95**	4.61	4.42**	4.53	5.02	4.80**
	(1.40)	(1.34)	(1.53)	(1.35)	(1.29)	(1.27)
World Wildlife Fund	3.93*	4.38*	3.96*	4.28*	4.40*	4.55*
(WWF)	(1.61)	(1.42)	(1.59)	(1.47)	(1.52)	(1.56)

### Product-cause fit: Means and standard deviations

Notes: \* Worst fit, \*\* Best fit

Standard deviations are in parentheses

The second pretest aimed at identifying two conditions where the celebrity endorser, product, and cause all fit well with each other, as well as two conditions where all the entities fit poorly with each other. This means that not only must there be a match (mismatch) between the celebrity endorser and the product and the celebrity endorser and the cause, but that same relationship must exist between the product and cause.

The analysis concluded with the selection of Anne Hathaway and Beyoncé as potential subjects of the main study, as it was revealed that none of the entities associated with Jennifer Lawrence met the stipulated criteria. It was determined that selecting the second best-fitting product for Anne Hathaway (Häagen-Dazs ice cream) and the second worst-fitting product for Beyoncé (Cheerios cereal) met the above-stated criteria, leading to optimum conditions for the manipulation of fit in the main study (see Table 19).

Anne Hathaway							
Endorser-H	Product Fit	Endorser-	Cause Fit	Product-Cause Fit			
Good fit	Poor fit	Good fit	Poor fit	Häagen-Dazs ice	Beats (by Dre)		
				cream	Headphones		
Häagen-Dazs ice	Beats (by Dre)	Make-A-Wish	Habitat for	Good fit	Poor fit		
cream	Headphones	foundation	Humanity	Make-A-Wish	Habitat for		
				foundation	Humanity		
		March of Dimes	WWF	March of Dimes	WWF		
		Bey	oncé				
Endorser-H	Product Fit	Endorser-	Cause Fit	<b>Product-Cause Fit</b>			
Good fit	Poor fit	Good fit	Poor fit	Beats (by Dre)	<b>Cheerios cereal</b>		
				Headphones			
Beats (by Dre)	Cheerios cereal	Make-A-Wish	Habitat for	Good fit	Poor fit		
Headphones		foundation	Humanity	Make-A-Wish	Habitat for		
_				foundation	Humanity		
		Product (RED)	WWF	Product (RED)	WWF		

Celebrity endorser-product-cause fit: Anne Hathaway and Beyoncé

The suitability of Anne Hathaway and Beyoncé for the main study was further evaluated statistically. Both celebrities showed significant differences in terms of fit between the products with which they fit well, and those with which they fit poorly. A paired samples *t*-test confirmed that Häagen-Dazs ice cream (M = 4.72, SD = 1.23) was significantly more congruent with Anne Hathaway than Beats (by Dre) Headphones (M = 2.32, SD = 1.43) (t(133) = -16.03, p < .01). The results from another paired samples *t*-test indicated that Beats (by Dre) Headphones (M = 6.38, SD = .97) was a significantly better fit for Beyoncé than was Cheerios cereal (M = 4.22, SD = 1.46) (t(133) = 15.171, p < .01).

Moreover, a one-way within subjects ANOVA was conducted to evaluate differences in Celebrity Endorser-Cause fit. The results revealed overall significant differences among the four causes associated with Anne Hathaway (F(3,399) = 12.18, p < .01). Pairwise comparisons (controlling for Type I error through the Bonferroni method) indicated that the Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 5.46, SD = 1.19) was a significantly better fit for Anne Hathaway than were Habitat for Humanity (M = 5.02, SD = 1.30)(p < .01) and WWF (M = 4.97, SD =

1.31)(p < .01). However, no significant differences were shown between the extent to which Anne Hathaway fit with March of Dimes (presumably a good fit) (M = 5.14, SD = 1.14) and Habitat for Humanity (p = .56) and WWF (p = .46), both of which were presumed to be incongruent with the actress based on their mean ordinal scores. As a result, Anne Hathaway was disqualified as the subject of the main study.

On the other hand, pairwise comparisons revealed significant differences in fit between all the causes that were most congruent with Beyoncé and those that were incongruent with her. Make-A-Wish foundation (M = 5.88, SD = 1.07) was found to be a significantly better fit for Beyoncé than were Habitat for Humanity (M = 5.19, SD = 1.27)(p < .01) and WWF (M =4.71, SD = 1.49) (p < .01). Product (RED) (M = 5.48, SD = 1.22) was also found to be significantly more congruent with the singer than were Habitat for Humanity (M = 5.19, SD =1.27)(p = .04) and WWF (M = 4.71, SD = 1.49) (p < .01). Beyoncé and her associated entities were therefore selected for further analysis.

#### Main Study

The main study was conducted using a  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  pretest-posttest design (see Table 20). This was conducted through self-administered online surveys. Online surveys were appropriate for this study due to topic relevance, as Pretest 1 revealed participants' dependence on social media for their news. Moreover, having participants read online news articles at their own convenience, as opposed to conducting the survey in a laboratory setting, evokes a relatively greater sense of realism for respondents. Also, the results of studies conducted through online surveys have been found to be comparable to those of studies conducted in lab settings (Krantz & Dalal, 2000).

The independent variables were celebrity endorser-product-cause fit (good fit vs. poor fit), cause involvement (high vs. low involvement), and scandal type (moral-based vs. competence-based).The dependent variables were attitudes (toward endorser, product, and organization), and purchase intentions. Perceptions of OPR served as the main moderating variable, while gender served as the blocking variable.

#### Table 20

#### Main study experimental design

Endorser-Product-Cause Fit	<b>Cause Involvement</b>	Scandal Type
	High cause involvement	Moral-based scandal
Good fit		Competence-based scandal
	Low cause involvement	Moral-based scandal
		Competence-based scandal
	High cause involvement	Moral-based scandal
Poor fit	-	Competence-based scandal
	Low cause involvement	Moral-based scandal
		Competence-based scandal

#### Sample

The sample consisted of 524 undergraduate students from a large Southeastern university who were enrolled in mass communication classes. Twenty-four responses were discarded, out of which 22 were incomplete, one respondent was a minor, and one was not a Millennial. This resulted in a total sample size of 500. A power analysis using G\*Power software (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) indicated that with a probability level of .05, a statistical power value of .80, and a moderate effect size, each experimental group should contain at least 34 participants. This condition was met, as each group was randomly assigned between 61 and 65 participants.

Of these, 81.6% (n = 408) were female and 18.4% (n = 92) were male. Participants were Millennials ranging in age from 18 to 26 (M = 20.29, SD = 1.26) who were offered course credit in return for volunteering for the study. A majority of participants were White or Caucasian (n = 413; 82.6%). The remaining participants belonged to the following ethnic groups: Black / African American (n = 36; 7.2%), Asian / Pacific Islander (n = 28; 5.6%), Hispanic / Latino (n = 18; 3.6%), and others who indicated they were biracial (n = 5; 1.0%). Moreover, respondents were mainly juniors (n = 208; 41.6%) and sophomores (n = 154; 30.8). Table 21 presents a summary of these and other sample characteristics.

### Table 21

Sample	n	%	Sample	n	%
Characteristics			Characteristics		
Age (N =500)			Class Standing (N = 500)		
18	24	4.8	Freshman	41	8.2
19	112	22.4	Sophomore	154	30.8
20	164	32.8	Junior	208	41.6
21	130	26.0	Senior	97	19.4
22	48	9.6	Ethnicity (N =500)		
23	13	2.6	White / Caucasian	413	82.6
24	6	1.2	Black / African American	36	7.2
25	1	.2	Hispanic / Latino	18	3.6
26	2	.4	Asian / Pacific Islander	28	5.6
			Other	5	1.0

Main study sample characteristics and frequencies

## Procedures

Like the first and second pretests, the main study was conducted using the Qualtrics survey system. This study was conducted from January to February 2014. Participants were contacted either through email or an announcement posted to their course management website (see Appendix H).

Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions: (1) Good fit, moral-based scandal, high cause involvement, (2) Good fit, moral-based scandal, low cause involvement, (3) Good fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (4) Good fit, competence-based scandal, low cause involvement, (5) Poor fit, moral-based scandal, high cause involvement, (6) Poor fit, moral-based scandal, low cause involvement, (7) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (1) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (1) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (2) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (2) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (3) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, (3) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement, and (8) Poor fit, competence-based scandal, high cause involvement.

After reading the consent form (see Appendix I) and agreeing to its terms, participants read a tweet announcing a company's new CRM initiative. Participants were then asked to click a "link" to read the full story, which included information on celebrity endorser Beyoncé's role in promoting the initiative. A pretest measuring attitudes, purchase intentions, and perceptions of OPR was then administered. Fit and cause involvement were also evaluated to ensure that the manipulations had had the intended effect.

Subsequently, subjects read another tweet about a negative event involving Beyoncé, depending on the experimental condition. A posttest was administered measuring attitudes and purchase intentions after participants had read the full story. Scandal type was also assessed as a manipulation check.

Moreover, demographic data such as age, gender, ethnicity, and class standing were collected. As participants had initially been informed that they were reading about real-life events, at the end of the survey, they were debriefed as to the true nature of the study (see Appendix J).

#### Instrument

The stimuli and measures used in the main study are outlined below:

**Stimuli.** As shown in Pretest 1, a majority of participants rely the most on social media (and Twitter in particular) for information on current events. Conveying information through this channel therefore increases the external validity of this study.

The first tweet presented to participants, which announced the organizations' CRM programs, appeared to have been posted by the Cable News Network (CNN). Selecting a credible news source such as CNN helps reduce the influence of skepticism on participant responses. Subjects were informed that the message had been posted the previous month, and it was implied that it was an actual tweet posted by the news organization about an actual event. In reality, the message was superimposed on an actual CNN tweet. An "@mention" and a fictitious URL link were included in the message in order to appear authentic (see Appendix I).

Moreover, the "link" participants clicked to read the full news article actually opened a file uploaded to the Qualtrics system. The full story consisted of what appeared to be a news article from the CNN website written by CNN staff. In reality, the story and authors were fictitious. This stimulus was developed by modifying an actual CNN webpage for the purposes of this study, complete with hyperlinks and images (see Appendix I).

Four versions of the CRM initiative announcement story were developed: (1) Good fit, high cause involvement: Beats Electronics LLC and Make-A-Wish foundation, (2) Good fit, low cause involvement: Beats Electronics LLC and Product (RED), (3) Poor fit, high cause involvement: General Mills, Inc. and Habitat for Humanity, and (4) Poor fit, low cause involvement: General Mills, Inc. and WWF.

The manipulation of fit perception and cause involvement were enhanced through the wording of the news articles, as well as the images used. In the good fit conditions, the connection between Beats headphones and celebrity endorser Beyoncé was emphasized by mentioning the fact that Beyoncé is a "global music icon." This creates the impression that Beyoncé's selection was a logical choice. Moreover, a picture of Beyoncé wearing a hooded sweater was used in the article to evoke a hip, urban image akin to that of the Beats brand. A modified image of Beyoncé using the "CRM product" was also included in the article in order to enhance the believability of the story, and to make it easier for participants to connect the two entities. The relationship between the celebrity endorser and nonprofit organization was also highlighted in a quote stating the fact that the nonprofit had a history of working with celebrities, and that Beyoncé was well known for her philanthropic efforts. Pictures of the celebrity endorser taken with people appearing to be beneficiaries of the nonprofit were also included in the article.

Conversely, in the bad fit conditions, the differences in image between the celebrity endorser and the organizations involved were highlighted by using glamorous pictures of Beyoncé in the news articles. This is a direct contrast to the images portrayed by General Mills, Inc., Habitat for Humanity, and WWF. This was further emphasized through a quote in the article stating that charity work is "not glamorous" and that Cheerios cereal is enjoyed by "ordinary people." Also, the fact that Beyoncé is a global music superstar, which is completely unrelated to the organizations involved, was included in the article. This draws further attention to the disconnect between the celebrity endorser and the organizations.

Furthermore, Habitat for Humanity's conservative image was evoked by mentioning its Christian values, a sharp contrast to Beyoncé's largely secular image. Finally, no images of the celebrity endorser and the CRM product were used in the story. Instead, the article included

images of what appeared to be male nonprofit staff / volunteers engaged physical activity of some sort, which were meant to contrast images of the star's luxurious lifestyle.

In the high cause involvement conditions, it was mentioned that the nonprofit organization at the center of the story benefitted individuals in the United States, while the low cause involvement stimuli referenced Africa or the world in general. This helped either enhance or diminish perceived cause relevance depending on the experimental condition.

The second tweet participants viewed was framed as breaking news posted by E! Online. E! Entertainment, which operates E! Online, is one of the premier sources of entertainment and celebrity news. As such, using a tweet from this news organization as a stimulus in this study helps create a sense of realism. Participants were informed that this was an actual tweet posted by the news organization in order to capture their natural reactions to the situation. They were also informed that this was a breaking news story to account for the fact that they had not heard of the incidents. Like the first tweet, although the E! Online tweet appeared to be genuine with an "@mention," hashtags, and a URL link, the message was, in fact, fictitious (see Appendix I).

Participants in the moral-based scandal condition read a tweet and news article about Beyoncé's mistreatment of a mother and her 6-year-old daughter at a charity event, while those in the competence-based scandal condition read about a lawsuit filed against the singer by a backup vocalist demanding credit and royalties. Again, the news articles appeared to have originated from the actual news organization's website, and included what appeared to be hyperlinks to enhance their authentic look (see Appendix I).

The manipulation of scandal type as an independent variable was also augmented by the phrasing of the news articles. In each of the two conditions, it was ensured that the negative act described strictly pertained to the assigned scandal type. For instance, the article under the

moral-based scandal condition referred to Beyoncé's character as a person, not a performer, while the article under the competence-based scandal took aim at her abilities as a singer, and not her moral values.

**Measures.** The main study instrument consisted of a pretest and a posttest. The pretest measured the following: attitudes (toward the celebrity endorser, product, and organization), purchase intentions, and perceptions of OPR. Fit and cause involvement were also assessed as manipulation checks. The posttest also measured attitudes and purchase intentions. In addition, scandal type was evaluated as a manipulation check. The internal consistency of the scales used in these evaluations, as assessed by Cronbach's alpha, was high (see Table 22).

Attitude toward the celebrity endorser was measured with the same 7-point semantic differential used in the first pretest with an additional item from the original scale developed by Till and Shimp (1998) ( $\alpha = .98$ ): "She is not trustworthy / She is trustworthy."

The product and organizational attitude scales used in the main study were however identical to those used in the first pretest.

Purchase intentions were measured with the following 7-point Likert scale adapted from Sweeney, Soutar, and Johnson (1999) and originally developed by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) ( $\alpha$  = .95): "I would consider buying [*product*]," "I will purchase this [*product*]," "There is a strong likelihood that I will buy [*product*]." This was anchored by "*strongly disagree / strongly agree*."

Nine additional items from the OPR scale developed by Ledingham and Bruning (1998, 1999) ( $\alpha = .91$ ) – which was used in Pretest 1 – were included in the main study.

Celebrity endorser-product-cause fit and cause involvement were measured with the same scales used in the first pretest. However two cause involvement items adapted from the original scale developed by Grau and Folse (2007) ( $\alpha = .94$ ) were included in the main study instrument. These were 7-point semantic differential scale items with the following anchors: "*doesn't / does matter a great deal to me*," and "*is of no / great concern to me*."

Finally, the scandal type measure remained unchanged from the first and second pretests.

### Table 22

Main study	items	and	reliability	measures
------------	-------	-----	-------------	----------

Construct	Items	Reliability
Endorser Attitude	1. My overall feelings about [celebrity endorser]	.977
	are	
	Anchors: "Bad / Good," "Unfavorable / Favorable,"	
	"Negative / Positive," "She is not trustworthy / She	
	is trustworthy"	
Product Attitude	1. My overall feelings about [product] are	.963
	Anchors: "Unfavorable / Favorable," "Negative /	
	Positive," "Strongly dislike / Strongly like"	
Organizational attitude	1. My overall feelings about [ <i>organization</i> ] are	.978
2	Anchors: "Bad / Good," "Unpleasant / Pleasant,"	
	"Unfavorable / Favorable"	
Purchase Intentions	1. "I would consider buying [product]"	.893
	2. "I will purchase this [product]"	
	3. "There is a strong likelihood that I will buy	
	[product]"	
	Anchors: "Strongly disagree / Strongly agree"	
Organization-Public Relationship	Please indicate the extent to which you agree or	.894
(OPR)	disagree with the following statements:	
	1. "I feel that I can trust [organization name] to do	
	what it says it will do"	
	2. "[Organization name] seems to be the kind of	
	organization that invests in its customers"	
	3. "[Organization name] demonstrates an interest	
	in customers as people"	
	4. "[Organization name] is involved in activities	
	that promote the welfare of its customers"	
	5. "[Organization name] acts in a socially	
	responsible manner"	
	6. "[Organization name] is aware of what I want as	
	a customer"	
<ul> <li>interests as the same"</li> <li>8. "I think that [organization name] is honest in its dealings with customers"</li> <li>9. "[Organization name] is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me"</li> <li>10. "[Organization name] is open about its plans for the future"</li> </ul>		
--		
<ul> <li>8. "I think that [organization name] is honest in its dealings with customers"</li> <li>9. "[Organization name] is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me"</li> <li>10. "[Organization name] is open about its plans for the future"</li> </ul>		
dealings with customers" 9. "[ <i>Organization name</i> ] is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me" 10. "[ <i>Organization name</i> ] is open about its plans for the future"		
9. "[ <i>Organization name</i> ] is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me" 10. "[ <i>Organization name</i> ] is open about its plans for the future"		
resources to maintain its relationship with me" 10. "[ <i>Organization name</i> ] is open about its plans for the future"		
10. "[Organization name] is open about its plans		
for the future"		
11. "I feel that [organization name] supports events		
that are of interest to its customers"		
12. "I think that [organization name] strives to		
improve the communities of its customers"		
Anchors: "Strongly disagree / Strongly agree"		
Cause Involvement 1. [ <i>Charity</i> ] is		
"Unimportant / Important to me." "Means nothing		
to me / Means a lot to me " "Is irrelevant to me / Is		
nersonally relevant?" "Doesn't / Does matter a great		
deal to me" and "Is of no / great concern to me"		
Fit 1 Please indicate how well you think the following 022		
antities fit with each other:		
(a) [Calabrity and orsar] and [product]		
(a) [Celebrity endorser] and [product] (b) [Celebrity endorser] and [charity]		
(b) [Celebrity endorser] and [charity]		
(C) [Froduci] and [charley]		
Anchors: Bad III / Good III		
2. Please indicate now logical you think it is for the		
following entities to be associated with each other:		
(a) [Celebrity endorser] and [product]		
(b) [ <i>Celebrity endorser</i> ] and [ <i>charity</i> ]		
(c) [ <i>Product</i> ] and [ <i>charity</i> ]		
Anchors: "Not at all logical / Very logical"		
3. Please indicate how appropriate you think it is		
for the following entities to be associated with each		
other:		
(a) [Celebrity endorser] and [product]		
(b) [ <i>Celebrity endorser</i> ] and [ <i>charity</i> ]		
(c) [ <i>Product</i> ] and [ <i>charity</i> ]		
Anchors: "Totally inappropriate / Very		
appropriate"		
Celebrity Endorser-Product Fit .939		
Celebrity Endorser-Cause Fit .922		
Product-Cause Fit .898		
Scandal Type 1. Categorize [ <i>celebrity endorser's</i> ] behavior		
according to whether you believe it primarily		
speaks to her moral values or professional skills.		
(a) This act mainly concerns [ <i>celebrity endorser</i> 's]		
morality, and has nothing to do with her		
professional skills or talent as a singer.		
(b) This act mainly concerns [ <i>celebrity endorser</i> 's]		
professional competence, and has everything to do		
with her talent or abilities as a singer.		

# Data Analysis

Using the statistical analysis software package SPSS, the following statistical tests

evaluated this study's hypotheses at the .05 level of significance:

# Table 23

# Summary of statistical tests and variables

Hypotheses	Statistical Tests	Variables
H1: Consumers' post-scandal (a) attitudes and	Repeated measures	Independent Variable:
(b) purchase intentions will be less favorable than	multivariate analysis	Negative publicity
their pre-scandal ones.	of covariance	Dependent Variables:
1	(MANCOVA)	(1) Endorser attitude
	· · · · ·	(2) Product attitude
		(3) Organizational attitude
		(4) Purchase intentions
		Blocking variable: Gender
H2: Under conditions of good fit, negative CRM	Multivariate analysis	Independent Variables:
endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a)	of covariance	(1) Cause involvement
endorser, (b) product, and (c) organizational	(MANCOVA)	(2) Fit
attitudes among consumers with low cause		Dependent Variables:
involvement than those with high cause		(1) Endorser attitude
involvement.		(2) Product attitude
		(3) Organizational attitude
		Blocking variable: Gender
H3: Negative CRM endorser publicity will result	Analysis of	Independent Variable:
in lower purchase intentions under conditions of	covariance	Cause involvement
low cause involvement than under conditions of	(ANCOVA)	Dependent Variable:
high cause involvement.		Purchase intentions
		Blocking variable: Gender
<b>H4:</b> Negative CRM endorser publicity will result	Multivariate analysis	Independent Variable:
in less favorable (a) consumer attitudes and (b)	of covariance	Scandal type
purchase intentions under conditions of moral-	(MANCOVA)	Dependent Variables:
based scandals than under conditions of		(1) Endorser attitude
competence-based scandals.		(2) Product attitude
		(3) Organizational attitude
		(4) Purchase intentions
		Blocking variable: Gender
<b>H5:</b> Product attitudes and organizational attitudes	Multiple mediation	Predictor variable:
will mediate the positive predictive effect of	regression analysis	Endorser attitude
CRM endorser attitudes on purchase intentions,		Criterion variable:
such that (a) CRM endorser attitudes will		Purchase Intentions
positively predict product attitudes and		Mediator variables:
organizational attitudes, and (b) product attitudes		(1) Product attitude
and organizational attitudes will positively		(2) Organizational attitude
predict purchase intentions.		

<b>H6:</b> The better the endorser-brand-cause fit, the stronger the predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on (a) product attitudes and (b) organizational attitudes.	Moderated multiple regression analysis	Predictor variable: Endorser attitude Criterion variables: (1) Product attitude (2) Organizational attitude Moderating variable: Fit
<b>H7:</b> Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a) consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of good fit than under conditions of poor fit.	Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA)	Independent variable: Fit Dependent variables: (1) Endorser attitude (2) Product attitude (3) Organizational attitude (4) Purchase intentions Blocking variable: Gender
<b>H8:</b> Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable consumer (a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of negative OPR perceptions than under conditions of positive OPR perceptions.	Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA)	Dependent variables: (1) Endorser attitude (2) Product attitude (3) Organizational attitude (4) Purchase intentions Moderating variable: OPR Blocking variable: Gender
Manipulation Checks		
Scandal type	One-sample Chi- square test	
Cause Involvement	Independent samples <i>t</i> -test	
Fit	Independent samples <i>t</i> -test	

#### **CHAPTER 4**

# RESULTS

The main study evaluated the hypothesized relationships between negative celebrity endorser publicity and consumer reactions to cause-related marketing. This chapter presents an assessment of the influence of fit, cause involvement, and scandal type, as well as the moderating role of organization-public relationships (OPR) on these reactions.

## **Manipulation Checks**

## **Endorser-Product-Cause Fit**

Composite scores of scale items were calculated for each fit condition (good fit vs. poor fit) and compared through an independent samples *t*-test. The results showed that the manipulation of fit was effective, as participants perceived the good fit groupings (Beyoncé/Make-A-Wish foundation/Beats headphones, and Beyoncé/ Product (RED)/Beats headphones, M = 5.67, SD = .92) as more appropriate than the poor fit groupings (Beyoncé/ Habitat for Humanity/Cheerios cereal, and Beyoncé/World Wildlife Fund (WWF)/Cheerios cereal, M = 4.39, SD = 1.14), t(478.51) = 13.87, p < .001.

## **Cause Involvement**

Composite measures were calculated for each cause involvement condition (high cause involvement vs. low cause involvement) and compared through an independent samples *t*-test. The results indicated that the manipulation of cause involvement was successful, as participants perceived the high involvement causes (Make-A-Wish foundation and Habitat for Humanity,

M = 5.08, SD = 1.07) as more personally relevant than the low involvement causes (Product (RED) and World Wildlife Fund (WWF), M = 4.30, SD = 1.20), t(498) = 7.75, p < .001).

# **Scandal Type**

The results for the scandal type manipulation check were mixed. Two hundred and fortysix participants were assigned to the moral-based scandal condition, out of which 206 (83.74%) correctly perceived the situation they had read about as pertaining to Beyoncé's moral values. A one-sample Chi-square test indicated that the proportion of those who made the right choice was significantly greater than those who did not,  $\chi^2(1, N = 246) = 112.17$ , p < .001.

However in terms of the competence-based scandal conditions, out of the 254 participants assigned, only 101 participants (39.8%) correctly perceived the situation they had read about as pertaining to Beyoncé's professional competence. A one-sample Chi-square test indicated that the proportion of those who made the wrong choice was significantly greater than those who had chosen correctly,  $\chi^2(1, N = 254) = 10.65$ , p = .001, meaning that this manipulation was unsuccessful.

This outcome is inconsistent with the results indicated in Pretest 1. This could be due to the fact that all competence-based scandals are, at their core, violations of the moral codes of society. Therefore, some participants may have considered these scandals at their basic level of interpretation. Also, during the first pretest, participants were able to make side-by-side comparisons between the two scandal scenarios, as they were exposed to both, while in the main study, they were only exposed to one. Their decisions in Pretest 1 could therefore have resulted from their relative evaluations of both scenarios. Moreover, the details of the story used in the main study may have influenced participants' perceptions of scandal type. Brief descriptions of the scandal were presented in the first pretest, while fully-developed news articles were used in the main study. For the sake of internal validity, it was decided that only the responses from participants who correctly perceived a particular scandal type [n = 307] will be analyzed when evaluating its influence. Based on the power analysis conducted, this sample size still exceeded the minimum requirement for a valid study.

#### **Hypothesis Testing**

The first hypothesis predicted lower consumer attitudes and purchase intentions after exposure to negative celebrity endorser publicity. A repeated measures multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), which controlled for gender, found significant differences between participants' pre- and post-scandal attitudes (toward the endorser, product, and organization), as well as purchase intentions. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices did not support the assumption of homogeneity in this analysis, Box's M = 915.30, F(540, 127103.69) =1.52, p < .001. Therefore the multivariate criterion of Pillai's Trace was used, as it is considered robust to violations of assumptions (Scheiner, 2001). Additionally, skewness and kurtosis indices for both the pre- and post-scandal dependent variables indicated that – with the exception of prescandal endorser attitudes - the assumption of normality had generally been met. This was based on suggested rules of thumb that state that skewness indices should fall within the normal range of -1 and +1, while kurtosis indices should be equal to 3 (D'agostino, Belanger, & D'Agostino, 1990, Muthén & Kaplan, 1985). The analysis indicated that pre-scandal endorser attitudes were negatively skewed, which can be explained by the stipulation that the celebrity endorser selected be highly regarded by a majority of subjects. However, this violation is inconsequential since, based on the central limit theorem, the effects of non-normality are remedied by a large sample size (Burdenski, 2000; Hair et al., 2010). The data met all other MANCOVA assumptions.

The first hypothesis was supported, Pillai's Trace = .24, F(4, 480) = 37.09, p < .001, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .24$ . The results indicated that participants' pre-scandal attitudes toward the celebrity endorser (M = 6.07), product (M = 5.64), and organization (M = 5.64), as well as their purchase intentions (M = 3.16) were significantly higher than their post-scandal attitudes ( $M_{endorser} = 4.00, M_{product} = 4.99, M_{organization} = 5.11$ ), and purchase intentions (M = 2.99) (see Figure 3).



Figure 3: Mean differences in attitudes and purchase intentions between the pretest and the posttest

Negative celebrity endorser publicity accounted for a large proportion of the variance in celebrity endorser attitude, while it had small to moderate effects on product and organizational attitudes, as well as purchase intentions. Table 24 presents a summary of these findings.

#### Table 24

	Prete	est	Post	Posttest			
	М	SD	М	SD	F	р	Partial $n^2$
					df(1, 483)		
Endorser Attitude	6.07	1.16	4.00	1.63	142.44	<.001	.23
Product Attitude	5.64	1.19	5.00	1.33	10.89	.001	.02
Organizational attitude	5.64	1.14	5.11	1.30	14.64	<.001	.03
<b>Purchase Intentions</b>	3.16	.94	2.99	.96	13.18	<.001	.03

Sample descriptives using within-subjects MANCOVA: Negative publicity effects

Furthermore, the within-subjects MANCOVA reported interaction effects between time point (pre- / post-scandal responses) and fit, Pillai's Trace = .05, *F* (4, 480) = 6.31, *p* < .001, multivariate  $\eta^2$  = .05, as well as time point and scandal type, Pillai's Trace = .11, *F* (4, 480) = 14.67, *p* < .001, multivariate  $\eta^2$  = .11. There were no interaction effects between time point and cause involvement, and time point and OPR, as well as time point and any other combination of variables.

Univariate tests (using the .02 level of significance through the Bonferroni method) showed that the interaction effect between time point and fit pertained to product attitude, F(1, 483) = 17.01, p < .001, partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ , and organizational attitude, F(1, 483) = 11.48, p = .001, partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ . The test also showed that the interaction effect between time point and scandal type pertained to endorser attitude, F(1, 483) = 56.10, p < .001, partial  $\eta^2 = .10$ , product attitude, F(1, 483) = 6.02, p = .01, partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ , and organizational attitude, F(1, 483) = 6.88, p = .01, partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ .

Independent samples *t*-tests, as well as a series of paired samples *t*-tests were conducted to further explore these relationships. In order to account for the multiple comparisons involved

in this analysis, a more conservative alpha level of .005 was adopted through the Bonferroni method.

An independent samples *t*-test revealed that consumers in the poor fit condition had more positive pre-scandal product attitudes than those in the good fit condition,  $M_{\text{poor fit}} = 5.92$ ,  $SD_{\text{poor}}$  $f_{\text{it}} = 1.10$ ;  $M_{\text{good fit}} = 5.35$ ,  $SD_{\text{good fit}} = 1.21$ ; t(498) = -5.50, p < .001. The results however showed no significant differences in post-scandal product attitudes between consumers in the good and poor fit conditions,  $M_{\text{good fit}} = 4.93$ ,  $SD_{\text{good fit}} = 1.38$ ;  $M_{\text{poor fit}} = 5.05$ ,  $SD_{\text{poor fit}} = 1.28$ ; t(498) = -.97, p = .33.

In the same vein, an independent samples *t*-test showed that consumers in the poor fit condition had more positive pre-scandal organizational attitudes than those in the good fit condition,  $M_{\text{poor fit}} = 5.89$ ,  $SD_{\text{poor fit}} = 1.02$ ;  $M_{\text{good fit}} = 5.38$ ,  $SD_{\text{good fit}} = 1.19$ ; t(484.44) = -5.08, p < .001. Consumers however recorded the same level of post-scandal organizational attitude regardless of fit condition,  $M_{\text{good fit}} = 5.02$ ,  $SD_{\text{good fit}} = 1.31$ ;  $M_{\text{poor fit}} = 5.20$ ,  $SD_{\text{poor fit}} = 1.29$ ; t(498) = -1.49, p = .14.

In terms of the interaction between time point and scandal type, an independent samples *t*-test indicated that there was no significant difference in pre-scandal attitude toward the celebrity endorser regardless of scandal type condition,  $M_{\text{moral}} = 6.10$ ,  $SD_{\text{moral}} = 1.13$ ;  $M_{\text{competence}} = 6.03$ ,  $SD_{\text{competence}} = 1.20$ ; t(498) = .63, p = .53. Consumers in the moral-based scandal condition however recorded less favorable post-scandal attitudes toward the celebrity endorser than those in the competence-based scandal condition,  $M_{\text{moral}} = 3.52$ ,  $SD_{\text{moral}} = 1.58$ ;  $M_{\text{competence}} = 4.47$ ,  $SD_{\text{competence}} = 1.55$ ; t(498) = -6.83, p < .001. These results persisted after adjusting for the failure of the scandal type manipulation in both the pre-scandal, t(305) = .59, p = .56, and post-scandal conditions, t(305) = -5.47, p < .001.

Similarly, the results also showed no significant difference in consumers' pre-scandal product attitudes irrespective of scandal type condition,  $M_{\text{moral}} = 5.62$ ,  $SD_{\text{moral}} = 1.20$ ;  $M_{\text{competence}} = 5.65$ ,  $SD_{\text{competence}} = 1.18$ ; t(498) = -.24, p = .81. Consumers in the moral-based scandal condition, however, indicated less favorable post-scandal product attitudes than those in the competence-based scandal condition,  $M_{\text{moral}} = 4.83$ ,  $SD_{\text{moral}} = 1.43$ ;  $M_{\text{competence}} = 5.15$ ,  $SD_{\text{competence}} = 1.21$ ; t(498) = -2.65, p = .008. After adjusting for the failure of the scandal type manipulation, the pre-scandal results held steady, t(305) = .12, p = .91. This post-scandal effect, however, disappeared, t(305) = -1.82, p = .07.

The results also indicated no significant differences in consumers' pre-scandal attitudes toward the organizations involved, regardless of scandal type condition,  $M_{\text{moral}} = 5.65$ ,  $SD_{\text{moral}} =$ 1.18;  $M_{\text{competence}} = 5.63$ ,  $SD_{\text{competence}} = 1.09$ ; t(498) = .18, p = .86. Moreover, based on the more conservative significance level adopted, there were no differences observed in consumers' post-scandal organizational attitudes irrespective of scandal type condition,  $M_{\text{moral}} = 4.98$ ,  $SD_{\text{moral}} = 1.39$ ;  $M_{\text{competence}} = 5.23$ ,  $SD_{\text{competence}} = 1.19$ ; t(498) = -2.15, p = .03 (This was significant at p < .05, but not at the adjusted alpha level). The results remained unchanged after adjusting for the failure of the scandal type manipulation in both the pre-scandal, t(305) = .21, p = .84, and post-scandal conditions, t(305) = -1.36, p = .18.

The results of a series of paired samples *t*-tests examining the interaction effects observed earlier indicated lower product and organizational attitudes after exposure to negative celebrity endorser publicity irrespective of fit condition. Less favorable attitudes toward the endorser, product, and organization were also reported irrespective of scandal type condition. The same results were observed after adjusting for the failure of the scandal type manipulation (see Table 25).

# Table 25

# Sample descriptives using t-test for equality of means

		Good Fi	t Condition				
		(n = 248)					
	Pret	Pretest Posttest					
	М	SD	M	SD	t	df	р
Product Attitude	5.35	1.21	4.93	1.38	5.25	247	<.001
Organizational attitude	5.38	1.19	5.02	1.31	5.03	247	<.001
		Poor Fi	t Condition				
		( <i>n</i>	= 252)				
	Pret	Pretest Posttest					
	M	SD	M	SD	t	df	р
Product Attitude	5.92	1.10	5.05	1.28	10.26	251	<.001
Organizational attitude	5.89	1.02	5.20	1.29	9.47	251	<.001
	Moral	-based S	Scandal Con	dition			
		( <i>n</i>	= 246)				
	Pret	test	Post	test			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	df	р
Endorser Attitude	6.10	1.13	3.52	1.58	25.94	245	<.001
Product Attitude	5.62	1.20	4.83	1.43	8.56	245	<.001
Organizational attitude	5.65	1.18	4.98	1.39	8.55	245	<.001
	Con	npetence	e-based Scan	dal			
		Col	ndition				
		( <i>n</i>	= 254)	<u> </u>			
	Pret	test	Post	test		10	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>	$\frac{df}{252}$	<u>p</u>
Endorser Attitude	6.03	1.20	4.47	1.55	17.58	253	<.001
Product Attitude	5.65	1.18	5.15	1.21	6.92	253	<.001
Organizational attitude	5.63	1.09	5.23	1.19	5.85	253	<.001
	Mora	l-based S	Scandal Con	dition			
		(Ad	justed)				
		( <i>n</i>	= 206)				
	Pret	<u>est</u>	Post	<u>est</u>	4	10	
Endougon Attitudo	$\frac{M}{(12)}$	<u>5D</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>5D</u>	I 25.76	<i>af</i>	$\frac{p}{\sqrt{001}}$
Endorser Attitude	0.12	1.12	3.37 4.91	1.57	25.70	205	<.001
And Allinge	5.64	1.21 1.17	4.01	1.47	1.92 8.66	205	<.001
Organizational attitude	<u> </u>	1.17	4.92	1.41 dol	0.00	203	<.001
	COL	Co	-Daseu Scall	luai			
			insted)				
		(Au (n	– 101)				
	Pref	est	<u>– 101)</u> Posti	est			
	M	SD	$M \qquad M \qquad SD$			df	п
Endorser Attitude	6.03	1 25	4 43	1 64	10 35	100	$\frac{P}{< 001}$
Product Attitude	5.61	1.19	5 12	1 27	4 00	100	<.001
Organizational attitude	5.61	1.06	5 14	1.27	4 21	100	<.001
Si Bannandian artitude	5.01	1.00	<i>2</i> .1 T	1.20	1.441	100	

The second hypothesis predicted that under the good fit condition, there will be less favorable post-scandal attitudes among consumers who are less involved with the cause than those who are highly involved with the cause. This hypothesis was not supported, as indicated by a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), which controlled for the influence of gender. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices supported the assumption of homogeneity in this analysis, Box's M = 19.63, F(18, 209945.29) = 1.07, p = .38. The results showed that under the good fit condition, there were no significant differences in attitudes between the two cause involvement conditions, Wilks'  $\Lambda = 1.00$ , F(3, 241) = .43, p = .73, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .01$ . Moreover, there was no interaction with scandal type, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .99$ , F(3, 241) = .73, p = .54, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .01$ . The data met all other MANCOVA assumptions.

The third hypothesis predicted that after exposure to negative celebrity endorser publicity, consumers who are highly involved with a cause will report higher purchase intentions than less involved consumers. This hypothesis was not supported. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to evaluate the influence of cause involvement on purchase intent, while controlling for gender. A preliminary test of the homogeneity-of-slopes assumption showed that there was no significant difference in the relationship between gender and purchase intentions resulting from the influence of cause involvement, F(1, 496) = .01, p = .93, partial  $\eta^2 = .00$ . The ANCOVA was not significant, F(1, 491) = .10, p = .75, partial  $\eta^2 = .00$ , meaning that there were no significant differences in purchase intentions between the high (M = 3.00) and low (M = 2.98) cause involvement conditions. Moreover, there were no interaction effects between cause involvement and fit, F(1, 491) = .02, p = .90, partial  $\eta^2 =$  .00, cause involvement and scandal type, F(1, 491) = .13, p = .72, partial  $\eta^2 = .00$ , and among cause involvement, fit, and scandal type, F(1, 491) = .06, p = .81, partial  $\eta^2 = .00$ .

The fourth hypothesis predicted less favorable attitudes and purchase intentions under conditions of moral-based scandals than under conditions of competence-based scandals. This hypothesis was partially supported. A MANCOVA tested this hypothesis, considering the responses of only those whose perceptions of scandal type matched the manipulation [n = 307]. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices supported the assumption of homogeneity in this analysis, Box's M = 91.04, F(70, 39808.53) = 1.23, p = .09. The data met all other MANCOVA assumptions.

The results showed an overall significant difference in responses depending on scandal type, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .91$ , F(4, 295) = 7.66, p < .001, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .09$ . There were however no interaction effects between scandal type and cause involvement, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .98$ , F(4, 295) = 1.23, p = .30, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .02$ , between scandal type and fit, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .97$ , F(4, 295) = 2.25, p = .06, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .03$ , as well as among scandal type, cause involvement and fit Wilks'  $\Lambda = .98$ , F(4, 295) = 1.69, p = .15, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .02$ .

Using the Bonferroni method, univariate tests showed a significant difference in consumers' endorser attitudes (F(1, 298) = 24.39, p < .001), with those in the moral-based scandal conditions reporting less favorable attitudes (M = 4.82) than those in the competence-based scandal conditions (M = 5.25). Scandal type had a moderate effect on celebrity endorser attitude (partial  $\eta^2 = .08$ ). There were however no significant differences in product attitudes (F(1, 298) = 3.64, p = .06), organizational attitudes (F(1, 298) = 1.42, p = .24) or purchase

intentions (F(1, 298) = .79, p = .37) based on scandal type. This confirms the follow-up tests carried out under *H1*.

To further investigate the impact of scandal type, *H4* was tested using perceived scandal type, as opposed to manipulated scandal type. Thus, all responses were analyzed this time, comparing those who had perceived the scandal they had read about as moral-based with those who perceived it as competence-based, irrespective of their actual assigned conditions. This determines whether the previously observed effects were due to the manipulation of the stimuli or consumer perceptions of scandal type. Another MANCOVA was conducted, which showed that Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices supported the assumption of homogeneity, Box's M = 86.34, F(70, 88355.83) = 1.19, p = .13. The results indicated that the influence of scandal type on consumer reactions to CRM endorser scandals resulted from the manipulation of the variable, as the significant effect disappeared in this analysis, Wilks'  $\Lambda = 1.00$ , F(4, 488) = .05, p = 1.00, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .00$ .

The fifth hypothesis predicted that product and organizational attitudes will mediate the positive predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on purchase intentions. To be specific, endorser attitudes will positively predict product and organizational attitudes, which, in turn, will positively predict purchase intentions. This was partially supported. *H5* was assessed from both the pre- and post-scandal perspectives through Preacher and Hayes' (2008) widely used multiple mediation regression analysis. This study used the SPSS macro developed by the researchers – a bootstrapped test of multiple mediation, which is an extension of the Sobel (1982) test. This approach was used, as it is able to simultaneously account for the mediation effects of more than one variable by evaluating total and specific indirect effects of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

Multiple regressions were conducted to assess the mediated model. It must be noted that the Preacher and Hayes (2008) approach produces unstandardized coefficients. In the pre-test condition, although the overall model was significant ( $R^2 = .31$ , F(3, 496) = 76.03, p < .001), the results revealed that there was no direct effect of CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions, B = .07, t(496) = 1.85, p = .07. Hayes, Preacher, and Myers (2011, p. 435) explained that "an effect that doesn't exist [...] can't be said to be mediated," thereby disproving *H5* under the pre-scandal condition.

The results, however, suggested that CRM endorser attitude had an indirect effect on purchase intentions, as the following significant, positive correlations were found: (1) endorser attitude and product attitude (B = .36, t (496) = 8.31, p < .001); (2) endorser attitude and organizational attitude (B = .30, t (496) = 7.21, p < .001); (3) product attitude and purchase intentions (B = .28, t (496) = 6.85, p < .001); (4) organizational attitude and purchase intentions (B = .25, t (496) = 5.87, p < .001) (see Figure 4).



Figure 4: Indirect effect of CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions through product and organizational attitudes

**Notes**: Path values represent unstandardized regression coefficients, \*p < .001

The mediation effect of product and organizational attitudes on the relationship between endorser attitudes and purchase intentions was also assessed under the post-scandal condition though multiple regressions. Here, H5 was supported. The results indicated a significant mediation model (F (3, 496) = 64.75, p < .001), with the independent variable and mediators explaining 28% of the variance in purchase intentions. Specifically, the results showed a significant, positive relationship between CRM endorser attitudes and purchase intentions (B =.12, t (496) = 4.79, p < .001). Endorser attitude also had significant positive effects on product attitude (B = .36, t (496) = 10.85, p < .001), and organizational attitude (B = .33, t (496) = 10.17, t (496) = 10.17)p < .001). It was also revealed that product attitude was positively related to purchase intentions (B = .25, t (496) = 5.54, p < .001), as was organizational attitude (B = .17, t (496) = 3.57, p < .001).001). As the aforementioned relationships were all significant, the bootstrapping method using bias corrected confidence estimators was used to test the significance of the indirect effects of endorser attitude on purchase intentions (see Preacher & Hayes, 2004). In line with recommendations proposed in the literature (e.g. Preacher & Hayes, 2008), the number of bootstrap samples was set at 5,000. Moreover, the confidence interval was set at 95%. The mediating role of product and organizational attitudes in the relationship between endorser attitudes and purchase intentions was confirmed by this analysis, B product attitude = .09, 95% CI [.05, .14], B organizational attitude = .05, 95% CI [.02, .09]. Finally, the direct effect of CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions became nonsignificant (B = -.02, t (496) = -.86, p = .39) when controlling for product and organizational attitudes, suggesting complete mediation (see Figure 5). Table 26 presents a summary of these results.

The strength of the mediation effects of product and organizational attitudes were compared to further evaluate the predictive role of consumer attitudes on purchase intentions.

With a bias corrected 95% CI of -.03 to .11 (p = .23), a pairwise contrast analysis determined that there were no significant differences between the specific indirect effect of endorser attitudes through product attitude and the specific indirect effect through organizational attitude.



**Figure 5:** Mediated effect of CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions through product and organizational attitudes

**Notes:** Path values represent unstandardized regression coefficients, Total effect of IV on DV is shown in parentheses, \*p < .001

## Table 26

Summary of multiple mediated regression analysis for variables predicting purchase intentions (N = 500)

	В	SE B	β
Pre-Scandal Condition			
IV on DV			
Endorser Attitude	.07	.04	.08
Mediators on DV			
Product Attitude	.28	.04	$.32^{*}$
Organizational Attitude	.25	.04	$.28^{*}$
IV on Mediators			
Product Attitude	.36	.04	.35*
Organizational Attitude	.30	.04	.31*

Post-Scandal Condition			
IV on DV			
Endorser Attitude	.12	.03	$.21^{*}$
Mediators on DV			
Product Attitude	.25	.05	.34*
Organizational Attitude	.17	.05	$.22^{*}$
IV on Mediators			
Product Attitude	.36	.03	.44*
Organizational Attitude	.33	.03	$.42^{*}$
IV on DV (controlling for Mediators)			
Endorser Attitude	02	.03	04

**Notes:**  $\beta$  values were derived using Baron and Kenny's (1986) mediation analysis approach, which confirmed the results, \*p < .05

The sixth hypothesis predicted the existence of an interaction effect of fit in the relationship between CRM endorser attitude, and product and organizational attitudes. This was not supported. A moderated multiple regression analysis was conducted to test *H6*. This approach is widely accepted in the social sciences (Aguinis, 2004). Again, this was analyzed from both pre- and post-scandal perspectives.

Prior to data analysis, the predictor variables were mean-centered in order to control for multicollinearity. This resulted in Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values of 2.20 or less, and tolerance values of at least .46. Hair et al. (2010) proposed VIF values of less than 10 and tolerance values of at least .10 as acceptable. As a categorical variable, fit was dummy coded (0 = Good fit, 1 = Poor fit), and the interaction predictor was calculated by multiplying the mean-centered endorser attitude and fit values, forming a product term. Two models were compared in each analysis. The main effects of endorser attitude and fit on each dependent variable (product attitude and organizational attitude) were tested in the first regression model (block 1). In the second step, the product term was added to these (in block 2).

In the pre-scandal condition, fit moderated the positive relationship between endorser and product attitudes. However, the role of fit was the opposite of what was predicted in *H6*. Overall, the two predictors in the first block explained a significant amount of variance in product attitude,  $R^2 = .18$ , F(2, 497) = 57.27, p < .001. Endorser attitude was a significant predictor of product attitude ( $\beta = .36$ , t(497) = 8.92, p < .001), as was fit ( $\beta = .25$ , t(497) = 6.33, p < .001). The results showed a significant  $R^2$  change from the initial model to the moderated one ( $\Delta R^2 = .012$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 496) = 7.30$ , p = .007). Moreover, the product term was a significant predictor of product attitudes ( $\beta = .16$ , t(496) = 2.70, p = .007). As Figure 6 illustrates, contrary to expectations, the strength of the predictive effect of endorser attitude on product attitude was more intense in the poor fit condition ( $\beta = .52$ ) than in the good fit condition ( $\beta = .23$ ).



Figure 6: Moderator effect of fit in the pre-scandal relationship between endorser and product attitudes

With regards to organizational attitude, the results showed that, overall, the two predictors in the first block explained a significant amount of variance in organizational attitude,  $R^2 = .15$ , F(2, 497) = 44.08, p < .001. Endorser attitude was a significant predictor of organizational attitude ( $\beta = .32$ , t(497) = 7.70, p < .001), as was fit ( $\beta = .24$ , t(497) =5.73, p < .001). There was however no significant  $R^2$  change from the initial model to the moderated one ( $\Delta R^2 = .002$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 496) = 1.30$ , p = .26), Moreover, the product term was not a significant predictor of organizational attitude ( $\beta = .07$ , t(496) = 1.14, p = .26), indicating that fit does not play a moderating role in the positive relationship between endorser and organizational attitudes. Figure 7 shows the strength of this relationship under the poor fit ( $\beta$ = .42) and good fit conditions ( $\beta = .24$ ).



**Figure 7:** *Moderator effect of fit in the pre-scandal relationship between endorser and organizational attitudes* 

From the post-scandal perspective, fit did not moderate the positive relationship between endorser attitudes, and product and organizational attitudes. First, the results showed that, generally, the two predictors in the first block explained a significant amount of variance in product attitude ( $R^2 = .19, F(2, 497) = 59.80, p < .001$ ). Endorser attitude was a significant predictor of product attitude ( $\beta = .44, t(497) = 10.88, p < .001$ ). However, fit did not significantly predict product attitudes ( $\beta = .05, t(497) = 1.33, p = .18$ ). Also, there was no significant  $R^2$  change from the initial model to the moderated one ( $\Delta R^2 = .001, \Delta F(1, 496) =$ .76, p = .38), and the product term did not significantly predict product attitudes ( $\beta = -.05, t(496) = -.87, p = .38$ ). Figure 8 shows the strength of this relationship under the good fit ( $\beta$ = .47) and poor fit conditions ( $\beta = .40$ ).



**Figure 8:** *Moderator effect of fit in the post-scandal relationship between endorser and product attitudes* 

Similarly, fit did not moderate the positive relationship between endorser and organizational attitudes. First, the results indicated that, in general, the two predictors in the first block explained a significant amount of variance in organizational attitude,  $R^2 = .18$ , F(1, 497) = 53.76, p < .001. Endorser attitude was a significant predictor of organizational attitude ( $\beta = .42, t(497) = 10.24, p < .001$ ). However, fit did not significantly predict organizational attitudes ( $\beta = .08, t(497) = 1.87, p = .06$ ). Also, the  $R^2$  change from the initial model to the moderated one was not significant,  $\Delta R^2 = .00, \Delta F(1, 496) = .14, p = .71$ , and the product term did not significantly predict organizational attitudes ( $\beta = .02, t(496) = .37, p = .71$ ). As Figure 9 shows, there was no interaction between fit and the positive relationship between endorser and organizational attitudes ( $\beta_{\text{good fit}} = .42, \beta_{\text{poor fit}} = .42$ ). Table 27 presents a summary of these results.



**Figure 9:** Moderator effect of fit in the post-scandal relationship between endorser and organizational attitudes

# Table 27

Summary of moderated multiple regression	analysis for variables predicting product and
organizational attitudes ( $N = 500$ )	

	Model 1				Model	2
Variable	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β
Pre-scandal (Product Attitude)						
Endorser Attitude	.37	.04	.36*	.25	.06	.24*
Fit	.61	.10	$.26^{*}$	.61	.10	$.26^{*}$
Endorser Attitude × Fit				.22	.08	$.16^{*}$
$R^2$		.18			.19	
F for change in $R^2$		57.27			$7.30^{*}$	
Pre-scandal (Organizational Attitude)						
Endorser Attitude	.31	.04	$.32^{*}$	.26	.06	$.27^{*}$
Fit	.54	.09	.24*	.54	.09	.24*
Endorser Attitude $\times$ Fit				.09	.08	.07
$R^2$		.15			.15	
F for change in $R^2$		44.08			1.30	
Post-scandal (Product Attitude)						
Endorser Attitude	.36	.03	.44*	.38	.05	.47*
Fit	.14	.11	.05	.14	.11	.05
Endorser Attitude $\times$ Fit				06	.07	05
$R^2$		.19			.19	
F for change in $R^2$		59.80			.76	
Post-scandal (Organizational Attitude)						
Endorser Attitude	.33	.03	$.42^{*}$	.32	.04	$.40^{*}$
Fit	.20	.11	.08	.20	.11	.08
Endorser Attitude $\times$ Fit				.02	.07	.02
$R^2$		.18			.17	
<i>F</i> for change in $R^2$		53.76			.14	

**Notes**: Endorser Attitude was mean-centered, \* *p*<.05

The seventh hypothesis predicted less favorable attitudes and purchase intentions under conditions of good fit than under conditions of poor fit. This hypothesis was tested using MANCOVA (controlling for gender). Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices supported the assumption of homogeneity in this analysis, Box's M = 89.52, F(70, 330483.35) = 1.25, p = .08. The data met all other MANCOVA assumptions.

The hypothesis was partially supported. First, the MANCOVA revealed significant results for the overall effect of fit, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .88$ , F(4, 488) = 16.54, p < .001, multivariate  $\eta^2$ = .12. Subsequently, a univariate test (using the Bonferroni method) showed significant differences between the two fit conditions, but only in relation to purchase intentions, F(1, 491) = 53.88, p < .001, partial  $\eta^2 = .10$ , with those in the poor fit condition recording significantly higher purchase intentions than those in the good fit condition ( $M_{\text{poor fit}} = 3.29$ ,  $M_{\text{good fit}} = 2.69$ ). There were however no fit effects on endorser attitudes (F(1, 491) = .15, p =.70, partial  $\eta^2 = .00$ ), product attitudes (F(1, 491) = 1.08, p = .30, partial  $\eta^2 = .002$ ), and organizational attitudes (F(1, 491) = 2.59, p = .11, partial  $\eta^2 = .005$ ). Neither were there interaction effects between fit and cause involvement, Wilks'  $\Lambda = 1.00$ , F(4, 488) = .10, p =.98, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .001$ , fit and scandal type, Wilks'  $\Lambda = 1.00$ , F(4, 488) = .43, p =.79, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .003$ , as well as among fit, cause involvement, and scandal type, Wilks'  $\Lambda$ 

= .99, F(4, 488) = 1.34, p = .26, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .011$ .

Finally, the eighth hypothesis predicted less favorable attitudes and purchase intentions among consumers who perceive a negative OPR than those who perceive a positive OPR after exposure to negative CRM endorser publicity. This was fully supported, Pillai's Trace = .27, F(4, 480) = 33.07, p < .001, multivariate  $\eta^2 = .22$ . Again Pillai's Trace was used, as Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices did not support the assumption of homogeneity in this analysis, Box's M = 252.19, F(150, 146021.20) = 1.59, p < .001. The data met all other MANCOVA assumptions.

A MANCOVA, which controlled for gender, indicated that subsequent to reading about the negative information, consumers who perceived a positive relationship with the organization had more favorable endorser (M = 4.17), product (M = 5.48), and organizational attitudes (M = 5.63), as well as purchase intentions (M = 3.33), than those who perceived a negative relationship with the organization ( $M_{\text{endorser attitude}} = 3.80$ ,  $M_{\text{product attitude}} = 4.49$ ,  $M_{\text{organizational attitude}} = 4.59$ ,  $M_{\text{purchase intentions}} = 2.64$ ) (see Figure 10).



Figure 10: Mean differences in post-scandal attitudes and purchase intentions between positive and negative OPR conditions

There were no interactions observed between OPR and any of the independent variables. Organization-public relationship accounted for a small to moderate proportion of the variance in celebrity endorser attitude, while it had large effects on product and organizational attitudes, as well as purchase intentions. Table 28 presents a summary of these findings.

# Table 28

	Positive $(n = 25)$	ositive OPR $(n = 253)$		gative )PR = 247)			
	М	SD	M	SD	F	р	Partial $\eta^2$
					$u_{j}(1, 403)$		
Endorser Attitude	4.17	1.59	3.8	0 1.66	7.22	.007	.02
Product Attitude	5.48	1.23	4.4	9 1.25	78.48	<.001	.14
Organizational Attitude	5.63	1.16	4.5	9 1.20	101.21	<.001	.17
<b>Purchase Intentions</b>	3.33	.88	2.6	4.89	79.25	<.001	.14

Sample descriptives using between-subjects MANCOVA: OPR effects

Table 29

Summary of hypotheses and results

	Hypotheses	Results
H1	Consumers' post-scandal (a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions will be	Supported
	less favorable than their pre-scandal ones.	
H2	Under conditions of good fit, negative CRM endorser publicity will result	Not Supported
	in less favorable (a) endorser, (b) product, and (c) organizational attitudes	
	among consumers with low cause involvement than those with high cause	
	involvement.	
H3	Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in lower purchase intentions	Not Supported
	under conditions of low cause involvement than under conditions of high	
	cause involvement.	
H4	Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a)	Partially Supported
	consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of moral-	
	based scandals than under conditions of competence-based scandals.	
H5	Product attitudes and organizational attitudes will mediate the positive	Partially Supported
	predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on purchase intentions, such	
	that (a) CRM endorser attitudes will positively predict product attitudes	
	and organizational attitudes, and (b) product attitudes and organizational	
	attitudes will positively predict purchase intentions.	
H6	The better the endorser-brand-cause fit, the stronger the predictive effect	Not Supported
	of CRM endorser attitudes on (a) product attitudes and (b) organizational	
	attitudes.	
H7	Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable (a)	Partially Supported
	consumer attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of good	
	fit than under conditions of poor fit.	
H8	Negative CRM endorser publicity will result in less favorable consumer	Supported
	(a) attitudes and (b) purchase intentions under conditions of negative OPR	
	perceptions than under conditions of positive OPR perceptions.	

#### CHAPTER 5

# DISCUSSION

This chapter provides an explanation of the results of this study. This is followed by a discussion of its theoretical and practical implications. Although it holds significant insights for celebrity endorsers and nonprofit organizations, this dissertation focuses on the implications for corporations that employ or are considering the use of celebrity endorsers as part of their CRM campaigns. Finally, this chapter concludes with a discussion of the study's limitations and avenues for extension.

## **Understanding the Findings**

This study revealed several important findings that explain how consumers respond to negative CRM endorser publicity. First, the results establish that consumers evaluate celebrity endorsers, CRM products, and their sponsoring organizations more negatively after a media scandal than before it occurs. Consumers are also less likely to purchase CRM products after a scandal. This finding reveals that the adverse effects of negative celebrity endorser publicity, as established in the literature (e.g. Fong & Wyer, 2012; Monga & John, 2008; Till & Shimp, 1998; Um, 2013), also apply within the context of CRM promotion, thus extending research in this area. This means that consumers react in similar ways to negative endorser information regardless of whether or not the strategic brand alliance involves a philanthropic cause. Varadarajan and Menon (1988) argued that CRM can be used as a strategy to assuage public outrage during a crisis. This study clarifies this by pointing out that CRM does not offer organizations already involved in CRM added protection from the unpleasant effects of a celebrity endorser scandal.

This study also reveals the extent to which negative CRM endorser publicity affects key elements within a strategic brand alliance. A CRM endorser misdeed has the greatest impact on consumer attitudes toward celebrity endorsers, followed by organizational attitude and purchase intent, and then product attitude. It must be noted, however, that the differences among effects on product attitude, organizational attitude, and purchase intentions are negligible. This finding reveals that celebrity endorsers bear the brunt of public outrage when a scandal emerges. This may explain why certain organizations, such as Nike, retain their athlete endorsers in the wake of a scandal, yet still manage to maintain their stellar reputations<sup>c</sup>.

The results also show that in the absence of negative CRM endorser publicity, an incongruent brand alliance elicits more positive product and organizational attitudes than a congruent brand alliance. This contradicts previous research on the topic (e.g. Rifon et al., 2004; Cornwell & Coote, 2005). However, this can be explained by the Pretest 1 results. Respondents reported more favorable product and organizational attitudes toward the product and organization under the poor fit condition [Cheerios cereal (M = 5.81, SD = 1.03), General Mills, Inc. (M = 5.67, SD = 1.17)] than those under the good fit condition [Beats headphones (M = 5.30, SD = 1.32), Beats Electronics (M = 5.25, SD = 1.38)]. This was confirmed by two paired samples *t*-tests [Product attitudes: (t(116) = -3.80, p < .001), organizational attitudes: (t(116) = -2.74, p = .007)]. This finding suggests that the valence of product and organizational attitudes override the influence of consistency in a strategic brand alliance untainted by scandal. It also implies that the positive evaluations that result from congruent

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Despite its many athlete endorser scandals over the years, Nike was recently named by *Fortune* magazine as one of the 20 most admired companies in the world, and is currently one of the 25 most powerful brands worldwide according to *Forbes* (CNNMoney, 2013; Forbes, 2013).

brand partnerships can be diminished by unfavorable regard for a corporation and its product. This finding contributes to the literature on the role of fit in strategic brand alliances.

Furthermore, as ELM proposes, highly involved consumers are valuable to organizations because their attitudes are more stable, and resistant to counterarguments (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). However, this study shows that negative celebrity endorser publicity diminishes these qualities. First, it is revealed that where there are congruent brand alliances, there is no difference in post-scandal attitudes between consumers who are highly and less involved with the cause. This study also found that following a CRM endorser scandal, there are generally no differences in purchase intentions among highly and less involved consumers. It can therefore be concluded that although the success or failure of a CRM initiative depends on cause involvement (Bester & Jere, 2012), this is not so after a celebrity endorser scandal, as cause involvement does not make a difference in consumer reactions.

Based on the literature, consumers who are highly involved with a cause transfer their positive attitudes toward the cause to its affiliated entities, but only where there is a good fit between them. Thus, theoretically speaking, highly involved consumers have more positive and enduring attitudes toward the elements involved in a congruent brand alliance than do less involved consumers. However, as this study shows, this is not always the case. As explained previously, CRM products promoted by celebrities hold many layers of meaning, including those bestowed by the celebrity, the organization, and the cause. Research has shown that selfcongruity moderates the influence of involvement in relation to symbolic products (Johar & Sirgy, 1991). Self-congruity refers to the extent to which a consumer perceives consistency between their self-concept and a product's value-expressive attributes or hedonic qualities. Its perceived importance is heightened by social consequence (Johar & Sirgy, 1991). After a scandal

involving a CRM endorser, there is some internal conflict within highly involved consumers, as there is now a discrepancy between their self-concept (and their feelings toward the cause) and the negative act. According to the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), individuals need to eliminate this imbalance in order to maintain consistency of thought. Based on this, it can be inferred that highly involved consumers resolve their internal conflict by aligning their attitude toward the negative act with their attitudes toward the endorser, product, and organization, as well as their purchase intentions. In this situation, it is important for them to distance themselves from this negative act due to its perceived moral or social reprehensibility. Thus, the importance of self-congruity in this context neutralizes the influence of cause involvement. This finding may explain why some highly involved consumers continue to support the Livestrong Foundation even after Lance Armstrong's doping scandal, while others choose not to. This study suggests that supportive consumers have somehow found a way to reconcile his negative act with their self-concept. One way they may have achieved this is by concluding that his actions are separate from the good deeds that his foundation does in the lives of cancer patients. This process may have been facilitated by the fact that the stigma associated with purchasing Livestrong merchandise might have been lessened by his dissociation from Nike and Livestrong.

The effect of cause involvement in this study might also have been neutralized by the mechanisms involved in the two information processing routes used by highly and less involved consumers (central and peripheral routes respectively). Based on ELM, it can be inferred that both routes led to the same conclusions, albeit through the influence of different factors. After exposure to a CRM endorser scandal, highly involved consumers are more motivated and able to process information about the act, its implications for the CRM initiative, and what their

continued support of the program means for their self-concept. On the other hand, less involved consumers use the scandal as a heuristic cue and are swayed by the mere fact that the endorser was involved in a negative act, without giving further thought to the situation and its significance.

This study also found that fit has no influence on consumers' post-scandal attitudes toward CRM endorsers, products, and organizations. Neither does it facilitate meaning transfer from endorser to product and sponsoring organization after a scandal. These findings contradict previous research on the influence of congruence in celebrity endorsement (e.g. Kamins, 1990; Thwaites et al., 2012). Lafferty (2007) explained that fit does not always impact consumer reactions to CRM due to the influence of the emotions evoked by philanthropy. According to her, the mere fact that an entity is tied to a cause sometimes suppresses the logical need for fit in a brand alliance, and negates its effect. Thus, fit is not always a priority in evaluating brand alliances, as organizations involved in CRM initiatives are generally perceived positively. Because social responsibility is important to Millennials, this is a plausible explanation. Also, the extent of congruence in a partnership also moderates fit effects. Drawing from the schema incongruity theory (Mandler, 1982), a derivative of Bartlett's (1932) schema theory, strategic brand alliances with intermediate fit levels (partnerships that are slightly incongruent) may still be as successful as perfectly congruent alliances. This theory explains that individuals fill in the gaps in situations where they perceive objects as only slightly illogical. Therefore, although the manipulation of fit was effective in this study (i.e. the good fit condition recorded significantly higher fit scores than the poor fit condition), the entities in the poor fit condition do not completely contrast each other such that it would be absolutely impossible for such a brand

alliance to exist. Thus, participants may have compensated for the lack of fit in this condition, neutralizing the fit effect.

Although fit may not be a priority in evaluating post-scandal attitudes, the results indicate that it is a deciding factor in the likelihood of purchasing a CRM product. In line with the postulates of schema theory, this study shows that consumers are more likely to purchase CRM products that are incongruent with their celebrity endorsers and nonprofit beneficiary than CRM products in a congruent brand alliance. This finding can be explained by the fact that, in this instance, consistency between the elements in the partnership fostered meaning transfer from one entity to another. Thus, the connection among Beats headphones, Beyoncé's image, and the nonprofit beneficiaries of the CRM initiative enhanced the negative effect of the endorser scandal on consumers' behavioral intentions. This finding not only reveals the relative importance of fit in consumers' post-scandal reactions, it also brings to light one of the disadvantages of congruent brand alliances, which should be taken into consideration when planning CRM campaigns.

The fact that fit influences post-scandal purchase intentions, but not attitudes can be explained by ELM, which suggests that elaboration may be enhanced by the weight of the decision. Deciding whether or not to purchase a CRM product tied to a scandal is a complicated process due to the various factors involved, not to mention its implications. Therefore, it is likely that the consumers were motivated and able to carefully consider this decision due to its importance. Central route processing of this nature enhances scrutiny of the logic behind the information presented (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), which triggers fit effects.

The results also indicated that consumers perceive CRM endorsers more harshly when they are involved in moral-based scandals. This was determined in both *H1* and *H4*, and supports

Votolato and Unnava's (2006) findings. Wojciszke et al. (1993) explained that consumers are more accommodating of competence-based scandals due to the expectation that individual differences in skill level will inevitably lead to mistakes. On the other hand, moral-based scandals are viewed more negatively, as it is seen as a violation of a standard code of moral values, which is uniform for everyone in society. The disappearance of the influence of scandal type when perception, as opposed to assigned scandal type, was analyzed indicates that this effect results from situational, and not individual factors.

This study also found that negative CRM endorser publicity has equally adverse effects on product and organizational attitudes, as well as purchase intentions, regardless of the type of scandal the celebrity endorser is involved in. Therefore, the harshness with which endorsers are evaluated during moral-based scandals does not spill over to the CRM product and its sponsoring organization. This may be because society does not hold organizations to the same moral standards as they do individuals (Votolato & Unnava, 2006), as such, they are not held accountable to the same extent.

This study also showed that CRM endorser attitudes positively predict product and organizational attitudes, which, in turn, positively predict purchase intentions. In the post-scandal condition, it was found that the predictive effect of CRM endorser attitudes on purchase intentions resulted from consumers' product and organizational attitudes, supporting the meaning transfer model. This finding elaborates on *H1* by explaining the manner in which negative celebrity endorser publicity affects consumer attitudes and purchase intentions. It also adds to the scarce literature on the link between celebrity endorsement and organizational attitudes.

The results also reveal that a direct relationship develops between CRM endorser attitudes and purchase intentions after exposure to the scandal. This can be explained by the fact

that negative information is a more powerful influencer of consumer reactions than positive information, especially when the news is surprising (Ito et al., 1998; Smith & Petty, 1996). Moreover, as this was a novel application of the meaning transfer model, some moderating factors could have been overlooked which could have impeded the influence of consumers' prescandal CRM endorser attitude on purchase intentions. For instance, skepticism has been identified as a moderator of the effects of both CRM and celebrity endorsement on purchase intentions (Tripp et al., 1994; Webb & Mohr, 1998), and this could have affected the meaning transfer process. Purchase intent – which was not measured in Pretest 1 – was also generally low, and this was reflected in the huge discrepancy between endorser attitudes and purchase intentions in the pre-scandal condition. Thus, this demonstrates the essence of pairing celebrity endorsers (no matter how highly regarded) with products the target market actually wants or needs.

Confirming Nan and Heo's (2007) findings, this study also indicates that, prior to a scandal, meaning transfer from a celebrity endorser to a product is facilitated by fit. However, in this study, this relationship was stronger in the poor fit, instead of the good fit, condition, contradicting schema theory's assumptions. *H1* revealed that positive product attitudes can subdue the effects of congruence in a scandal-free strategic brand alliance. Therefore, it is possible that consumer attitudes play a bigger role in the meaning transfer process than previously realized. This implies that when both the CRM endorser and the product are well-liked, consumers more readily transfer their positive regard for the endorser to the product, regardless of the inconsistency that exists between them.

On the other hand, congruence did not facilitate the transfer of meaning from CRM endorser to organization in the pre-scandal condition. The diminished role of fit here suggests

that in this condition, different perceptions of the congruence among entities may have determined fit's function in the meaning transfer process. In this study, the fit between organizations, charities, and endorsers was inferred from product evaluations. However, it is possible that participants could have perceived subtle differences between the extent to which products fit with endorsers and charities, and the extent to which organizations fit with these entities. For instance, participants may have perceived Beyoncé's endorsement of Cheerios as more fitting than her association with General Mills as a company, or vice versa, and this may have changed fit's role from one situation to the other. Therefore, a more nuanced examination of fit might provide some insight into the relative role of congruence in the meaning transfer process from CRM endorser to product and organization.

In the same vein, this study found that after a scandal, fit does not moderate the transfer of meaning from the endorser to the CRM product and its sponsoring organization. As discussed previously, this may be accounted for by the fact that the influence of fit is weakened within the context of post-scandal attitudes due to the involvement of a philanthropic cause. Research has also indicated that involvement with an organization (which was not considered in this study) neutralizes the influence of fit in a strategic brand alliance (Lafferty, 2007). Thus, these may account for fit's diminished influence in this context.

Finally, perhaps the most important finding this study reveals is that positive organization-public relationships protect corporations in the incidence of negative celebrity endorser publicity. Thus, this study lends support to OPR research on the mitigating role of positive relationships on negative information effects (e.g. Coombs, 1998, 2000; Kim & Lee, 2005; Marra, 1992). This finding can be explained by Coombs and Holladay (2001), who argued that stakeholders who have positive relationships with organizations are less likely to dwell on

unfavorable information about the organization than others with whom organizations have negative relationships. Moreover, consumers with positive OPR perceptions empathize more with organizations during the course of a specific incident or event (Hung-Baesecke & Chen, 2013).

This study also found that OPR has the greatest influence on organizational attitude. This is followed by product attitude and purchase intentions, and, finally, endorser attitudes. OPR's strong influence on organizational attitudes may be explained by research in the area of relationship management claiming that positive OPRs lead to favorable attitudes toward organizations, which then translate into supportive actions (Ledingham, 2006). Moreover, consumer affiliation with an organization leads to favorable organizational perceptions, which extend to product evaluations and brand attitudes (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Kim, 2003). This finding also suggests that in a brand alliance, the influence of OPR extends beyond the organization to its partners regardless of fit (as there was no interaction between OPR and fit).

#### **Theoretical Implications**

This study contributes to the literature on schema theory, ELM, the meaning transfer model, and OPR in several ways.

First, in terms of schema theory, this study brings a deeper understanding to the implications of congruence in a strategic brand alliance. One of the assumptions of schema theory is that incongruence increases elaboration on a topic, which leads to skepticism and other negative outcomes. This dissertation, however, builds on this by revealing that in the absence of a scandal, positive product and organizational attitudes compensate for the adverse effects of incongruence on consumer evaluations. Moreover, the influence of fit in a strategic brand alliance is relative. Thus, consumers place greater importance on fit when evaluating their post-
scandal purchase intentions than when evaluating their attitudes. This study also enhances our understanding of the function of fit in post-scandal meaning transfer by revealing organizational involvement as a potential moderating factor.

The meaning transfer model is also extended by applying it to a new area: endorsement of a CRM product. This study explains how meaning transfer occurs within this context both in the presence and absence of a CRM endorser scandal. In doing so, it also supports theories linking attitudes and behavioral intentions, such as the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior. Moreover, the direct and indirect effects of endorser attitude on purchase intentions further explain the mechanisms behind the attitude-behavioral intention link, depending on the context. This study also extends the meaning transfer model by bringing some understanding to the dynamics at play when there are two affect sources.

With regards to ELM, this dissertation expands on the role of involvement in persuasion in light of negative information. First, it reveals that negative CRM endorser publicity moderates the influence of cause involvement on consumer attitudes and purchase intentions. This study may also provide an explanation for this effect by drawing on other theories such as the selfcongruity theory and the theory of cognitive dissonance, thus contributing to theoretical advancement in the area of persuasion.

This dissertation makes a strong contribution to relationship management scholarship by extending research on the moderating role of OPR on consumer reactions to crises to include the context of CRM endorser scandals, which adds to the limited research in this area. The main assumption of OPR according to Ledingham (2003, p.190) is that "effectively managing organizational relationships around common interests and shared goals, over time, results in mutual understanding and benefit for interacting organizations and publics." Thus, the outcomes

of high quality OPRs are mutual understanding and benefit. This study reveals one such benefit for organizations: protection from reputational damage resulting from negative endorser information.

This study also demonstrates the consequences of effective OPR management by linking PR efforts and outcomes in a measurable way. Also, the influence of OPR on product and organizational attitudes, as well as purchase intentions – as revealed in this study – enhances the field's understanding of how OPR functions in this context, which helps quantify the value of public relations. This study therefore lends support to Ki and Hon's (2007) relational model by illustrating how relationship management can serve as a yardstick for evaluating public relations effectiveness.

Finally, this dissertation adds to the body of knowledge on important PR-related topics such as corporate perception, CSR, community relations, and crisis, relationship, and campaign management by integrating theories and concepts from psychology, marketing, and advertising. Thus, this study fosters the development of PR theory by drawing on other fields and disciplines.

### **Practical Implications**

This dissertation holds many practical implications for corporations engaged in, or considering CRM. First, it is revealed that a CRM initiative consisting of ill-fitting partners might still be successful if the product and organization are well-liked among consumers. Consumers do not think about fit as much if they love the product and organization. Thus, reputable organizations with beloved products should not be held back from sponsoring a CRM initiative with nonprofit organizations and celebrity endorsers with whom they are not perfectly matched. This finding also implies that corporations must bolster their CRM campaigns with other promotional strategies in order to enhance consumer attitudes toward the organization and

its CRM product, as the positive influence of congruence with an endorser and cause is diminished by unfavorable attitudes. Moreover, since the market is oversaturated with CRM products, in order to cut through the clutter, it is crucial to be the best-liked CRM product and organization in a particular product category.

This study also shows that employing a well-regarded celebrity endorser is one way to enhance attitudes toward a CRM product and its sponsoring organization due to the positive correlation that exists among these entities. Moreover, purchase intentions can generally be increased by engendering positive product and organizational attitudes among consumers. This may be done through events, promotions, advertising, and other marketing communications strategies.

This study also highlights the risk involved in promoting CRM initiatives through celebrity endorsement. It demonstrates the importance of selecting endorsers who have a low level of scandal susceptibility in order to lower the likelihood that they will be embroiled in a media scandal, as this may – among other things – disrupt CRM programs due to consumers' reluctance to purchase products.

It is also shown that although perceptions of corporations and their products decline after a celebrity endorser scandal, consumers direct most of their outrage toward the celebrity endorser. Therefore, there is the opportunity for the corporation to redeem itself after the scandal or protect itself from further damage. This may involve facilitating the reconciliation of consumers' self-concept with the negative act through crisis management techniques, which may be identified through future research.

This study also elaborates on the pros and cons of congruent versus incongruent strategic brand alliances in light of negative CRM endorser publicity. Although incongruent brand

alliances generally elicit unfavorable reactions, in terms of product and organizational attitudes, they are no more affected than congruent brand alliances when an endorser scandal emerges. Thus, the advantages of congruent alliances do not include protection from the adverse effects of endorser scandals on consumer attitudes, and it should not be assumed otherwise. Moreover, it is revealed that scandals' effect on purchase intentions is intensified when there is a good fit between the endorser, product, and cause. Corporations must therefore account for this in their crisis communication planning by taking precautionary measures such as including morals clauses in endorsement contracts that will enable organizations to quickly dissociate themselves and their products from endorsers in the event of a scandal.

Many organizations base their selection of philanthropic causes on the characteristics and values of their customer base because highly involved consumers are more accepting of CRM initiatives. This study shows that among CRM product consumers, cause involvement is not a powerful predictor of attitudes and behavior, as, to some extent, most of these customers already believe that the CRM initiative is important. Organizations must therefore refrain from taking highly involved consumers for granted by assuming that they will remain brand loyal after a CRM endorser commits a negative act. Efforts must instead be geared toward developing and nurturing relationships with these stakeholders prior to the emergence of a scandal.

Also, as demonstrated by this study, CRM consumers do not make the distinction between moral- and competence-based scandals in their evaluation of sponsoring organizations and their products. As such, all negative acts affect consumer attitudes to the same extent. Therefore, corporations must endeavor to respond to each situation with the same level of seriousness. For instance, some have speculated that there are differences in how Nike handles its various athlete endorser crises (see Bercovici, 2012). Nike is tougher on its athlete endorsers

who are involved in competence-based scandals (e.g. doping scandals), as these are tied to the qualities that connect the athlete to the company's brand image and its values. Due to the strength of this connection, it may be expected that an endorser's competence-based misdeed would have greater repercussions for the organization. However, this study suggests otherwise within the context of CRM. It reveals that moral-based scandals involving CRM endorsers should not be taken lightly, as they have the same damaging effects on consumer evaluations of organizations and their products as competence-based scandals do.

Finally, this study emphasizes the value of public relations to organizations. It shows that positive OPRs reduce the risks associated with adopting celebrity endorsers. Organizations must therefore make it a priority to build positive, and mutually beneficial relationships with their stakeholders through strategies such as providing unconditional support, and being accessible, open, positive, and cooperative (Grunig & Huang, 2000; Hon & Grunig, 1999; Hung, 2006).

# Limitations and Avenues for Future Research

This study had some shortcomings, which provide opportunities for extension. First, one of the major shortcomings of online research is the lack of control over experimental conditions and procedures. As such, although participants were told that the scandals, tweets, and news articles were real, some subjects could have searched online for the story and found out the truth, thereby damaging the internal validity of this study. Moreover, there was no way to ensure that the participants followed the correct procedures when completing the survey, such as reading the tweets and then clicking the link to read the full story from beginning to end. Future research could use a double-blind experimental design in a more controlled environment, such as a computer lab, where procedures would be monitored by an unbiased research assistant. On the

other hand, completing the survey unsupervised and at participants' convenience mimicked the real-life situation of reading the news online.

Replications of this study must also ensure that subjects do not participate in multiple stages of data collection. In the present study, there is the possibility that some respondents took part in at least one pretest, as well as the main study, which could have clued them in to the fact that the stories and scandals were fictitious. However, it must be noted that the impact of this exposure on the internal validity of this study is unlikely to be significant, as it applied to only a handful of respondents.

Also, future research applying this study's methodology would benefit from measuring the believability of the scandal scenarios used. This should be done during pretesting. This controls for the effects of skepticism, as participants are unlikely to take the survey seriously if they doubt the authenticity of the story. While there is no evidence of respondent fatigue, it is a potential confound, which should be controlled for during the pretesting phase of future studies. Since there were 19 somewhat lengthy scandal scenarios to be evaluated, there is a chance that some participants may have grown tired of reading them and simply skimmed over the last few scenarios, or skipped them altogether. Future research must safeguard the internal validity of the study by timing participants in order to weed out those who completed the section too quickly, or by only allowing participants access to the survey questions after a predetermined period of time, increasing the likelihood that they will read the scenarios in their entirety.

In addition to measuring endorser, product, and organizational attitudes, consumer attitudes toward CRM should also have been investigated, as skepticism toward CRM products and initiatives could have tainted responses. Future research in this area should also consider the influence of personal values, such as altruism, on post-scandal purchase intentions.

Also, factors such as product category could have influenced purchase intentions, as this was not controlled for. Although both products used in this study were considered hedonic by participants, there is a difference in how frequently consumers purchase a product like headphones, as opposed to cereal. Therefore, there is a greater likelihood that participants would have a need for cereal more than headphones, and this could have influenced their purchase intentions. Purchase intentions could also have been affected by price and socioeconomic background since they have some bearing on whether participants feel they can afford to purchase the product. To illustrate this, Beats headphones range in price from \$169.95 -\$449.95<sup>d</sup> therefore, as much as participants would like to own a pair, if they feel this is out of reach, it could have shaped their perception of the likelihood that they would purchase the CRM product in future. By contrast, a regular-sized 8.9 oz. box of Cheerios cereal costs about \$2.58<sup>e</sup>. Nevertheless, based on Pretest 2 and the manipulation check, these products were appropriate for this study since they served their respective purposes as congruent and incongruent CRM products in the strategic brand alliances studied. At any rate, in addition to measuring product familiarity, attitude, and type, extensions of this study should also measure purchase intentions and frequency of purchase during the pretesting phase to ensure that the products selected stand an equal chance of being purchased, and are products participants would actually buy.

As previously discussed, in the pre-scandal condition, the discrepancy between product and organizational attitudes across fit conditions moderated the influence of congruence. Future research examining fit effects should therefore control for these differences. The influence of other types of personal involvement such as involvement with the brand, organization, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup> Based on price listings on the Beats website. Retrieved April 6, 2014 from http://www.beatsbydre.com/headphones/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>e</sup> Based on price listings on the Walmart website. Retrieved April 6, 2014 from http://www.walmart.com/ip/10311408? wmlspartner=wlpa&adid=222222222700000000&wl0=&wl1=g&wl2=c&wl3=41833582510&wl4=&wl5=pla&wl6=19 880599990&veh=sem

endorser should also be considered in future research, as these may have been crucial to fit effects within the context of this study. Moreover, this study examined the combined influence of three types of fit: endorser-product fit, endorser-cause fit, and product-cause fit. Since, historically, fit effects in brand alliances have been studied individually, there is not yet enough information on how the combined effect functions to provide explanations for consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions after an endorser scandal. Future research should examine the dynamics among these three types of fit both in the pre- and post-scandal contexts.

The results also indicated that there might be other influencers of purchase intentions in addition to the attitudes examined in this study. This should be further investigated. This study might also be extended by conducting a full investigation into how highly involved consumers navigate their feelings toward CRM products after an endorser scandal. Considering the fact that social consequence may be a factor in this context, it would be useful to apply the theory of planned behavior or the theory of reasoned action to this study in order to examine how attitudes and subjective norms function to determine purchase intentions. Another reason why subjective norms are significant is that according to a Millennial study conducted by public relations firm Edelman, 63% of Millennials shop with a member of their reference group, and never make unapproved purchases (Edelman Berland, 2012). Thus, this variable is important in the study of consumer behavior among Millennials.

This dissertation showed that consumers might place more weight on the decision of whether to purchase a CRM product after a scandal. Thus, factors such as donation amount, proximity, type of cause, and beneficiaries, which could moderate the perceived importance of the decision, should be considered in future studies.

Consumer reactions to negative CRM endorser publicity could also be investigated from the standpoint of attribution theory (Weiner, 1985, 1986) by investigating the influence of blame, and whether it has an impact on meaning transfer and extent of attitudinal impact. Votolato and Unnava (2006) found that when one party in a strategic brand alliance is involved in a crisis, transfer of negative attitudes to the other party is moderated by the level of perceived complicity in the act. Moreover, the scope of the scandal (whether it affected the celebrity alone, some external party, or both) also determines reactions to it (Money et al., 2006). Therefore, considering these factors might bring a deeper understanding to this topic.

This study could also be extended by investigating the stability of post-scandal attitudes and behavioral intentions to determine whether these are fleeting or enduring. A longitudinal study conducted at different points of an actual scandal would bring some understanding to this topic. This will inform image management decision-making among corporations.

Future research should also determine which crisis response strategies would be most appropriate for responding to CRM endorser crises depending on situational factors. For instance, new inquiries could evaluate the relative effectiveness of Benoit's (1995) image restoration techniques in mitigating the negative effects of CRM endorser scandals. This will not only help organizations protect their reputations and assets, it will also contribute to the advancement of the theory. Research has found that consumers with positive OPR perceptions of organizations in crisis have more favorable reactions to their crisis response strategies (Park & Reber, 2011). Future research should apply this finding within the context of this study in light of OPR's moderating function in the formation of consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions.

Also, Ki and Hon (2007) found that some OPR dimensions are more influential than others in eliciting positive consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions. In particular, they

identified perceptions of satisfaction and control mutuality as the most accurate predictors of these outcomes. Therefore, this study could be extended by exploring the relative strengths of Ledingham and Bruning's (1998) five OPR dimensions in determining consumers' post-scandal attitudes and purchase intentions.

As the concepts of mutuality and symmetry are at the heart of OPR management, relationships from this perspective are considered from both points of view (Ki & Hon, 2007). One of the shortcomings of this study was that OPR was solely measured from the consumer standpoint. However, this problem is common in the relationship management literature, as most established OPR scales are not modelled to account for organizational perceptions about their relationships with their stakeholders. This study could therefore be extended by applying the coorientation theory. The coorientation theory from the PR perspective was developed by Broom (1977), and provides a framework through which OPR can be gauged from both perspectives. In fact, Ferguson (1984) suggested the use of the coorientational model measure to conceptualize relationship variables. According to the coorientation theory of PR, organizations, and the key publics they are in relationships with, have certain ideas and attitudes about each other, and the issues or problems they are facing. Organizations and their publics also have perceptions of what the other party's ideas and attitudes are. Thus, each party in a relationship has a simultaneous coorientation toward the other party and the attitude object. The extent to which these ideas and evaluations align determines the quality of OPR. One notable difference between the coorientation theory and the relationship management theory is that this model is more useful for describing short-term relationships than long-term ones (Grunig & Huang, 2000), and this should be taken into consideration in the design of future studies.

Although research has shown that a match-up in gender between consumers and celebrity endorsers does not moderate evaluations of scandals (Edwards & La Ferle, 2009), this study could benefit from considering the influence of celebrity endorser gender on consumer evaluations to determine whether there are significant differences in reactions to male versus female endorsers.

Finally, this study only considered the attitudes and behavioral intentions of consumers who belong to the Millennial generation. Although a recent study reported by *Adweek* suggested that, as consumers, Millennials may not be as completely different from other generations as previously believed, they still have many unique characteristics. For instance, *Adweek* reported that, like other generations, most Millennials value word-of-mouth referrals, and prefer shopping in-store to shopping online (Klara, 2014). Similar to Baby Boomers, Millennials also consider factors such as quality, price, and value when shopping (Radius Global Market Research, 2013). Still, Millennials differ in important ways. They are idealists who hold post-materialist values (Edelman Berland, 2012), and this is reflected in the fact that social responsiveness forms the basis of many of their decisions as consumers (Cone Inc., 2010). Therefore, the insights from this study might be enriched by comparing its results to those obtained from CRM consumers belonging to other generations. This information will help in target audience segmentation and enhance the effectiveness of crisis management techniques.

### CHAPTER 6

# CONCLUSION

Strategic brand alliances between corporations, nonprofit organizations, and celebrities are value-laden: each individual component holds meaning for consumers. Although promoting CRM initiatives through celebrity endorsement may be an effective marketing communications strategy, the complexity of this union raises questions about the dynamics among entities. This dissertation explored the implications of a change in valence for one of these entities, and discovered a potential threat to this partnership. It also provided corporations with a solution to mitigate this threat: by building and nurturing positive stakeholder relationships.

Thirty years after Ferguson's (1984) call for a focus on relationships in public relations scholarship, this dissertation has uncovered new benefits of developing positive organization-public relationships. One major point this study makes is that corporations will not be left unscathed by a CRM endorser scandal since the negative consumer attitudes formed will transfer to the products and organizations associated with endorsers. However, these negative outcomes can be controlled by developing strong, positive bonds with stakeholders.

Over the years, relationship management theory has proven its heuristic value, as it is able to account for stakeholder attitudes and behaviors across contexts. This dissertation contributes to this by applying the theory to a previously unobserved phenomenon that reflects current global trends in business practice. By integrating theories from other fields and disciplines, this dissertation responds to Ferguson's (1984) appeal for the development of the OPR framework through the interdisciplinary approach, thus extending its explanatory power. It

is important for the continued advancement of public relations theory to keep testing the limits of its various theoretical frameworks.

Moreover, this dissertation's examination of the roles of fit, cause involvement, and scandal type has produced valuable insights, which have shed some light on the complexities of the phenomenon under investigation. Overall, it was revealed that fit and cause involvement function differently within the context of celebrity-endorsed CRM initiatives. As this study is only the first step in unraveling the roles of these variables in this situation, future research in this area is necessary.

As the popularity of CRM continues to grow, so will the use of promotional strategies to heighten its appeal. It is therefore imperative for organizations to understand the consequences of implementing these promotional strategies. This dissertation provides some food for thought for CSR managers as they weigh the benefits against the costs of involving celebrities in their CRM programs. It also provides a pre-emptive measure to help safeguard corporate reputations and CRM initiatives in the incidence of negative endorser publicity.

#### REFERENCES

Adkins, S. (1999). Cause related marketing: Who cares wins. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

- Agrawal, J., & Kamakura, W. A. (1995). The economic worth of celebrity endorsers: An event study analysis. *The Journal of Marketing*, *59*, 56-62.
- Aguinis H. (2004). Regression analysis for categorical moderators. New York: Guilford.
- Ahluwalia, R. (1996). *An integrated model of market-related negative information processing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Ahluwalia, R., Burnkrant, R. E., & Unnava, H. R. (2000). Consumer response to negative publicity: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(2), 203–214.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Arellano, J. (2007, September 7). Kelly Clarkson joins Ford as Warrior in Pink against cancer. *Automotive.com.* Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://blogs.automotive.com/kellyclarkson-joins-ford-as-warrior-in-pink-against-cancer-2443.html#ixzz2XhlQJcu5.
- Atkin, C. & Block, M. (1983). Effectiveness of celebrity endorsers. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 23(1), 57-61.

- Bandenhausen, K. (2012, November 29). Tiger Woods delivered \$6 million more for sponsors than Rory McIlroy in 2012. *Forbes*. Retrieved April 27, 2013 from http://www.forbes. com/sites /kurtbadenhausen/2012/11/29/tiger-woods-delivered-6-million-more-forsponsors-than-rory-mcilroy-in-2012/.
- Barker, O. (2013, November 22). The story of Doris. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved November 22, 2013 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/oliver-barker/the-story-of-doris\_b\_43177 49.html.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173 - 1182.
- Barone, M. J., Miyazaki, A. D., & Taylor, K.A. (2000). The influence of cause-related marketing on consumer choice: Does one good turn deserve another? *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 248–262.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge,England: Cambridge University Press.
- Becker-Olsen, K. L., Cudmore, A., & Hill, R. P. (2006). The impact of perceived corporate social responsibility on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(1), 46-53.
- Becker-Olsen, K. L., & Hill, R. P. (2006). The impact of sponsor fit on brand equity the case of nonprofit service providers. *Journal of Service Research*, 9(1), 73-83.
- Bell, K. (2011). A delicious way to help save lives: Race, commodification, and celebrity in product (RED). *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 4(3), 163-180.

- Benoit, W. (1995). Accounts, excuses, and apologies: A theory of image restoration strategies.New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bercovici, J. (2012, October 22). Lance Armstrong and Nike: No, it's not just about money. *Forbes*. Retrieved April 16, 2014 from http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffbercovici/2012/ 10/22/lance-armstrong-and-nike-no-its-not-just-about-money/.
- Berger, I. E., Cunningham, P. H., & Kozinets, R. V. (1999). The processing of cause-related marketing claims: Cues, biases, or motivators? *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26(1), 491-497.
- Bester, S., & Jere, M. G. (2012). Cause-related marketing in an emerging market: Effect of cause involvement and message framing on purchase intention. *Journal of Database Marketing* & *Customer Strategy Management*, 19(4), 286-293.
- Broderick, A., Jogi, A. & Garry, T. (2003). Tickled pink: The personal meaning of cause related marketing for customers. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *19*(5 6), 583 610.
- Broom, G. M. (1977). Coorientational measurement of public issues. *Public Relations Review*. *3*(4),110-119.
- Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a concept and theory of organization– public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 9(2), 83–98.
- Broom, G. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1990). Using research in public relations: Applications to program management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brown, K. A., & White, C. L. (2011). Organization–public relationships and crisis response strategies: Impact on attribution of responsibility. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 23(1), 75-92.

- Brown, T. J., & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing*, *61*(1), 68-84.
- Bruning, S. D. (2001). Axioms of relationship management: Applying interpersonal communication principles to the public relations context. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 7(1-2), 3-16.
- Bruning, S. D., DeMiglio, P. A., & Embry, K. (2006). Mutual benefit as outcome indicator:
   Factors influencing perceptions of benefit in organization–public relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 32(1), 33-40.
- Bruning, S. D., & Galloway, T. (2003). Expanding the organization–public relationship scale: Exploring the role that structural and personal commitment play in organization–public relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 29(3), 309-319.
- Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (1999). Relationships between organizations and publics:
   Development of a multi-dimensional organization-public relationship scale. *Public Relations Review*, 25(2), 157-170.
- Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (2002). Identifying the communication, behaviors, and interaction patterns of agency-client relationships in development and decline. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 8(2), 21-34.
- Burdenski, T. K. (2000). Evaluating univariate, bivariate, and multivariate normality using graphical procedures. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints*, *26*(2), 15-28.
- Capotorto, A. (2011, September 28). Jennifer Aniston: Ford Warriors in Pink PSA. *IMDB*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.imdb.com/news/ni15986537/.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, *34*(4), 39-48.

- Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*(5), 752-766.
- Chen, Y. R. R. (2005). Multinational corporations' government affairs in China: MNCgovernment relations and corporate political strategies. Paper presented at the Public Relations Division of the 55th Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, New York.
- Chowdhury, T. G., & Khare, A. (2011). Matching a cause with self-schema: The moderating effect on brand preferences. *Psychology & Marketing*, 28(8), 825–842.
- Chung, K. Y., Derdenger, T., & Srinivasan, K. (2012). Economic value of celebrity endorsements: Tiger Woods' impact on sales of Nike golf balls. Retrieved April 27, 2013 from http://econ.arizona.edu/docs/Seminar\_Papers/2011-2012/Derdenger20120511.pdf.
- CNN. (2013, April 26). *Lance Armstrong fast facts*. Retrieved April 28, 2013 from http://www. cnn.com/2013/01 /17/us/lance-armstrong-fast-facts.
- CNNMoney. (2013). *World's most admired companies*. Retrieved April 25, 2013 from http:// money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/most-admired/.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/ correlation: Analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cone Inc. (2008). 2008 Cone Cause Evolution Study. Retrieved February 7, 2013 from http://www.conecomm.com/stuff/contentmgr/files/0/8ac1ce2f758c08eb226580a3b67d56 17/files /cone25thcause.pdf.

- Cone Inc. (2010). 2010 Cone Cause Evolution Study. Retrieved February 7, 2013 from http:// ppqty.com /2010\_ Cone\_Study.pdf.
- Cone Inc. (2013). 2013 Cone Communications/Echo Global CSR Study. Retrieved August 18, 2013 from http://www.conecomm.com/stuff/contentmgr/files/0/fdf8ac4a95f78de426c2c b117656b846/files/ 2013\_cone\_communicationsecho\_global\_csr\_study.pdf.
- Cone Inc. & AMP Agency. (2006). *The 2006 Cone Millennial Cause Study*. Retrieved November 9, 2013 from http://www.centerforgiving.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=9cKyEls7NXg %3D&tabid=102&mid=477.
- Connors, S. (2013). Consumed by identity: The role of psychosocial development in the consumption constellations of emerging adults (master's thesis). Retrieved November 16, 2013 from https://dspace.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10214/7419/Connors\_Scott\_201308\_MSc.pdf?sequence=5.
- Coombs, W. T. (1998). An analytic framework for crisis situations: Better responses from a better understanding of the situation. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *10*(3), 177-191.
- Coombs, W. T. (2000). Crisis management: Advantages of a relational perspective. In J. A.
  Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public Relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 73-93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2001). An extended examination of the crisis situations: A fusion of the relational management and symbolic approaches. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13(4), 321–340.

- Cutlip S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (1985). *Effective public relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dadush, S. (2010). Profiting in (RED): The need for enhanced transparency in cause-related marketing. *International Law & Politics*, 42, 1269-1336.
- D'agostino, R. B., Belanger, A., & D'Agostino, R. B., Jr. (1990). A suggestion for using powerful and informative tests of normality. *The American Statistician*, 44(4), 316-321.
- Davis, H. L. (2010). Feeding the world a line?: Celebrity activism and ethical consumer practices from Live Aid to Product Red. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *9*(3), 89-118.
- Davis, K., & Blomstrom, R. L. (1975). *Business and society: Environment and responsibility*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Demetriou, M., Papasolomou, I., & Vrontis, D. (2009). Cause-related marketing: Building the corporate image while supporting worthwhile causes. *Journal of Brand Management*, *17*(4), 266-278.
- Deshpande, S., & Hitchon, J. C. (2002). Cause-related marketing ads in the light of negative news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(4), 905-926.
- Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(3), 307-319.
- Drumwright, M. E. (1996). Company advertising with a social dimension: The role of noneconomic criteria. *Journal of Marketing*, *60*(4), 71-87.
- Duff, A. (2003). Making the cause fit commercial aims. *Director*, 56(8), 42.
- Duncan, T. & Moriarty, S. (1997). Driving brand value: Using integrated marketing to manage profitable stakeholder relationships. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dupree, J. (2000). Review of brand spirit: How cause related marketing builds brands. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *17*(5), 461-464.

Dyer, R. (1986). Heavenly bodies: Film stars and society. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

- Edelman Berland. (2012). *8095 refreshed* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved April 12, 2014 from http://www.slideshare.net/fullscreen/EdelmanInsights/8095-global-external-final/48.
- Edwards, S. M., & La Ferle, C. (2009). Does gender impact the perception of negative information related to celebrity endorsers? *Journal of Promotion Management*, *15*(1-2), 22-35.
- Einwiller, S. A., Fedorikhin, A., Johnson A. R., & Kamins M. A. (2006). Enough is enough! When identification no longer prevents negative corporate associations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *34*(2),185–195.
- Ellen, P. S., Mohr, L. A., & Webb, D. J. (1995, October). Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility: do attributions make a difference? Paper presented at the Association of Consumer Research Annual Conference, Minneapolis, MN.
- Erdogan, B. Z. (1999). Celebrity endorsement: A literature review. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *15*(3), 291–314.
- Erdogan, B. Z., Baker, N. J., & Tagg, S. (2001). Selecting celebrity endorsers: The practitioner's perspective. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *41*(3), 39–59.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191.

- Ferguson, M. A. (1984, August). Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, Gainesville, FL.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7(2), 117-140.
- Fishbein M., & Ajzen I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.
- Foiret, C. (2008, October 9). Sean Connery's new Louis Vuitton ad. *Trendland*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://trendland.com/sean-connery-new-louis-vuitton-ad/.
- Folse, J. A. G., Niedrich, R.W., & Grau, S. L. (2010). Cause-relating marketing: The effects of purchase quantity and firm donation amount on consumer inferences and participation intentions. *Journal of Retailing*, 4(86), 295-309.
- Fong, C. P., & Wyer, R. S. (2012). Consumers' reactions to a celebrity endorser scandal. *Psychology & Marketing*, 29(11), 885-896.
- Forbes (2013). *World's most valuable brands*. Retrieved April 27, 2013 from http://www. forbes.com/powerful-brands/list/.
- Friedman, H. H., & Friedman, L. (1979). Endorser effectiveness by product type. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 19(5), 63-71.
- Funk, C. L. (1996). The impact of scandal on candidate evaluations: An experimental test of the role of candidate traits. *Political Behavior*, 18(1), 1-24.
- Gabbott, M., & Hogg, G. (1999). Consumer involvement in services: A replication and extension. *Journal of Business Research*, *46*(2), 159-166.

- Grau, S. L., & Folse, J. A. G. (2007). Cause-related marketing (CRM): The influence of donation proximity and message-framing cues on the less-involved consumer. *Journal of Advertising*, 36(4), 19–33.
- Goldman, K. (1994, January 7). Dead celebrities are resurrected as pitchmen. *Wall Street Journal*, pp. BI, B2.
- Goldwert, L. (2012, August 14). Nivea drops Rihanna over her raunchy image; Skin care company axes pop star over party-girl image. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved November 23, 2013 from http://www.nydailynews.com/life-style/fashion/nivea-drops-rihanna-raunchy-image-skin-care-company-axes-pop-star-party-girl-image-article-1.1136001#ixzz2lXGSBTCQ.

Graham, J. (1989, December 11). Sponsors line up for rocking role. Advertising Age, 50.

- Greenberg, K. (2013, September 30). Millennials, everyone else love different brands. *MediaPost*. Retrieved October 1, 2013 from http://www.mediapost.com/publications /article/210230/millennials-everyone-else-love-different-brands.html.
- Grunig, J. E. (1993). Image and substance: From symbolic to behavioral relationships. *Public relations review*, *19*(2), 121-139.
- Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). Effective public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Ehling, W. P. (1992). What is an effective organization? In J. E.
  Grunig, D. M. Dozier, W. P. Ehling, L. A. Grunig, F. C. Repper, & J. White (Eds.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 65–90). Hillsdale,
  NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Grunig, J. E., & Huang, Y. H. (2000). From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators: Antecedents of relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 23-54). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gupta, S., & Pirsch, J. (2006). The company-cause-customer fit decision in cause-related marketing. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *23*(6), 314–326.
- Gwinner, K. (1997). A model of image creation and image transfer in event sponsorship. *International Marketing Review*, *14*(3), 145-158.
- Gwinner, K. P., & Eaton, J. (1999). Building brand image through event sponsorship: The role of image transfer. *Journal of Advertising*, 28(4), 47-57.
- Haigh, M., Brubaker P., & Whiteside E. (2011, May). Examining how organizations' Facebook pages impact perceptions of CSR and organization-public relationships. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, Boston, MA.
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hajjat, M. M. (2003). Effect of cause-related marketing on attitudes and purchase intentions: the moderating role of cause involvement and donation size. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 93-109.
- Hall, M. R. (2006). Corporate philanthropy and corporate community relations: Measuring relationship-building results. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *18*(1), 1-21.
- Halonen-Knight, E., & Hurmerinta, L. (2010). Who endorses whom? Meanings transfer in celebrity endorsement. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 19(6), 452-460.

- Halpert, J. (2013, August 8). 13 brands Millennials like best. *MSN Money*. Retrieved October 1, 2013 from http://money.msn.com/investing/13-brands-millennials-like-best.
- Hastie R. (1984). Causes and effects of causal attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(1), 44-56.
- Hawkins, D. I., Best, R. J., & Coney, K. A. (1983). Consumer behavior: Implications for marketing strategy (Rev. ed.). Piano, TX: Business Publications.
- Hayes, A. F., Preacher, K. J., & Myers, T. A. (2011). Mediation and the estimation of indirect effects in political communication research. In E. P. Bucy & R. L. Holbert (Eds.), *Sourcebook for political communication research: Methods, measures, and analytical techniques* (pp. 434-465). New York: Routledge.
- Hinson, J. A., & Swanson, J. L. (1993). Willingness to seek help as a function of self-disclosure and problem severity. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *71*(4), 465-470.
- Hoek, J., & Gendall, P. (2008). An analysis of consumers' responses to cause related marketing. Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 20(2), 283-297.
- Hogg, M., & Vaughan, G. (2005). Social Psychology (4th ed.). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Hon, C. L., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*.Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven,CT: Yale University Press.
- Huang, Y. (1997, May). Toward the contemporary Chinese philosophy of public relations: A perspective from the theory of global public relations. Paper presented to the Division of Public Relations, the 47th annual conference of the International Communication Association, Quebec, Canada.

- Huang, Y. (1998, August). *Public relations strategies and organization–public relationships*.Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Baltimore, MD.
- Huang, Y. (2001). OPRA: A cross-cultural, multiple-item scale for measuring organization– public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *13*(1), 61–90.
- Huang, Y. -H. C., & Zhang, Y. (2012). Revisiting organization–public relations research over the past decade: Theoretical concepts, measures, methodologies and challenges. *Public Relations Review*, 39(1), 85–87.
- Hung, C. J. F. (2005). Exploring types of organization–public relationships and their implications for relationship management in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(4), 393-426.
- Hung, C. J. F. (2006). Toward the theory of relationship management in public relations: How to cultivate quality relationship? In E. L. Toth (Ed.) *The future of excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 443-476). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hung-Baesecke, C. J. F., & Chen, Y. R. (2013). The effect of organization-public relationship types and quality on crisis attributes. In K. Sriramesh, A. Zerfass, & J. Kim (eds.), *Public relations and communication management*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Hyllegard, K. H., Ogle, J. P., Yan, R. N., & Attmann, J. (2010). Exploring Gen Y responses to an apparel brand's use of cause-related marketing: Does message matter when it comes to support for the breast cancer cause? *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 28(1), 19-34.

- IEG Sponsorship Report. (2013, January 7). 2013 sponsorship outlook: Spending increase is double-edged sword. Retrieved February 7, 2013 from http://www.sponsorship.com /IEGSR/2013/01/07 /2013-Sponsorship-Outlook--Spending-Increase-Is-Dou.aspx.
- Ito, T. A., Larsen, J. T., Smith, N. K., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1998). Negative information weighs more heavily on the brain: the negativity bias in evaluative categorizations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(4), 887.
- Johar, J. S. & Sirgy, M. J. (1991). Value-expressive versus utilitarian advertising appeals: When and why to use which appeal. *Journal of Advertising*, *20*(3), 23-33.
- Johnson, A. R. (2005). When a celebrity is tied to immoral behavior: Consumer reactions to Michael Jackson and Kobe Bryant. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *32*, 100–101.
- Justin, N. (2013, January 12). James Denton: The not-so-desperate househusband. *Star Tribune*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.startribune.com/entertainment/tv/186487151. html.
- Kahle, L. R., Homer, P. M. (1985). Physical attractiveness of the celebrity endorser: A social adaptation perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *11*(4), 954-961.
- Kamen, J. M., Azhari, A. C., & Kragh, J. R. (1975). What a spokesman does for a sponsor. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 15(2), 17-24.
- Kamins, M. A. (1990). An investigation into the "match-up" hypothesis in celebrity advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *19*(1), 4–13.
- Kamins, M. A., & Gupta, K. (1994). Congruence between spokesperson and product type: A matchup hypothesis perspective. *Psychology and Marketing*, *11*(6), 569-586.

- Karimi, F. (2013, July 23). Lance Armstrong says his doping still 'polarizing topic' for many. CNN. Retrieved November 25, 2013 from http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/23/us/lancearmstrong-interview/index.html.
- Kensinger, E. A., & Corkin, S. (2003). Effect of negative emotional content on working memory and long-term memory. *Emotion*, *3*(4), 378–93.
- Kent, R. J., & Allen, C. T. (1994). Competitive interference effects in consumer memory for advertising: the role of brand familiarity. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 97-105.
- Ki, E. J., & Shin, J.-H. (2006). Status of organization–public relationship research from an analysis of published articles, 1985–2004. *Public Relations Review*, 32(2), 194-195.
- Kim, Y. (2001). Searching for the organization-public relationship: A valid and reliable instrument. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(4), 799-815.
- Kim, J. (2003, July). Exploring the effects of organization–public relationships on attitude toward the organization, brand, and purchase intention. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City.
- Kim, J.-E., & Johnson, K. K. P. (2013). The impact of moral emotions on cause-related marketing campaigns: A cross-cultural examination. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112(1), 79-90.
- Kim, Y., & Lee, E. (2005, May). The impact of the organization-public relationship on perceptions toward the crisis and image restoration strategies. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, New York, NY.

- Klara, R. (2014, April 4). What if Millennials are ... sort of like everyone else? Adweek. Retrieved May 21, 2014 from http://www.adweek.com/news/advertising-branding/whatif-millennials-are-sort-everyone-else-156771.
- Klaus, N., & Bailey, A. A. (2008). Celebrity endorsements: An examination of gender and consumers' attitudes. *American Journal of Business*, *23*(2), 53-62.
- Knapp, M. (1984). *Interpersonal communication and interpersonal relationships*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Knittel, C. R. & Stango, V. (2014). Celebrity endorsements, firm value and reputation risk: Evidence from the Tiger Woods scandal. *Management Science*, *60*(1), 21-37.
- Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005). Corporate social responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and your cause. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Krantz, J. H., & Dalal, R. (2000). Validity of Web-based psychological research. In M. H.Birnbaum (Ed.), *Psychological experiments on the Internet* (pp. 35-60). San Diego, CA US: Academic Press.
- Laaksonen, P. (1994). Consumer involvement: Concepts and research. London: Routledge.
- Lafferty, B. A. (2007). The relevance of fit in a cause–brand alliance when consumers evaluate corporate credibility. *Journal of Business Research*, *60*(5), 447-453.
- Lafferty, B. A. (2002). The dual credibility model: The influence of corporate and endorser credibility on attitudes and purchase intentions. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *10*(3), 1-12.
- Lafferty, B. A., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2005). Cause–brand alliances: Does the cause help the brand or does the brand help the cause? *Journal of Business Research*, *58*(4), 423-429.

- Langmeyer, L., & Shank, M. D. (1993). Celebrity endorsers and public service agencies: A balancing act. *Proceedings of the 1993 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising*, (pp. 197-207). Columbia, MO: American Academy of Advertising.
- Langmeyer, L., & Walker, M. (1991). A first step to identify the meaning in celebrity endorsers. Advances in consumer research, 18(1), 364-371.
- Ledingham, J. A. (2000, May). *Relationship management: Where do we go from here?* Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.
- Ledingham, J. A. (2003). Explicating relationship management as a general theory of public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *15*(2), 181-198.
- Ledingham, J. A. (2006). Relationship management: A general theory of public relations. In C.
  Botan & V. Hazleton (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 465–483). Mahwah, NJ:
  Lawrence Erlbaum, Inc.
- Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management in public relations:
  Dimensions of an organization–public relationship. *Public Relations Review*, 24(1), 55–65.
- Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (2001). Community relations. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 527–534). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lei, P. W., & Wu, Q. (2007). Introduction to structural equation modeling: Issues and practical considerations. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *26*(3), 33-43.
- Levinson, M., Novy-Williams, E., & Duff, A. (2012, October 24). Armstrong faces \$200 million salary loss with reputation hit. *Bloomberg Businessweek*. Retrieved April 29, 2013 from http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-24/armstrong-faces-200-million-salaryloss-with-reputation-ruined.

Lichtenstein, D. R., Drumwright, M. E., & Braig, B. M. (2004). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate-supported nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 16–32.

Littlejohn, S. W. (1995). Theories of human communication (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Loechner, J. (2010, July 19). Returning college students spending optimistically. *MediaPost*. Retrieved November 9, 2013 from http://www.mediapost.com/publications/article/ 132165/.
- Louie T.A., Kulik R. L., & Jacobsen R. (2001). When bad things happen to the endorsers of good products. *Marketing Letters*, *12* (1), 13–23.
- Lucarelli-Dimmick, S., Bell, T. E., Burgiss, S. G, & Ragsdale, C. (2000). Relationship management: A new professional model. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to public relations* (pp. 117–136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lull, J. & Hinerman, S. (1997). The search for scandal. In J. Lull, & S. Hinerman, (eds.), *Media* scandals: Morality and desire in the popular culture marketplace (pp. 1-33). New York:
   Columbia Univ. Press.
- Lynch, J., & Schuler, D. (1994). The matchup effect of spokesperson and product congruency: A schema theory interpretation. *Psychology & Marketing*, *11*(5), 417-445.
- May, S., Cheney, G., & Roper, J. (2007). *The debate over corporate social responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, S. B., & Lutz, R. J. (1989). An empirical examination of the structural antecedents of attitude toward the ad in an advertising pretesting context. *Journal of Marketing*, *53*(2), 48-65.

- Mandler, G. (1982). The structure of value: accounting for taste. In H. Margaret, S. Clarke, & S.T. Fiske (Eds.), *Affect and cognition: The 17th annual Carnegie symposium on cognition* (pp. 3–36). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Marra, F. J. (1992). *Crisis public relations: A theoretical model*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- McCracken, G. (1989). Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *16*(3), 310-321.

McCracken, G. (1988). Culture and consumption. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- McDonough, J. (1995). Bringing brands to life. *Advertising Age, Special Collectors Edition*, *Spring*, 34-35.
- McGuire, W. J. (1985). Attitudes and attitude change. In L. Gardner, & E. Aronson, (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, (Vol. 2, pp. 233-346). New York: Random House.
- Mittelstaedt, J. D., Riesz, P. C., & Burns, W. J. (2000). Why are endorsements effective? Sorting among theories of product and endorser effects. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 22(1), 55-66.
- Miller, C. (1993, March 29). Some celebs just now reaching their potential-And they're dead. *Marketing News*, 2, 22.
- Miller, F. M., & Allen, C. T. (2012). How does celebrity meaning transfer? Investigating the process of meaning transfer with celebrity affiliates and mature brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(3), 443-452.
- Money, R. B., Shimp, T. A., & Sakano, T. (2006). Celebrity endorsements in Japan and the US Is negative information all that harmful? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 26(1), 113-123.

- Monga, A. B., & John, D. R. (2008). When does negative brand publicity hurt? The moderating influence of analytic versus holistic thinking. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 18(4), 320–332.
- Mowen, J. C., & Brown, S. W. (1981). On explaining and predicting the effectiveness of celebrity endorsers. *Advances in consumer research*, 8(1), 437-441.
- Murray, D., & Price, B. (2012, June). When sports stars go off the rails: How gender and involvement influence the negative publicity of sport endorsers. Paper presented at the International Academy of Business & Economics conference, Venice, Italy.
- Muthén, B., & Kaplan, D. (1992). A comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables: A note on the size of the model. British Journal of *Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 45(1), 19-30.
- Ni, L., & Wang, Q. (2008, May). Anxiety and uncertainty management in an intercultural setting. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, Quebec.
- Odell, A. (2010, July 1). Angelina Jolie no longer the face of St. John since she 'overshadowed the brand'. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved November 23, 2013 from http://nymag.com /thecut/2010/01/angelina\_jolie\_no\_longer\_the\_f.html.
- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise. *Journal of Advertising*, *19*(3), 39-52.
- Ohanian, R. (1991). The impact of celebrity spokespersons' perceived image on consumers' intention to purchase. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *31*(1), 46-54.

- O'Keefe, D. J. (2008). Elaboration likelihood model. In W. Donsbach, (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of communication*, (Vol. 4, pp. 1475-1480). Oxford, UK, and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Olsen, G. D., Pracejus, J. W., & Brown, N. R. (2003). When profit equals price: Consumer confusion about donation amounts in cause-related marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 22(2), 170-180.
- O'Reilly, T. (2013, May 25). Nobody's dead anymore: Marketing deceased celebrities. *CBCradio*. Retrieved November 18, 2013 from http://www.cbc.ca/undertheinfluence/ season-2/2013/05/25/nobodys-dead-anymore-marketing-deceased-celebrities-1/.
- Park, H., & Reber, B. H. (2011). The organization-public relationship and crisis communication:
  The effect of the organization-public relationship on publics' perceptions of crisis and attitudes toward the organization. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 5(4), 240-260.
- Peter, J. P., & Olson, J. C. (2010). *Consumer behavior and marketing strategy* (9th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Peloza, J., & Hassay, D. N. (2007). A typology of charity support behaviors: Toward a holistic view of helping. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 17(1-2), 135-151.
- Petchesky, B. (2012, October 17). A full list of the brave, brave companies that dropped Lance Armstrong only after Nike did. *Deadspin.com*. Retrieved April 28, 2013 from http://deadspin.com/5952679/a-full-list-of-the-brave-brave-companies-that-droppedlance-armstrong-as-an-endorser-only-after-nike-did.

- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issues involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1915–1926.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Petty, R., & Cacioppo, J. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: Application to advertising. In L. Percy & A. Woodside (Eds.), *Advertising and Consumer Psychology* (pp. 3-23). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L., Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 19, pp. 123-205). New York: Academic Press.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(5), 847-855.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T., & Schumann, D. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10(2), 135-147.
- Phu, C. N. (2010). Save Africa: The commodification of (PRODUCT) RED campaign. *Kaleidoscope: A Graduate Journal of Qualitative Communication Research*, 9(1), 107-125.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 36(4), 717-731.

- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879-891.
- Putrevu, S. (2001). Exploring the origins and information processing differences between men and women: Implications for advertisers. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 10(1), 1-14.
- Radius Global Market Research. (2013, December 3). *Millennial and Boomer shoppers may be more alike than you think*. [Press Release]. Retrieved May 21, 2014 from http://www.radius-global.com/ about/news-releases/millennial-and-boomer-shoppers-may-be-more-alike-than-you-think.
- Reilly, P. J. (2012, January 27). Hooking up with Gen Y Challenge for business. *Forbes*. Retrieved May 19, 2014 from http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterjreilly/2012/01/27/ hooking-up-with-gen-y-challenge-for-business/.
- Rhee, Y. (2004). The employee-public-organization chain in relationship management: A case study of a government organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Richey, L., & Ponte, S. (2008). Better (Red)<sup>™</sup> than Dead? Celebrities, consumption and international aid. *Third World Quarterly*, 29(4), 711-729.
- Richins, M. L. (1994). Valuing things: The public and private meanings of possessions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *21*(3), 593–608.
- Rifon, N. J., Choi, S. M., Trimble, C. S., & Li, H. (2004). Congruence effects in sponsorship:
  The mediating role of sponsor credibility and consumer attributions of sponsor motive. *Journal of Advertising*, 33(1), 29–42.
- Ross, J. K., Patterson, L. T., & Stutts, M. A. (1992). Consumer perceptions of organizations that use cause-related marketing. *Journal of Academy Marketing Science*, 20(1), 93-97.
- Rossiter. J. R. & Percy, L. (1987). Advertising and promotion management. London: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Rovell, D. (2013a, February 16). How Nike landed Michael Jordan. ESPN. Retrieved April 25, 2013 from http://espn.go.com/blog/playbook/dollars/post/\_/id/2918/how-nike-landedmichael-jordan.
- Rovell, D. (2013b, May 28). Nike to end Livestrong deal. *ESPN*. Retrieved November 25, 2013 from http://espn.go.com/sports/endurance/story/\_/id/9318209/nike-ending-linelivestrong-products.
- Sallot, L. M., Lyon, L. J., Acosta-Alzuru, C., & Jones, K. O. (2003). From aardvark to zebra: A new millennium analysis of theory development in public relations academic journals. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 15(1), 27-90.
- Salzmann, O. (2006). Corporate sustainability management in the energy sector: An empirical contingency approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany.
- Scheiner, S. M. (2001). MANOVA: Multiple response variables and multispecies interactions. In
  S. M. Sebeiner, & J. Gurevitch, (Eds.), *Design and analysis of ecological experiments*(Pp. 99-115). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schuhwerk, M. E., & Lefkoff-Hagius, R. (1995). Green or non-green? Does type of appeal matter when advertising a green product? *Journal of Advertising*, *24*(2), 45-55.

- Schultz, E. J. (2010, December 2). Study: Standing by Tiger helped Nike's bottom line. Advertising Age. Retrieved April 27, 2013 from http://adage.com/article/news/studystanding-tiger-woods-helped-nike-s-bottom-line/147431/.
- Schoen, M. P. (2005). Museum-public relationships: Exploring the relationship management theory of public relations (*master's thesis*). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-10252005-094017/unrestricted/Schoen\_thesis.pdf.
- Selius, C. (2010). The effect of color congruency and involvement on non-profit organizational messaging. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida). Retrieved August 27, 2013 from http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1763.
- Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 225-243.
- Setiawan, B. L. (2011, June 1). Orbis + Daniel Craig watch by Omega has arrived in stores. *Racked*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://racked.com/archives/2011/06/01/orbisdaniel-craig-watch-by-omega-has-arrived-in-stores.php.
- Sheikh, S., & Beise-Zee, R. (2011). Corporate social responsibility or cause-related marketing? The role of cause specificity of CSR. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *28*(1), 27-39.
- Shelton, S. (2012, October 2). Martina McBride joins the fight against breast cancer. *Fitness Magazine*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.fitnessmagazine.com/blogs /fitstop/2012/10/02/ celebrity/martina-mcbride-joins-the-fight-against-breast-cancer/.

Sherman, S. P. (1985, August 19). When you wish upon a star. Fortune, 66-71.

Shimp, T. A. (2008). Integrated marketing communications in advertising and promotion.Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

- Smith, S. M., & Petty, R. E. (1996). Message framing and persuasion: A message processing analysis. *Personality and Psychology Bulletin*, 22(3), 257–68.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology* (pp. 290-312). Washington DC: American Sociological Association.
- Strahilevitz, M., & Myers, J. G. (1998). Donations to charity as purchase incentives: How well they work may depend on what you are trying to sell. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4), 434–446.
- Sweeney, J. C., Soutar, G. N., & Johnson, L. W. (1999). The role of perceived risk in the qualityvalue relationship: A study in a retail environment. *Journal of Retailing*, 75(1), 77-105.
- Sweetser, K. D. (2010). A losing strategy: The impact of nondisclosure in social media on relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22(3), 288-312.
- The Nonprofit Times. (2013, October 9). *Study: Corporations plan to hike giving in 2014*. Retrieved October 22, 2013 from http://www.thenonprofittimes.com/news-articles/study-corporations-plan-to-hike-giving-in-2014/.
- Till, B. D., & Shimp, T. A. (1998). Endorsers in advertising: The case of negative celebrity information. *Journal of Advertising*, *27*(1), 67–82.
- Thwaites, D., Lowe, B., Monkhouse, L. L., & Barnes, B. R. (2012). The impact of negative publicity on celebrity ad endorsements. *Psychology & Marketing*, 29(9), 663-673.
- Trimble, C. S., & Rifon, N. J. (2006). Consumer perceptions of compatibility in cause-related marketing messages. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 29-47.

- Tripp, C., Jensen, T. D., & Carlson, L. (1994). The effect of multiple product endorsements by celebrities on consumer attitudes and intentions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 535-547.
- Tucker, M. A. (2009). A case study: Oxfam international's make trade fair campaign and relationship management theory (master's thesis). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0024589/tucker\_m.pdf.
- Ulm, C. (2012, August 24). Nike to continue to sponsor Lance Armstrong. SB Nation. Retrieved November 25, 2013 from http://www.sbnation.com/2012/8/24/3266159/lance-armstrongnike-sponsor-doping-usada-tour-de-france/in/2847907.
- Um, N. H. (2013). Celebrity scandal fallout: How attribution style can protect the sponsor. *Psychology & Marketing*, *30*(6), 529-541.
- Varadarajan, P. R. & Menon, A. (1988). Cause-related marketing: A coalignment of marketing strategy and corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Marketing*, *52*(3), 58-74.
- Vercic, D., & Grunig, J. E. (1995, July). The origins of public relations theory in economics and strategic management. Paper presented to the Second International Public Relations Research Symposium, Bled, Slovenia.
- Vertuno, J. (2012, October 17). Lance Armstrong stepping down As Livestrong chairman. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved April 28, 2013 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ 2012/10/17/lance-armstrong-livestrong\_n\_1973097.html
- Vilela, A. M., & Nelson, M. R. (2013). Testing the selectivity hypothesis in cause-related marketing among Generation Y: [When] does gender matter for short- and long-term persuasion? *Journal of Marketing Communication*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/13527266.2013.841272.

- Vorvoreanu, M. (2008). Website experience analysis: A new research protocol for studying relationship building on corporate websites. *Journal of Website Promotion*, *3*(3/4), 222-249.
- Voss, K. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Grohmann, B. (2003). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of consumer attitude. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *40*(1), 310-320.
- Votolato, N. L., & Unnava, H. R. (2006). Spillover of negative information on brand alliances. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 16(2), 196-202.
- Watson, B. (2010, April 27). KFC's pink bucket breast cancer campaign: Critics have it wrong. *Daily Finance*. Retrieved November 23, 2013 from http://www.dailyfinance.com/ 2010/04/27/kfcs-pink-buckets-have-some-breast-cancer-advocates-seeing-red/.
- Webb, D. J., & Mohr, L. A. (1998). A typology of consumer responses to cause-related marketing: From skeptics to socially concerned. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 17(2), 226-238.
- Wei, W. (2010, July 21). Tiger Woods lost \$22 million in endorsements in 2010. Business Insider. Retrieved April 27, 2013 from http://www.businessinsider.com/tiger-woods-lost-22-million-in-2010-endorsements-2010-7.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychology Review*, 92(4), 548-573.
- Weiner, B. (1986). An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. New York: Springer Verlag.
- White, D. W., Goddard, L., & Wilbur, N. (2009). The effects of negative information transference in the celebrity endorsement relationship. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 37(4), 322-335.

- Wojciszke, B., Brycz, H., & Borkenau, P. (1993). Effects of information content and evaluative extremity on positivity and negativity biases. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(3), 327-335.
- Woollard, D. (2008, August 30). Julia Roberts's \$125 T-shirt for (Product) Red. Luxist. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.luxist.com/2008/08/30/julia-roberts-125-tshirt-for-product-red/.
- Woolldard, D. (2010, August 30). Bono and Ali Hewson are latest Vuitton ad stars. *Luxist*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.luxist.com/2010/08/30/bono-and-ali-hewsonare-latest-vuitton-ad-stars/.
- Wymer, W. W., & Samu, S. (2003). Dimensions of business and nonprofit collaborative relationships. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *11*(1), 3.
- Yang, S.-U. (2007). An integrated model for organization-public relational outcomes, organizational reputation, and their antecedents. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 19(2), 91-121.
- Youn, S., & Kim, H. (2008). Antecedents of consumer attitudes toward cause-related marketing. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 48(1), 123–137.
- Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *12*(3), 341-352.
- Ziller, T. (2012, October 22). Lance Armstrong stripped of 7 Tour de France titles, banned from cycling. SB Nation. Retrieved November 25, 2013 from http://www.sbnation.com/2012/ 10/22/3537674/lance-armstrong-stripped-of-7-tour-de-france-titles-bannedfrom/in/2847907.

#### APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Pretest 1 announcement

Dear Students,

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ph.D. candidate Osenkor Gogo, under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber, evaluating individual perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, negative publicity, as well as media consumption.

Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate in or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you do choose to partake in this study, you will be asked to answer an online questionnaire, which will take 20 - 25 minutes to complete. Your participation will earn you extra class credit at the discretion of your instructor. If extra credit is available, there will also be an option for receiving credit without participating in the research.

To participate in this study, copy and paste the following link: https://grady.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\_37X8Zborgqy6x1P

The deadline for participation is October 31, 2013.

Your involvement in this study is appreciated.

If you have any questions, contact me at osenkor@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Osenkor Gogo

#### APPENDIX B: Pretest 1 instrument

#### Dear Students:

I am Osenkor Gogo, a doctoral candidate under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber from the Department of Advertising and Public Relations at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study titled "Understanding the Effect of Negative Celebrity Endorser Publicity on Cause-Related Marketing: The Role of Organization-Public Relationships." The purpose of this study is to evaluate individual perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, negative publicity, as well as media consumption.

Your participation will involve answering questions about your perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, negative publicity, as well as your media consumption. You will be provided with lists of these entities for your evaluation, and this should only take about 20 to 25 minutes.

Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to withdraw from the study, the information that can be identified as yours will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed, unless you make a written request to remove, return, or destroy the information.

The information you provide will only be accessed by the researcher. No individuallyidentifiable information about you, or provided by you during the research, will be shared with others without your written permission, unless required by law. All the individually-identifiable information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your name will be collected so that you can receive extra credit (if applicable to your course) and will not be linked to your responses in the record of responses from the survey. Your name will be separated from your responses as soon as data collection is complete and will only be released to faculty in order to be awarded extra credit. There is however a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only.

The findings from this project may provide an understanding of your perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, as well as negative publicity. You will also be introduced to social science research. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. You will receive extra class credit for answering questions, which will be at the discretion of your instructor. If extra credit is available, there will also be an option for receiving credit without participating in the research. Your decision about participation and your responses will have no bearing on your grades or class standing.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (412) 352-2893 or send an email to osenkor@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

Thank you for your consideration! Please save this page for your records.

□ I understand that by checking this box, I give my consent to participate in this study

	Totally Unfamiliar (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Familiar (7)
Adam Levine	Ο	О	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
Anne Hathaway	O	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beyoncé	O	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Eli Manning	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο
Jennifer Lawrence	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο
Rihanna	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Serena Williams	0	О	0	0	O	0	0

On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the following celebrities?

On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the following celebrities?

	Did not recognize at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Recognized very well (7)
Adam Levine	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Anne Hathaway	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beyoncé	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Eli Manning	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Jennifer Lawrence	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Rihanna	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Serena Williams	0	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο

On a scale of 1 to 7, how knowledgeable are you about the following celebrities?:

	Not knowledgeable at all(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very knowledgeable (7)
Adam Levine	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Anne Hathaway	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beyoncé	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Eli Manning	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Jennifer Lawrence	•	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Rihanna	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Serena Williams	0	0	0	0	Ο	0	Ο

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Adam Levine - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Adam Levine are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	О	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	O	O	O	0	0

## Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Anne Hathaway - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Anne Hathaway are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	О	О	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	О	О	О	О

## Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Beyoncé - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	O	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	O	O	O	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Eli Manning - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Eli Manning are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	О	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	О	О	О	О

## Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Jennifer Lawrence - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Jennifer Lawrence are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	0	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	О	О	О	О

# Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Rihanna - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Rihanna are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	O	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	O	O	O	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Serena Williams - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Serena Williams are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	O	О	О	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	O	О	О	О	О	О

#### Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Adam Levine - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Adam Levine?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Anne Hathaway - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Anne Hathaway?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Beyoncé - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Beyoncé?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	O	0	O	O

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Eli Manning - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Eli Manning?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Jennifer Lawrence - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Jennifer Lawrence?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Rihanna - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Rihanna?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Serena Williams - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how physically attractive do you find Serena Williams?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unattractive: Extremely Attractive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the following products?

	Totally Unfamiliar (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Familiar (7)
Abercrombie & Fitch T-shirts	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Beats by Dre headphones	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Gap jeans	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
iPhone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nike shoes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pepsi soda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Starbucks coffee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Did not recognize at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Recognized very well (7)
Abercrombie & Fitch T-shirts	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Beats by Dre headphones	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Doritos chips	Ο	0	0	0	О	О	Ο
Gap jeans	Ο	0	0	0	О	О	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
iPhone	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Nike shoes	0	0	0	0	О	О	Ο
Pepsi soda	Ο	0	0	0	О	О	Ο
Starbucks coffee	0	0	0	0	Ο	О	0

On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the following products?

On a scale of 1 to 7, how knowledgeable are you about the following products?

	Not knowledgeable at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very knowledgeable (7)
Abercrombie & Fitch T-shirts	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beats by Dre headphones	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Gap jeans	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
iPhone	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Nike shoes	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Pepsi soda	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Abercrombie & Fitch Tshirts - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	О	0	О	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	O	О	О	О	О	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dull: Exciting	О	0	О	O	О	О	О
Not fun: Fun	О	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about Abercrombie & Fitch T-shirts are ...

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Beats by Dre headphones -Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

-2 0 +1+2Unfavorable: Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Favorable Negative: Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Positive Strongly dislike: Ο О О О Ο Ο О Strongly like Dull: Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Exciting Not fun: Fun Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Ο Not Ο Ο Ο enjoyable: О О Ο Ο Enjoyable

My overall feelings about Beats by Dre headphones are ...

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Cheerios cereal - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Cheerios cereal are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	О	О
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	О	О	О	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	O	O	О	0	O	O
Dull: Exciting	O	0	О	O	O	O	O
Not fun: Fun	О	0	О	О	О	Ο	Ο
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	О	0	О	О	О	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Doritos chips - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Doritos chips are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	0	0	Ο	O	0	0
Negative: Positive	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	О	O	0	O	o	O
Dull: Exciting	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Not fun: Fun	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	O	Ο
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	О	О	O	О	O	o	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Gap jeans - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Gap jeans are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	О	О	О	0
Negative: Positive	О	О	О	О	О	Ο	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	О	О	О	О	О	О
Dull: Exciting	О	О	О	О	О	Ο	О
Not fun: Fun	О	О	О	О	О	0	О
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Häagen-Dazs ice cream - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Häagen-Dazs ice cream are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	О	О	О	0	0
Negative: Positive	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	O	0	О	O	O	O	0
Dull: Exciting	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο

Not fun: Fun	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	O	O	0	О	О	Ο	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... iPhone - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about the iPhone are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	0	О	О	О	0
Negative: Positive	О	О	Ο	О	О	О	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	О	0	О	О	О	0
Dull: Exciting	О	О	Ο	О	О	О	О
Not fun: Fun	О	О	Ο	О	О	О	О
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Nike shoes - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Nike shoes are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	О	О	О	0	О
Negative: Positive	Ο	О	Ο	О	Ο	Ο	Ο
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	О	О	O	О
Dull: Exciting	Ο	Ο	Ο	О	Ο	0	Ο
Not fun: Fun	0	Ο	Ο	О	Ο	0	Ο
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Pepsi soda - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Pepsi soda are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	O	0	0	0	0	О
Negative: Positive	Ο	Ο	Ο	О	О	О	О

Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	O
Dull: Exciting	0	О	0	О	0	0	0
Not fun: Fun	О	О	Ο	О	О	Ο	Ο
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	О	О	0	0	О	0	O

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Starbucks coffee - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Starbucks coffee are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	O	O	О
Negative: Positive	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	O	O	О
Dull: Exciting	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Not fun: Fun	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	О
Not enjoyable: Enjoyable	0	0	0	0	0	0	O

On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the following organizations?

	Totally Unfamiliar (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Familiar (7)
Abercrombie & Fitch	Ο	0	Ο	0	Ο	0	О
Apple, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Gap, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
General Mills, Inc.	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	О
Nike, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
PepsiCo	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Starbucks Coffee Company	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О

	Did not recognize at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Recognized very well (7)
Abercrombie & Fitch	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Apple, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Gap, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
General Mills, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
PepsiCo	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks Coffee Company	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the following organizations?:

On a scale of 1 to 7, how knowledgeable are you about the following organizations?:

	Not knowledgeable at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very knowledgeable (7)
Abercrombie & Fitch	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
Apple, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Gap, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
General Mills, Inc.	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike, Inc.	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
PepsiCo	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks Coffee Company	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Abercrombie & Fitch - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Abercrombie & Fitch are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	О	0	О	О	О	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	О	О	0	Ο

## Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Apple, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Apple, Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	О	Ο	Ο	О	О	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	О	Ο	О	О	О	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	О	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	О	О	О	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Gap, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Gap, Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	О	О	О	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... General Mills, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about General Mills, Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Nike, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Nike, Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	0	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	0	0	О	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... PepsiCo - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about PepsiCo are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	O	O	O	O	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Starbucks Coffee Company - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

My overall feelings about Starbucks Coffee Company are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	O	O	O	O	O	0	O

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Abercrombie & Fitch - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Abercrombie & Fitch to do what it says it will do.	0	0	0	0	0
Abercrombie & Fitch sees my interests and its interests as the same.	O	O	O	O	O
I think that Abercrombie & Fitch strives to improve the communities	0	0	0	0	0

of its			
customers.			

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Apple, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Apple, Inc. to do what it says it will do.	0	O	O	0	O
Apple, Inc. sees my interests and its interests as the same.	O	O	O	O	O
I think that Apple, Inc. strives to improve the communities of its customers.	O	O	0	O	Q

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC to do what it says it will do.	0	0	0	0	0
Beats (by Dre) Electronics	0	0	0	0	0

LLC sees my interests and its interests as the same.					
I think that Beats (by Dre) Electronics LLC strives to improve the communities of its	O	0	0	0	O

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Gap, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Gap, Inc. to do what it says it will do.	0	0	0	0	0
Gap, Inc. sees my interests and its interests as the same.	0	O	O	0	0
I think that Gap, Inc. strives to improve the communities of its customers.	O	O	O	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... General Mills, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust General Mills Inc. to do what it says it will do.	О	O	О	О	О
General Mills Inc. sees my interests and its interests as the same.	O	O	О	О	О
I think that General Mills Inc. strives to improve the communities of its customers.	0	0	O	О	О

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Nike, Inc. - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Nike, Inc. to do what it says it will do.	O	O	O	O	0
Nike, Inc. sees my interests and its interests as the same.	O	O	O	O	O
I think that	<b>O</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>O</b>	Ο	Ο

Nike, Inc.			
strives to			
improve the			
communities			
of its			
customers.			

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... PepsiCo - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust PepsiCo to do what it says it will do.	0	0	O	0	O
PepsiCo sees my interests and its interests as the same.	О	0	O	О	O
I think that PepsiCo strives to improve the communities of its customers.	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the follo... Starbucks Coffee Company - Did not recognize at all (1) Is Not Selected

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust the Starbucks Coffee Company to do what it says it will do.	0	0	0	O	O

The Starbucks Coffee Company sees my interests and its interests as the same.	O	Q	O	Q	O
I think that the Starbucks Coffee Company strives to improve the communities of its customers.	Q	Q	O	O	O

	Totally Unfamiliar (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Familiar (7)
American Cancer Society	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
American Red Cross	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amnesty International	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	0
Autism Speaks	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feeding America	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	0
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
ONE Campaign	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
The Nature Conservancy	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
United Negro College Fund	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the following charities?

On a scale of 1 to 7, how well do you recognize the following charities?:

	Did not recognize at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Recognized very well (7)
American Cancer Society	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
American Red Cross	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Amnesty International	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Autism Speaks	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Feeding America	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

ONE Campaign	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Product (RED)	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
The Nature Conservancy	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
United Negro College Fund	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

On a scale of 1 to 7, how knowledgeable are you about the following charities?

	Not knowledgeable at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very knowledgeable (7)
American Cancer Society	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
American Red Cross	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)	O	o	o	o	o	o	О
Amnesty International	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Autism Speaks	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Feeding America	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ONE Campaign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Nature Conservancy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Negro College Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	<b>O</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0

American Cancer Society ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	Ο	0	0	О	О	О

Is irrelevant to me: Is	0	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	0
personally relevant							

American Red Cross ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	o	0	0	0	0	О

American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	О	О	0	0	0	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	О	0	0	О	0	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	ο	0	ο	0	o	0

Amnesty International ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	0	o	0

Autism Speaks ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	О	0	0	0	О	О

Feeding America ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	О	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	Ο	0	0	О	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	o	0	0	0	0	0

Habitat for Humanity ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	О	0	0	0	О	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	О	0	0	О	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	О

Make-A-Wish Foundation ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	О	0	0	Ο	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	Ο	0	0	0	o	0

March of Dimes ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	Ο	0	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	О	0	0	0	0	0	О

ONE Campaign ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	О	0	0	0	О	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	О	0	0	0	0	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	Ο	0	0	0	О	О

Product (RED) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	О	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	О	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	О	О	О

Susan G. Komen for the Cure ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	О	О	0	О	О	О	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	О	0	О	О	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	О	О	0	О	О	О	О

The Nature Conservancy ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	О	0	О	0	Ο	О	О
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	0	О	0	0	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	О	0	О	0	0	О	О

United Negro College Fund ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	О	0	0	0	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	О

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	О	О	О
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	О	О	О
	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities					
---	--	--					
Maroon 5 front man Adam Levine was involved in a hit- and-run accident. He hit a 24- year old man with his Porsche and drove off in a hurry with the paparazzi in tow. The man suffered a broken rib and knee injuries.	O	O					
Adam Levine was arrested on suspicion of driving while under the influence of alcohol on his way home from dinner. A small amount of marijuana was also discovered in his car. During his arrest, much like a few months ago on national television, Levine was heard making anti-patriotic comments.	O	O					
In a tell-all book, former Maroon 5 drummer Ryan Dusick revealed that Adam Levine secretly paid several prominent DJs to play his band's early records or offered them a cut if his album went platinum. Levine's band has sold more than 10 million albums since 2002.	O	O					

	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities
After fumbling several lines from her script, actress Anne Hathaway ranted that the writing was "undeserving of an Oscar-winning actress." She then refused to come out of her trailer, holding up production for the entire day.	O	O
In a media interview, Anne Hathaway revealed that she thinks there is nothing wrong with cheating in a relationship and has an open marriage.	0	O
Although it has been kept under wraps for years, Anne Hathaway's former manager has revealed that the star frequently leaves the high-end stores Saks Fifth Avenue and Neiman Marcus with jewelry and clothes she has not paid for.	O	O

	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities
At a charity event, singer Beyoncé refused to take a picture with or sign an autograph for a 6-year old girl after she mentioned she wasn't in school because it was shut down due to lice infestation. After her mother complained, she and her daughter were escorted out by security.	O	O
A backup vocalist has filed a lawsuit seeking credit and royalties on Beyoncé's new album. She accused the star and her producers of digitally combining her voice with Beyoncé's to enhance three songs, and then failing to credit her.	O	O
While trying to launch her solo career, Beyoncé colluded with her father, who is also her ex-manager, to sabotage former Destiny's Child bandmate Kelly Rowland's career in order to prevent her from becoming the breakout star of the group.	O	O

	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities
It has been discovered that NFL quarterback Eli Manning has been using performance- enhancing drugs.	0	0
Eli Manning has a lovechild with a FOX News reporter and paid \$15 million to keep her quiet. This unraveled when he accidentally "sexted" his wife's friend instead of his mistress.	O	O
Eli Manning was part of a group of football players suspected of orchestrating the videotaping of the Philadelphia Eagles' defensive coach's hand signals.	О	O

	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities
Actress Jennifer Lawrence appeared at a red carpet event with a white substance on her face. When a reporter commented on it, she giggled and said it was "just a little molly." (Molly is the street name for an illegal drug).	O	O
Jennifer Lawrence used a body double in The Hunger Games for a majority of her	Ο	Ο

action scenes and publicly took credit for it.		
--	--	--

	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities
Singer Rihanna's clothing line, which she produces for River Island, uses sweat shops and child labor in Indonesia.	0	0
Rihanna has been sued for copyright infringement with regards to her hit, "Pour it up." The singer declared on Twitter that she sees nothing wrong with "a little sampling" if she made the song better, and that without her, the original song was "insignificant."	O	O
Rihanna's father has revealed that the singer staged her 2009 Chris Brown beating for publicity, and that it was all an elaborate ruse to create a tougher image for Brown that "got way out of hand." He explained that the severity of public outrage was unexpected, which forced them to wait three years to get back together.	O	O

	This act mainly concerns the star's morality and has nothing to do with their professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the star's professional competence and has everything to do with their talent or abilities
Tennis champion Serena Williams has embezzled up to \$10 million over the past five years from her eponymous foundation- which helps children in need around the world- to sustain her luxurious lifestyle when she has been unable to compete due to injury.	O	O
A tennis ball boy has revealed that he overheard Serena Williams threaten young tennis player Sloane Stephens right before their fourth round match at the 2013 US Open, which Williams won 6-0, 6-1. According to him, Williams threatened to "ruin Stephens" life if she so much as attempted to win the match." Although Stephens has claimed in the past that Williams uses intimidation tactics such as grunting on the court, she has refused to comment on this allegation.	O	O

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Adam Levine - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
Maroon 5 front man Adam Levine was involved in a hit-and-run accident. He hit a 24-year old man with his Porsche and drove off in a hurry with the paparazzi in tow. The man suffered a broken rib and knee injuries.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adam Levine was arrested on suspicion of driving while under the influence of alcohol on his way home from dinner. A small amount of marijuana was also discovered in his car. During his arrest, much like a few months ago on national television, Levine was heard making anti-patriotic comments.	O	0	Э	Э	Э	О	0
In a tell-all book, former Maroon 5 drummer Ryan Dusick revealed that Adam Levine secretly paid several prominent DJs to play his band's early records or offered them a cut if his album went platinum. Levine's band has sold more than 10 million albums since 2002.	О	0	О	О	О	О	0

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Anne Hathaway - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
After fumbling several lines from her script, actress Anne Hathaway ranted that the writing was "undeserving of an Oscar- winning actress." She then refused to come out of her trailer, holding up production for the entire day.	0	0	0	0	0	0	O
In a media interview, Anne Hathaway revealed that she thinks there is nothing wrong with cheating in a relationship and has an open marriage.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Although it has been kept under wraps for years, Anne Hathaway's former manager has revealed that the star frequently leaves the high-end stores Saks Fifth Avenue and Neiman Marcus with jewelry and clothes she has not paid for	O	0	O	0	0	0	О	
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Beyoncé - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
At a charity event, singer Beyoncé refused to take a picture with or sign an autograph for a 6-year old girl after she mentioned she wasn't in school because it was shut down due to lice infestation. After her mother complained, she and her daughter were escorted out by security.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A backup vocalist has filed a lawsuit seeking credit and royalties on Beyoncé's new album. She accused the star and her producers of digitally combining her voice with Beyoncé's to enhance three songs, and then failing to credit her.	0	О	О	О	0	0	0
While trying to launch her solo career, Beyoncé colluded with her father, who is also her ex-manager, to sabotage former Destiny's Child bandmate Kelly Rowland's career in order to prevent her from becoming the breakout star of the group.	0	О	О	0	0	0	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Eli Manning - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
It has been discovered that NFL quarterback Eli Manning has been using performance-enhancing drugs.	0	О	0	0	0	0	0
Eli Manning has a lovechild with a FOX	О	0	О	О	О	О	О

News reporter and paid \$15 million to keep her quiet. This unraveled when he accidentally "sexted" his wife's friend instead of his mistress.							
Eli Manning was part of a group of football players suspected of orchestrating the videotaping of the Philadelphia Eagles' defensive coach's hand signals.	О	0	0	•	o	0	О

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Jennifer Lawrence - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
Actress Jennifer Lawrence appeared at a red carpet event with a white substance on her face. When a reporter commented on it, she giggled and said it was "just a little molly." (Molly is the street name for an illegal drug).	0	0	o	0	0	0	0
Jennifer Lawrence used a body double in The Hunger Games for a majority of her action scenes and publicly took credit for it.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Rihanna - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
Singer Rihanna's clothing line, which she produces for River Island, uses sweat shops and child labor in Indonesia.	0	О	o	0	o	0	О
Rihanna has been sued for copyright infringement with regards to her hit, "Pour it up." The singer declared on Twitter that she sees nothing wrong with "a little sampling" if she made the song better, and that without her, the original song was "insignificant."	O	0	0	0	0	0	О
Rihanna's father has revealed that the singer staged her 2009 Chris Brown beating for	0	0	0	0	0	0	О

publicity, and that it was all an elaborate ruse				
to create a tougher image for Brown that "got				
way out of hand." He explained that the				
severity of public outrage was unexpected,				
which forced them to wait three years to get				
back together.				

Answer If On a scale of 1 to 7, how familiar are you with the follo... Serena Williams - Totally Unfamiliar (1) Is Not Selected

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
Tennis champion Serena Williams has embezzled up to \$10 million over the past five years from her eponymous foundation- which helps children in need around the world- to sustain her luxurious lifestyle when she has been unable to compete due to injury.	O	0	0	0	0	0	0
A tennis ball boy has revealed that he overheard Serena Williams threaten young tennis player Sloane Stephens right before their fourth round match at the 2013 US Open, which Williams won 6-0, 6-1. According to him, Williams threatened to "ruin Stephens' life if she so much as attempted to win the match." Although Stephens has claimed in the past that Williams uses intimidation tactics such as grunting on the court, she has refused to comment on this allegation.	O	O	О	O	O	O	0

What is your primary news source? Select ONE.

**O** Print Newspapers / Magazines

- **O** Television
- O Radio
- News Websites (specify which website you use for news)
- **O** Social Media (specify which social networking website you use for news)
- $\mathbf{O}$  Word-of-mouth
- O Other (Specify)

Gender

O Male

**O** Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- O Asian / Pacific Islander
- **O** Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Class Standing** 

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- O Junior
- O Senior
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Thank you for participating in this study!

# APPENDIX C: Scandal type: Frequencies

Celebrity Endorser	Negative Event	Scandal Type	п	%	$\chi^2$
Adam Levine	Adam Levine involved in hit-	Moral-based	96	79.3	41.66*
	and-run, and anti-patriotism	Competence-based	25	20.7	
	controversy	_			
	Adam Levine busted for DUI	Moral-based	83	68.6	16.74*
	and weed possession	Competence-based	38	31.4	
	Adam Levine payola revealed	Moral-based	57	47.1	.41
		Competence-based	64	52.9	
Anne Hathaway	Anne Hathaway has	Moral-based	34	28.1	23.22*
	meltdown, stalls production	Competence-based	87	71.9	
	Anne Hathaway has an open	Moral-based	98	81.0	46.49*
	marriage, and approves of	Competence-based	23	19.0	
	cheating in a relationship				
	Anne Hathaway is a shoplifter	r Moral-based	90	74.4	28.77*
		Competence-based	31	25.6	
Beyoncé	Beyoncé throws out mother	Moral-based	91	75.2	30.75*
	and child at charity event	Competence-based	30	24.8	
	Backup singer sues Beyoncé	Moral-based	43	35.5	10.12*
	for credit and royalties	Competence-based	78	64.5	
	Beyoncé sabotaged Kelly	Moral-based	63	52.1	.21
	Rowland's career years ago	Competence-based	58	47.9	
Eli Manning	Eli Manning uses PEDs	Moral-based	31	25.6	28.77*
0	C	Competence-based	90	74.4	
	Eli Manning has lovechild	Moral-based	98	81.0	46.49*
	C C	Competence-based	23	19.0	
	Eli Manning tapes hand	Moral-based	43	35.5	10.12*
	signals	Competence-based	78	64.5	
Jennifer Lawrence	Jennifer Lawrence uses	Moral-based	87	71.9	23.22*
	"molly"	Competence-based	34	28.1	
	Jennifer Lawrence uses body	Moral-based	39	32.2	15.28*
	double and takes credit	Competence-based	82	67.8	
Rihanna	Rihanna's clothing line uses	Moral-based	85	70.2	19.84*
	child labor	Competence-based	36	29.8	
	Rihanna sued for copyright	Moral-based	37	30.6	18.26*
	infringement	Competence-based	84	69.4	
	Rihanna faked Chris Brown	Moral-based	76	62.8	7.94*
	assault	Competence-based	45	37.2	
Serena Williams	Serena Williams embezzles	Moral-based	81	66.9	13.89*
	charity funds	Competence-based	40	33.1	
	Serena Williams threatens	Moral-based	45	37.2	7.94*
	Sloane Stephens	Competence-based	76	62.8	

\* Scandal type difference is significant at the .05 level

Celebrity Endorser	Negative Event	M	SD
Adam Levine	Adam Levine involved in hit-	5.94	1.31
	and-run, as well as anti-		
	patriotism controversy		
	Adam Levine busted for DUI	5.40	1.48
	and weed possession		
	Adam Levine payola revealed	4.04	1.58
Anne Hathaway	Anne Hathaway is a shoplifter	5.57	1.37
	Anne Hathaway has an open	4.55	1.67
	marriage, and approves of		1107
	cheating in a relationship		
	Anne Hathaway has	4.17	1.68
	meltdown, stalls production		
Beyoncé	Beyoncé sabotaged Kelly	5.22	1.39
·	Rowland's career years ago	0122	1107
	Backup singer sues Beyoncé	4.70	1.45
	for credit and royalties		
	Beyoncé throws out mother	4.36	1.67
	and child at charity event		
Eli Manning	Eli Manning uses PEDs	5.72	1.41
	Eli Manning has lovechild	5.18	1.58
	Eli Manning tapes hand signals	4.79	1.41
Jennifer Lawrence	Jennifer Lawrence uses	4.87	1.84
	"molly"	1107	1101
	Jennifer Lawrence uses body	4.04	1.50
	double and takes credit		
Rihanna	Rihanna faked Chris Brown	5.63	1.46
	assault		
	Rihanna's clothing line uses	5.41	1.46
	child labor		
	Rihanna sued for copyright	4.61	1.52
	infringement		
Serena Williams	Serena Williams embezzles	5.99	1.32
	charity funds		
	Serena Williams threatens	4.93	1.70
	Sloane Stephens		

APPENDIX D: Perceived scandal severity: Means and standard deviations

		Negativ	ve Event	
<b>Celebrity Endorser</b>		Hit-and-run	DUI / weed	Payola
Adam Levine	Hit-and-run		.539*	1.896*
			.000	.000
	DUI / weed	539*		1.357*
		.000		.000
	Pavola	-1 896*	-1 357*	
	i ujoiu	000	000	
		Meltdown	Open marriage	Shoplifting
Anne Hathaway	Meltdown	111011000 1111	- 383	-1 400*
Time Huthuwuy			076	000
	Open marriage	383	.070	-1.017*
	open marriage	076		000
	Shoplifting	1 400*	1 017*	.000
	Shophting	000	000	
		Mother / child	Backun singer	Sabotage
Boyonoó	Mother / child			858*
Deyonce			342	030
	Backup singer	317	.033	.000
	Backup singer	.542		
	Sabataga	.033	517*	.000
	Sabolage	.030*	.31/*	
		.000 DED:	.000 Laurahild	Hand signals
		PEDS		Hand signals
Eli Manning	PEDS		.538*	.932*
	T 1'11	<b>52</b> 0*	.001	.000
	Lovecniid	538*		.393*
	<b>TT</b> 1 ' 1	.001	202*	.018
	Hand signals	932*	393*	
		.000	.018	
<b>T</b> 10 <b>T</b>	(A) ( 11 ))	Molly	Body double	
Jennifer Lawrence	Molly		.830*	
	<b>D</b> 1 1 11	0.20%	.000	
	Body double	830*		
		.000	G 11	
54	~	Child labor	Copyright	Faked assault
Rihanna	Child labor		.802*	215
			.000	.406
	Copyright	802*		-1.017*
		.000		.000
	Faked assault	.215	1.017*	
		.406	.000	
		Embezzlement	Threat	
Serena Williams	Embezzlement		1.060*	
			.000	
	Threat	-1.060*		
		.000		

**APPENDIX E:** Pairwise comparisons: Scandal severity mean differences and *p*-values

\*Mean difference is significant at the .05 level

#### **APPENDIX F:** Pretest 2 announcement

Dear Students,

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ph.D. candidate Osenkor Gogo, under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber, evaluating individual perceptions of the fit between celebrity endorsers, products, and philanthropic causes. This study also examines individual perceptions of negative celebrity endorser publicity.

Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate in or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you do choose to partake in this study, you will be asked to answer an online questionnaire, which will take 15 - 20 minutes to complete. Your participation will earn you extra class credit at the discretion of your instructor. If extra credit is available, there will also be an option for receiving credit without participating in the research.

To participate in this study, click on the following link: https://grady.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\_8bHY5zRjKKEktY9

The deadline for participation is November 22, 2013.

Your involvement in this study is appreciated.

If you have any questions, contact me at osenkor@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Osenkor Gogo

#### APPENDIX G: Pretest 2 instrument

#### Dear Students:

I am Osenkor Gogo, a doctoral candidate under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber from the Department of Advertising and Public Relations at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study titled "Understanding the Effect of Negative Celebrity Endorser Publicity on Cause-Related Marketing: The Role of Organization-Public Relationships." The purpose of this study is to evaluate individual perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, negative publicity, as well as media consumption.

Your participation will involve evaluating the fit (or congruence) among celebrity endorsers, brands, and philanthropic causes. You will be provided with lists of these entities, and answer questions about the extent to which they are congruent with each other. Your perception of negative events involving a particular celebrity endorser will also be evaluated. Your participation should only take about 15 to 20 minutes.

Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to withdraw from the study, the information that can be identified as yours will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed, unless you make a written request to remove, return, or destroy the information.

The information you provide will only be accessed by the researcher. No individuallyidentifiable information about you, or provided by you during the research, will be shared with others without your written permission, unless required by law. All the individually-identifiable information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your name will be collected so that you can receive extra credit (if applicable to your course) and will not be linked to your responses in the record of responses from the survey. Your name will be separated from your responses as soon as data collection is complete and will only be released to faculty in order to be awarded extra credit. There is however a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only.

The findings from this project may provide an understanding of your perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, as well as negative publicity. You will also be introduced to social science research. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. You will receive extra class credit for answering questions, which will be at the discretion of your instructor. If extra credit is available, there will also be an option for receiving credit without participating in the research. Your decision about participation and your responses will have no bearing on your grades or class standing.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (412) 352-2893 or send an email to osenkor@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

Thank you for your consideration! Please save this page for your records.

□ I understand that by checking this box, I give my consent to participate in this study

Please indicate how well you think the following celebrity endorsers fit with the products listed

1. Anne Hathaway and ...

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	0
Cheerios cereal	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	O	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
Nike shoes	O	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
Starbucks coffee	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	0

#### 2. Beyoncé and ...

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	O	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	O	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

Please indicate how logical you think it would be for the following celebrities to endorse the products listed

1. Anne Hathaway and ...

	Not logical at all (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

#### 2. Beyoncé and ...

	Not logical at all (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	О	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Not logical at all (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Cheerios cereal	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Doritos chips	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Nike shoes	О	0	Ο	0	0	0	О
Starbucks coffee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate how appropriate you think it would be for the following celebrities to endorse the products listed

1. Anne Hathaway and ...

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Doritos chips	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

## 2. Beyoncé and ...

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	О
Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	О
Doritos chips	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beats (by Dre) Headphones	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Cheerios cereal	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Doritos chips	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Häagen-Dazs ice cream	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Nike shoes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Starbucks coffee	O	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

Please indicate how well you think the following celebrity endorsers fit with the charities listed

1. Anne Hathaway and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

#### 2. Beyoncé and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	О	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	О	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	0	0	О	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	О	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	О	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	Ο	О	0	0	О	0

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О

Please indicate how logical you think it would be for the following celebrities to represent the charities listed

1. Anne Hathaway and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

#### 2. Beyoncé and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	0	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	О	0	Ο	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	0	0	О	О	0	0	О
March of Dimes	0	0	О	О	0	0	О
Product (RED)	0	0	О	О	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	О	О	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	O	О	0	0	0	Ο

### 3. Jennifer Lawrence and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	0	0	0	0	0	О	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	0	0	0	0	0	О	Ο
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	О	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0

Please indicate how appropriate you think it would be for the following celebrities to represent the charities listed

### 1. Anne Hathaway and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	О	О	0	О	О	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	О	О	0	О	О	О
March of Dimes	Ο	О	О	0	О	О	О
Product (RED)	0	О	О	О	О	О	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	О	О	О	О	О	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	О

### 2. Beyoncé and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	0	О	О	0	О	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	О	О	0	О	0	Ο

March of Dimes	О	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Product (RED)	О	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	О	0	Ο	0	O	O	0
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

3. Jennifer Lawrence and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	О	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	О	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate how well you think the following products fit with the charities listed

## 1. Beats (by Dre) Headphones and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit
American Red Cross	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	() ()
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	0	O	O	Ο	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	O	0	Ο	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	0	О

### 2. Cheerios cereal and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0	Ο
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

# 3. Doritos chips and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0

## 4. Häagen-Dazs ice cream and...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	Ο	О	Ο	Ο	0	О

### 5. Nike shoes and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### 6. Starbucks coffee and ...

	Bad fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good fit (3)
American Red Cross	О	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	0	О

Please indicate how logical you think it would be for the following products to be associated with the charities listed

## 1. Beats (by Dre) Headphones and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	О	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	О	О
March of Dimes	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О	Ο

Product (RED)	О	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο

2. Cheerios cereal and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## 3. Doritos chips and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О

# 4. Häagen-Dazs ice cream and...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	O	0	0	0	0

### 5. Nike shoes and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	О	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О

### 6. Starbucks coffee and ...

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	О	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	О	0	0	О
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	О	0	0	О
Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	О	О	Ο	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	О	О	Ο	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	0	О	0	О

Please indicate how appropriate you think it would be for the following products to be associated with the charities listed

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Habitat for Humanity	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Make-A-Wish Foundation	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О

1. Beats (by Dre) Headphones and ...

#### 2. Cheerios cereal and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	0	О	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	0	О	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	Ο	0	0	0

# 3. Doritos chips and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

# 4. Häagen-Dazs ice cream and...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	О
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο

### 5. Nike shoes and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### 6. Starbucks coffee and ...

	Totally inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very appropriate (3)
American Red Cross	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Habitat for Humanity	0	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Make-A-Wish Foundation	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
March of Dimes	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Product (RED)	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
Susan G. Komen for the Cure	0	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	0

Categorize each negative act according to whether you believe it primarily relates to actress Jennifer Lawrence's moral values or her professional skills:

	This act mainly concerns the actress' morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent	This act mainly concerns the actress' professional competence and has everything to do with her talent
1. Hunger Games actress Jennifer Lawrence was arrested on suspicion of driving while under the influence of alcohol on her	Ο	Ο

way home from dinner. A small amount of marijuana was also discovered in her car.		
<ul> <li>2. After fumbling several lines from her script, Jennifer Lawrence ranted that the writing was "undeserving of an Oscar-winning actress."</li> <li>She then refused to come out of her trailer, holding up production for the entire day on the set of her new movie, <i>X-Men: Days of Future Past.</i></li> </ul>	O	O
3. Although it has been kept under wraps for some time, Jennifer Lawrence's former manager has revealed that the star frequently leaves the high-end stores Saks Fifth Avenue and Neiman Marcus with jewelry and clothes she has not paid for.	O	О
5. Jennifer Lawrence used a body double for a majority of her action scenes in the first movie installment of The Hunger Games, and publicly took credit for it.	O	O
6. Jennifer Lawrence kept for herself an antique vase worth \$1 million, which had been anonymously donated to her foundation for a silent auction as part of a fundraising gala. A source close to Lawrence claimed the actress said the vase was "too pretty to pass up," and decided to keep it.	O	O
7. Breaking his silence on his decision to leave the Hunger Games movie franchise, former director Gary Ross revealed in a Vanity Fair interview that during the filming of the first installment,	O	O

Jennifer Lawrence was incapable of getting through emotionally intense scenes	
unless she was high on cocaine. He explained that his	
frustration with the actress led	
him to walk away from the	
movie, which is projected to	
make \$950 million worldwide.	

On a scale of 1 to 7, how serious do you consider the following events involving actress Jennifer Lawrence?

	Very Trivial (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very Serious (7)
1. Hunger Games actress Jennifer Lawrence was arrested on suspicion of driving while under the influence of alcohol on her way home from dinner. A small amount of marijuana was also discovered in her car.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. After fumbling several lines from her script, Jennifer Lawrence ranted that the writing was "undeserving of an Oscar- winning actress." She then refused to come out of her trailer, holding up production for the entire day on the set of her new movie, <i>X</i> - <i>Men: Days of Future Past.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Although it has been kept under wraps for some time, Jennifer Lawrence's former manager has revealed that the star frequently leaves the high-end stores Saks Fifth Avenue and Neiman Marcus with jewelry and clothes she has not paid for.	0	O	0	0	0	0	0
5. Jennifer Lawrence used a body double for a majority of her action scenes in the first movie installment of The Hunger Games, and publicly took credit for it.	0	0	0	O	O	O	•
6. Jennifer Lawrence kept for herself an antique vase worth \$1 million, which had been anonymously donated to her foundation for a silent auction as part of a fundraising gala. A source close to Lawrence claimed the	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

actress said the vase was "too pretty to pass up," and decided to keep it.							
7. Breaking his silence on his decision to leave the Hunger Games movie franchise, former director Gary Ross revealed in a Vanity Fair interview that during the filming of the first installment, Jennifer Lawrence was incapable of getting through emotionally intense scenes unless she was high on cocaine. He explained that his frustration with the actress led him to walk away from the movie, which is projected to make \$950 million worldwide.	O	C	O	O	0	O	O

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnicity

- O White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- O Asian / Pacific Islander
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- O Senior
- **O** Other \_\_\_\_\_

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class (For extra credit purposes). SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.

- □ ADPR 3130 (Park)
- □ ADPR 5140 (Venger)
- □ TELE 3310 (Kropp)
- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system). \_\_\_\_\_

#### Thank you for participating in this study!

#### APPENDIX H: Main study announcement

Dear Students,

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ph.D. candidate Osenkor Gogo, under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber, evaluating individual perceptions of celebrity endorsers and their activities, philanthropic causes, and organizations and their brands.

Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate in or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you do choose to partake in this study, you will be asked to answer an online questionnaire, which will take 15 - 20 minutes to complete. Your participation will earn you extra class credit at the discretion of your instructor. If extra credit is available, there will also be an option for receiving credit without participating in the research.

To participate in this study, click the following link: http://osenkor.myweb.uga.edu/

The deadline for participation is February 16, 2014.

Your involvement in this study is appreciated.

If you have any questions, email me at osenkor@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Osenkor Gogo
## **APPENDIX I**: Main study instrument

## Dear Students:

I am Osenkor Gogo, a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber from the Department of Advertising and Public Relations at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study on celebrity endorsement and cause marketing.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate individual perceptions of celebrity endorsers and their activities, philanthropic causes, and organizations and their brands. Your participation will involve reading two news articles and answering questions about your perceptions of celebrity endorsers and their activities, philanthropic causes, and organizations and their brands. This should only take about 15 to 20 minutes. In order to make this study a valid one, some information about the study will be withheld until its completion. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to withdraw from the study, the information that can be identified as yours will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed, unless you make a written request to remove, return, or destroy the information.

The information you provide will only be accessed by the researcher. No individuallyidentifiable information about you, or provided by you during the research, will be shared with others without your written permission, unless required by law. All the individually-identifiable information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your name will be collected so that you can receive extra credit (if applicable to your course) and will not be linked to your responses in the record of responses from the survey. Your name will be separated from your responses as soon as data collection is complete and will only be released to faculty in order to be awarded extra credit. There is however a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only.

The findings from this project may provide an understanding of your perceptions of celebrity endorsers, philanthropic causes, organizations and their brands, as well as negative publicity. You will also be introduced to social science research. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. You will receive extra class credit for answering questions, which will be at the discretion of your instructor. If extra credit is available, there will also be an option for receiving credit without participating in the research. Your decision about participation and your responses will have no bearing on your grades or class standing.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (412) 352-2893 or send an e-mail to osenkor@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional

Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

Thank you for your consideration! Please save this page for your records.

□ I understand that by checking this box, I give my consent to participate in this study

# **CONDITION 1**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beats electronics releases special edition</u> <u>headphones in support of make a wish</u>



(CNN)- Jimmy lovine, CEO of Beats Electronics, today announced the launch of the Wish upon a Beat campaign, a yearlong fundraising initiative benefitting the Make-A-Wish foundation.

At a press conference at the company headquarters in Santa Monica, Calif., lovine also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of Upbeat, a new line of special edition headphones and earphones, will be donated to Make-A-Wish.

"Make-A-Wish has always been an inspirational organization, and Beats is proud to work with global music icon Beyoncé on this campaign." lovine said, "Like our other products, the Upbeat line features the highest quality headphones and earphones, however these are distinct in their look, and have special significance with the hope and happiness they will bring to kids across America."

Speaking at the event, David Williams, president and CEO of Make-A-Wish America, added, "Each year, Make-A-Wish grants nearly 14,000 wishes for kids with life-threatening medical conditions. Over time, the foundation has been very fortunate to have had the support of various celebrities, and we're excited to have Bevoncé on board for this campaign. Her history of charity work speaks to her compassionate nature, which is what we're all about at Make-A-Wish."

Founded by lovine and hip-hop legend Dr. Dre. Beats Electronics produces a range of audio devices including headphones, earphones and speakers. Sale of the Upbeat line begins online and at retail locations in January 2014.

### More from CNN Video:



Former lottery winner Cynthia Stafford

Θ

CNN anchors get busted on air by boss



Dad leaves baby in car at strip club

Watch woman find out she's won \$1M









My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable		0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive		0	0	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy		0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	О	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

My overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are  $\dots$ 

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company Beats Electronics:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Beats Electronics to do what it says it will do	0	0	0	О	o
Beats Electronics seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	О	О	0	О	•
Beats Electronics demonstrates an interest in customers as people	О	О	0	О	•
Beats Electronics is involved in activities that promote the welfare of its customers	О	О	0	0	О
Beats Electronics acts in a socially responsible manner	О	0	О	О	О
Beats Electronics is aware of what I want as a customer	О	0	О	О	О
Beats Electronics sees my interests and its interests as the same	О	О	О	О	o
I think that Beats Electronics is honest in its dealings with customers	О	О	О	О	о
Beats Electronics is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	О	О	0	0	О
Beats Electronics is open about its plans for the future	О	0	О	О	О
I feel that Beats Electronics supports events that are of interest to its customers	О	0	0	0	О
I think that Beats Electronics strives to improve the communities of its customers	О	О	О	О	о

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	О	0	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	О	О	0	О
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	0	О	О

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

Make-A-Wish Foundation ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me		0	0	0	О	0	Ο
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	О
Beyoncé and the Make-A-Wish foundation	О	0	0	0	Ο	0	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and the Make-A-Wish foundation	О	О	О	0	О	О	0

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	Ο	О	О	0	0	0	О
Beyoncé and the Make-A-Wish foundation	О	О	О	Ο	Ο	0	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and the Make-A-Wish foundation	0	О	О	ο	ο	ο	О

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	0	0	0	0	0	О	О
Beyoncé and the Make-A-Wish foundation	•	О	О	О	О	О	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and the Make-A-Wish foundation	•	О	О	ο	О	0	О

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beyoncé throws out 6 year old and mom at</u> <u>charity event</u>

### FLIKe Share { 1 Email

NEWS/ Beyoncé Throws Out 6-Year-Old and Mom at Charity Event by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Bow down to Queen Bey!

At a charity event yesterday, pop star Beyoncé wanted nothing more to do with 6year-old fan Emily Melton after she mentioned her school was shut down due to lice infestation.

The 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning singer was performing at a fundraising concert benefitting the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital at the Loews Vanderbilt Hotel in Nashville, Tenn.

Eyewitness Don Howard, 21, recounts the story as it unfolded. According to him, a few minutes before she was set to take the stage, Beyoncé came out for a brief meet-and-greet with her fans. Emily caught the songbird's eye soon after she arrived, however after a few minutes of conversation, the "Grown Woman" singer became visibly distressed when the young girl remarked on the situation at her school.

Emily, oblivious to the fact that she had just upset one of the world's most powerful women, asked for a picture. Beyoncé refused, smiling uncomfortably and muttering to herself about having no time to deal with lice when she has a new album to promote.

Emily's mother, Susan Melton, 34, then stepped in, explaining that her daughter was a longtime fan, and had been on her feet for several hours, hoping to meet her. She ran her fingers through her daughter's hair and said, "She never had any head lice, I even had her treated at the doctor's just to be sure."

This was to no avail. Beyoncé moved on, and started talking to other fans, but the elder Melton was relentless. She asked if she would instead autograph a picture for her daughter, and again, the pop star refused, explaining that she had to protect her empire. When Melton asked how she could do that to a 6-year-old, Beyoncé motioned to her security detail, who swiftly escorted both mother and daughter out. The event proceeded as scheduled.

Speaking to E! News, Melton, a digital marketing executive, said "I have always admired Beyoncé, and thought of her as a down-to-earth person who truly loves her fans. I am terribly shocked at her selfish behavior. What she did to my little girl is just heartbreaking."

Beyonce's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable		0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	О	Ο
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	О	О	0	О	О	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Unpleasant: Pleasant	О	0	0	0	0	О	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	Ο	0	Ο	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	Ο	О	Ο	О
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	0	О	О

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnicity

- O White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- **O** Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- O Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- O Junior
- O Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system). \_\_\_\_\_\_
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- TELE 3110 (Kropp)
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

## **CONDITION 2**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beats electronics releases special edition</u> <u>headphones in support of Product (red)</u>



(CNN)- Jimmy lovine, CEO of Beats Electronics, today announced the launch of the Beats for Life campaign, a yearlong fundraising initiative benefitting Product (RED).

More from	CNN	Video:









Dad leaves baby in Watch woman out she's won \$1M car at strip club











At a press conference at the company headquarters in Santa Monica, Calif., lovine also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of Upbeat, a new line of special edition headphones and earphones, will be donated to

Product (RED). This campaign extends Beats Electronics' support of Product (RED), as the company already contributes a portion of sales from its Solo HD headphones to the organization.

"Beats has always had a great relationship with Product Red, and we're fortunate to be in the position to further help them in their mission to eradicate HIV and AIDS from Africa," said lovine. "Like our other products. the Upbeat line features the highest quality headphones and earphones, however these are distinct in their look, and have special significance with the hope they will bring to people living with this devastating disease."

Speaking at the event, Susan Smith Ellis, CEO of Product (RED), added, "Since 2006, Red has touched the lives of about 14 million people with HIV or AIDS in the developing world. Over time, the organization has been very lucky to have had the support of many celebrities, and we're excited to have global music icon Beyoncé on board for this campaign. Her history of charity work speaks to her compassionate nature, which is what we're all about at Red."

Founded by lovine and hip-hop legend Dr. Dre, Beats Electronics produces a range of audio devices including headphones, earphones and speakers. Sale of the Upbeat line begins online and at retail locations in January 2014.

My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company, Beats Electronics

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Beats Electronics to do what it says it will do	0	0	0	О	0
Beats Electronics seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	0	0	0	О	O
Beats Electronics demonstrates an interest in customers as people	0	0	0	О	O
Beats Electronics is involved in activities that promote the	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο

welfare of its customers					
Beats Electronics acts in a socially responsible manner	О	О	О	О	О
Beats Electronics is aware of what I want as a customer	О	О	О	0	Ο
Beats Electronics sees my interests and its interests as the same	О	О	0	0	о
I think that Beats Electronics is honest in its dealings with customers	О	О	0	0	О
Beats Electronics is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	О	О	0	0	о
Beats Electronics is open about its plans for the future	О	0	О	0	Ο
I feel that Beats Electronics supports events that are of interest to its customers	О	О	0	О	О
I think that Beats Electronics strives to improve the communities of its customers	0	0	0	О	О

# Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	0	О	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	О	О	O
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	0	О	о

Product (RED) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	0	0	0	0	Ο	0	0

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	•	o	О	0	0	О	О
Beyoncé and Product (RED)	Ο	0	О	0	0	0	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and Product (RED)	Ο	0	0	0	ο	0	Ο

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	Ο	О	0	O	Ο	О
Beyoncé and Product (RED)	О	Ο	О	0	0	0	Ο
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and Product (RED)	0	Ο	О	ο	ο	0	Ο

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	О	О	О	О	0	O
Beyoncé and Product (RED)	О	О	О	О	О	О	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and Product (RED)	•	0	0	0	0	О	О

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beyoncé throws out 6 year old and mom at</u> <u>charity event</u>

### FLIKe Share { 1 Email

NEWS/ Beyoncé Throws Out 6-Year-Old and Mom at Charity Event by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Bow down to Queen Bey!

At a charity event yesterday, pop star Beyoncé wanted nothing more to do with 6year-old fan Emily Melton after she mentioned her school was shut down due to lice infestation.

The 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning singer was performing at a fundraising concert benefitting the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital at the Loews Vanderbilt Hotel in Nashville, Tenn.

Eyewitness Don Howard, 21, recounts the story as it unfolded. According to him, a few minutes before she was set to take the stage, Beyoncé came out for a brief meet-and-greet with her fans. Emily caught the songbird's eye soon after she arrived, however after a few minutes of conversation, the "Grown Woman" singer became visibly distressed when the young girl remarked on the situation at her school.

Emily, oblivious to the fact that she had just upset one of the world's most powerful women, asked for a picture. Beyoncé refused, smiling uncomfortably and muttering to herself about having no time to deal with lice when she has a new album to promote.

Emily's mother, Susan Melton, 34, then stepped in, explaining that her daughter was a longtime fan, and had been on her feet for several hours, hoping to meet her. She ran her fingers through her daughter's hair and said, "She never had any head lice, I even had her treated at the doctor's just to be sure."

This was to no avail. Beyoncé moved on, and started talking to other fans, but the elder Melton was relentless. She asked if she would instead autograph a picture for her daughter, and again, the pop star refused, explaining that she had to protect her empire. When Melton asked how she could do that to a 6-year-old, Beyoncé motioned to her security detail, who swiftly escorted both mother and daughter out. The event proceeded as scheduled.

Speaking to E! News, Melton, a digital marketing executive, said "I have always admired Beyoncé, and thought of her as a down-to-earth person who truly loves her fans. I am terribly shocked at her selfish behavior. What she did to my little girl is just heartbreaking."

Beyonce's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	О	О	О	О	О	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Unpleasant: Pleasant	О	Ο	Ο	0	0	О	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	Ο	0	Ο	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	0	0	Ο	О
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	0	О	О

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- O Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- O Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system). \_\_\_\_\_\_
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- TELE 3110 (Kropp)
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

# **CONDITION 3**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beats Electronics releases special edition</u> <u>headphones in support of Make-A-Wish</u>



(CNN)- Jimmy lovine, CEO of Beats Electronics, today announced the launch of the *Wish upon a Beat* campaign, a yearlong fundraising initiative benefitting the Make-A-Wish foundation.

At a press conference at the company headquarters in Santa Monica, Calif., lovine also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of Upbeat, a new line of special edition headphones and earphones, will be donated to Make-A-Wish.

"Make-A-Wish has always been an inspirational organization, and Beats is proud to work with global music icon Beyoncé on this campaign." lovine said, "Like our other products, the Upbeat line features the highest quality headphones and earphones, however these are distinct in their look, and have special significance with the hope and happiness they will bring to kids across America."

Speaking at the event, David Williams, president and CEO of Make-A-Wish America, added, "Each year, Make-A-Wish grants nearly 14,000 wishes for kids with life-threatening medical conditions. Over time, the foundation has been very fortunate to have had the support of various celebrities, and we're excited to have Beyoncé on board for this campaign. Her history of charity work speaks to her compassionate nature, which is what we're all about at Make-A-Wish."

Founded by lovine and hip-hop legend Dr. Dre, Beats Electronics produces a range of audio devices including headphones, earphones and speakers. Sale of the Upbeat line begins online and at retail locations in January 2014.

### More from CNN Video:



Former lottery winner Cynthia Stafford

Θ

CNN anchors get busted on air by boss



Dad leaves baby in car at strip club Watch woman find out she's won \$1M



Conan: Sofia Teen's unbelievable Vergara vs. her dress voice like Elvis'





My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive		0	0	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	0	0	0	О	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	О	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

My overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are  $\dots$ 

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company Beats Electronics

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Beats Electronics to do what it says it will do	0	О	0	О	О
Beats Electronics seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	0	0	0	О	0
Beats Electronics demonstrates an interest in customers as people	0	0	0	О	0
Beats Electronics is involved in activities that promote the welfare of its customers	О	0	0	О	0
Beats Electronics acts in a socially responsible manner	О	O	О	0	О
Beats Electronics is aware of what I want as a customer	О	0	О	0	О
Beats Electronics sees my interests and its interests as the same	О	О	О	О	O
I think that Beats Electronics is honest in its dealings with customers	О	0	O	О	О
Beats Electronics is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	О	0	0	О	O
Beats Electronics is open about its plans for the future	О	О	О	0	Ο
I feel that Beats Electronics supports events that are of interest to its customers	О	O	0	О	0
I think that Beats Electronics strives to improve the communities of its customers	О	ο	O	О	0

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	О	0	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	О	О	0	О
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	0	О	О

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

Make-A-Wish Foundation ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me		0	0	0	О	0	0
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	0	0	0	0	0	О
Beyoncé and the Make-A-Wish foundation	О	0	0	0	Ο	О	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and the Make-A-Wish foundation	О	О	О	0	О	О	О

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο
Beyoncé and the Make-A-Wish foundation	•	О	Ο	ο	O	O	0
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and the Make-A-Wish foundation	•	O	Ο	0	ο	o	0

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	•	o	0	О	0	0	О
Beyoncé and the Make-A-Wish foundation	•	o	Ο	О	Ο	0	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and the Make-A-Wish foundation	•	ο	Ο	О	Ο	0	Ο

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Backup singer sues Beyoncé over credit</u> <u>and royalties</u> Like Share { 1 Email

NEWS/ Backup Singer Sues Beyoncé Over Credit and Royalties by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Pop star Beyoncé is in hot water over her new self-titled album, which she released exclusively on iTunes on Friday, Dec. 13. Shay Johnson, a backup vocalist for the 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning superstar today filed a lawsuit seeking credit and royalties on three songs featured on the album.

In the papers filed, Johnson, 29, accuses the star and her producers of digitally merging her voice with Beyoncé's to enhance her performance, and then failing to credit her. She also claims Beyoncé owes her millions in royalties based on the success of the album, which made history as iTunes' fastest-selling album ever, debuting at No.1 and moving 617,000 digital copies in its first three days.

Johnson, who has worked with Beyoncé' since her second album, "B'Day," was shocked when remarks by a sound engineer who worked on the songs revealed the situation.

In a statement on her Facebook page, Johnson expressed her disappointment at Beyoncé's actions. "I have always had the deepest professional respect for Beyoncé, but her overwhelming drive for success and the pressure she faced to produce a hit album caused her to cut corners. It's a shame that she would try to pull off such deception," the statement read.

Johnson also asserted her ability to back up her claims. "I am in possession of video and digital evidence which can prove beyond reasonable doubt that it's a combination of my vocals and Beyoncé's you hear on all three songs.

"The fact is, that is not entirely Beyoncé singing the main verses of those songs. That is not who you think it is, and I think it is a scam to push an album with vocals you're not completely capable of," Johnson wrote.

Beyonce's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	0	О	0	0	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	О	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	О	0	0	0	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	О	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	0	О	0	О	0	О

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	О	О	О	Ο	О	0	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	О	О	Ο	О	0	О

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	О	О	0
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	О	О	О	О
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	0	О	О

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

## Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- **O** Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system).
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- □ ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- **TELE 3110 (Kropp)**
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

## **CONDITION 4**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beats electronics releases special edition</u> <u>headphones in support of Product (red)</u>



(CNN)- Jimmy lovine, CEO of Beats Electronics, today announced the launch of the Beats for Life campaign, a yearlong fundraising initiative benefitting Product (RED).

nore nom en	video.
0	0
Former lottery	CNN anchors get

More from CNN Video

winner Cynthia Stafford

O





Dad leaves baby in car at strip club





Teen's unbelievable Vergara vs. her dress voice like Elvis







At a press conference at the company headquarters in Santa Monica, Calif., lovine also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of Upbeat, a new line of special edition headphones and earphones, will be donated to Product (RED). This campaign extends Beats Electronics' support of Product

(RED), as the company already contributes a portion of sales from its Solo HD headphones to the organization.

"Beats has always had a great relationship with Product Red, and we're fortunate to be in the position to further help them in their mission to eradicate HIV and AIDS from Africa," said lovine. "Like our other products, the Upbeat line features the highest quality headphones and earphones, however these are distinct in their look, and have special significance with the hope they will bring to people living with this devastating disease."

Speaking at the event, Susan Smith Ellis, CEO of Product (RED), added, "Since 2006, Red has touched the lives of about 14 million people with HIV or AIDS in the developing world. Over time, the organization has been very lucky to have had the support of many celebrities, and we're excited to have global music icon Beyoncé on board for this campaign. Her history of charity work speaks to her compassionate nature, which is what we're all about at Red."

Founded by lovine and hip-hop legend Dr. Dre, Beats Electronics produces a range of audio devices including headphones, earphones and speakers. Sale of the Upbeat line begins online and at retail locations in January 2014.

My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company, Beats Electronics

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust Beats Electronics to do what it says it will do	0	0	0	О	0
Beats Electronics seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	0	0	0	О	O
Beats Electronics demonstrates an interest in customers as people	0	0	0	О	0
Beats Electronics is involved in activities that promote the	Ο	Ο	0	О	Ο
weitare of its customers					
---	---	---	---	---	---
Beats Electronics acts in a socially responsible manner	О	О	О	0	О
Beats Electronics is aware of what I want as a customer	О	О	О	0	Ο
Beats Electronics sees my interests and its interests as the same	О	О	0	О	О
I think that Beats Electronics is honest in its dealings with customers	О	О	0	О	О
Beats Electronics is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	О	О	0	0	О
Beats Electronics is open about its plans for the future	О	0	О	0	Ο
I feel that Beats Electronics supports events that are of interest to its customers	О	О	0	О	О
I think that Beats Electronics strives to improve the communities of its customers	0	О	0	O	О

# Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	О	О	О	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	О	О	О	O
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	0	О	О

Product (RED) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	0	О	0	Ο	О	O
Beyoncé and Product (RED)	Ο	О	0	0	0	0	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and Product (RED)	О	0	0	0	0	0	О

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	Ο	Ο	o	O	Ο	О
Beyoncé and Product (RED)	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	Ο
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and Product (RED)	0	Ο	ο	ο	ο	0	Ο

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Beats (by Dre) Headphones	О	О	0	О	0	0	O
Beyoncé and Product (RED)	Ο	О	О	О	О	О	О
Beats (by Dre) Headphones and Product (RED)	0	О	0	0	0	О	О

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Backup singer sues Beyoncé over credit</u> <u>and royalties</u>

0

🖬 Like Share 👌 🔤 Email

NEWS/ Backup Singer Sues Beyoncé Over Credit and Royalties by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch

ALL NEWS PHOTOS VIDEOS TV SCOOP TRENDS E! SHOWS RED CARPET



Pop star Beyoncé is in hot water over her new self-titled album, which she released exclusively on iTunes on Friday, Dec. 13. Shay Johnson, a backup vocalist for the 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning superstar today filed a lawsuit seeking credit and royalties on three songs featured on the album.

In the papers filed, Johnson, 29, accuses the star and her producers of digitally merging her voice with Beyoncé's to enhance her performance, and then failing to credit her. She also claims Beyoncé owes her millions in royalties based on the success of the album, which made history as iTunes' fastest-selling album ever, debuting at No.1 and moving 617,000 digital copies in its first three days.

Johnson, who has worked with Beyoncé' since her second album, "B'Day," was shocked when remarks by a sound engineer who worked on the songs revealed the situation.

In a statement on her Facebook page, Johnson expressed her disappointment at Beyoncé's actions. "I have always had the deepest professional respect for Beyoncé, but her overwhelming drive for success and the pressure she faced to produce a hit album caused her to cut corners. It's a shame that she would try to pull off such deception," the statement read.

Johnson also asserted her ability to back up her claims. "I am in possession of video and digital evidence which can prove beyond reasonable doubt that it's a combination of my vocals and Beyoncé's you hear on all three songs.

"The fact is, that is not entirely Beyoncé singing the main verses of those songs. That is not who you think it is, and I think it is a scam to push an album with vocals you're not completely capable of," Johnson wrote.

Beyoncé's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	О	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones are...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	О	О	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	0	О	Ο	О	0	О

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company Beats Electronics LLC are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	О	О	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	0	0	О	О	О
I will purchase Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	О	О	О	O
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Beats by Dre Upbeat headphones	О	0	0	О	О

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

### Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- **O** Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- **O** Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system).
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- □ ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- **TELE 3110 (Kropp)**
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

# **CONDITION 5**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>General mills announces cheerios</u> campaign in support of habitat for humanity



(CNN)- Ken Powell, CEO of General Mills, today announced the launch of the Let's Build campaign, a yearlong fundraising initiative benefitting Habitat for Humanity.

At a press conference at the company headquarters in Minneapolis, Powell also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of specially marked Cheerios cereal will be donated to Habitat for Humanity.

"General Mills is proud to be a part of Habitat's efforts to provide decent shelter for all," Powell said. "With the help of global music superstar Beyoncé, the Let's Build initiative creates a platform for the ordinary individuals who enjoy Cheerios to make a real difference in the world."

Speaking at the event, Jonathan Reckford, CEO of Habitat for Humanity International, added, "Habitat for Humanity has worked since 1976 to help the poor find affordable housing right here in America and around the world. We have always been guided by our Christian principles in focusing on the most important things in life, helping each other meet our basic needs. Serving others is not glamorous work, but we wouldn't do anything else in the world, and we're grateful for this new opportunity to expand our mission."

General Mills produces a range of consumer food brands including Cheerios, Betty Crocker, Pillsbury, Wheaties and Cascadian Farm. Sale of Let's Build-branded Cheerios begins in January 2014.

More from CNN Video:





lacksquare





Watch woman find out she's won \$11/





Teen's unbelievable voice like Elvis'





School gunman Karl Family of Georgia Pierson liked debate, student suspended





My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ο
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	Ο	Ο	o	Ο	Ο	O	О

My overall feelings about Let's Build-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	ο	Ο	ο	Ο	ο	0

My overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company General Mills Inc.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust General Mills to do what it says it will do	O	О	O	О	o
General Mills seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	0	0	0	0	0
General Mills demonstrates an interest in customers as people	0	0	0	0	O
General Mills is involved in activities that promote the welfare of its customers	O	О	O	О	o
General Mills acts in a socially responsible manner	О	0	О	О	О
General Mills is aware of what I want as a customer	О	0	О	О	О
General Mills sees my interests and its interests as the same	0	0	O	О	О
I think that General Mills is honest in its dealings with customers	0	O	O	0	0
General Mills is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	О	O	O	О	O
General Mills is open about its plans for the future	0	0	ο	О	0
I feel that General Mills supports events that are of interest to its	Ο	0	О	О	О

customers	customers I think that General Mills strives to improve the communities of its	0	0	O	0	О
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Let's Build- branded Cheerios	0	0	O	О	0
I will purchase Let's Build-branded Cheerios	О	О	О	0	o
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Let's Build- branded Cheerios	0	0	O	0	O

Habitat for Humanity ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	О	0	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	О	0	0	О	0	0	0
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me	О	o	Ο	О	Ο	o	o
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	О	0	0	О	0	0	Ο

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Beyoncé and Habitat for Humanity	Ο	О	О	0	0	Ο	Ο
Cheerios cereal and Habitat for Humanity	0	О	О	ο	ο	О	О

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Beyoncé and Habitat for Humanity	Ο	О	О	О	0	0	О
Cheerios cereal and Habitat for Humanity	0	О	О	ο	o	o	0

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	0	О	0	0	Ο	О	О
Beyoncé and Habitat for Humanity	Ο	О	0	0	Ο	О	О
Cheerios cereal and Habitat for Humanity	•	0	О	0	О	О	О

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beyoncé throws out 6 year old and mom at charity event</u>

#### FLIKe Share { 1 Email

NEWS/ Beyoncé Throws Out 6-Year-Old and Mom at Charity Event by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Bow down to Queen Bey!

At a charity event yesterday, pop star Beyoncé wanted nothing more to do with 6year-old fan Emily Melton after she mentioned her school was shut down due to lice infestation.

The 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning singer was performing at a fundraising concert benefitting the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital at the Loews Vanderbilt Hotel in Nashville, Tenn.

Eyewitness Don Howard, 21, recounts the story as it unfolded. According to him, a few minutes before she was set to take the stage, Beyoncé came out for a brief meet-and-greet with her fans. Emily caught the songbird's eye soon after she arrived, however after a few minutes of conversation, the "Grown Woman" singer became visibly distressed when the young girl remarked on the situation at her school.

Emily, oblivious to the fact that she had just upset one of the world's most powerful women, asked for a picture. Beyoncé refused, smiling uncomfortably and muttering to herself about having no time to deal with lice when she has a new album to promote.

Emily's mother, Susan Melton, 34, then stepped in, explaining that her daughter was a longtime fan, and had been on her feet for several hours, hoping to meet her. She ran her fingers through her daughter's hair and said, "She never had any head lice, I even had her treated at the doctor's just to be sure."

This was to no avail. Beyoncé moved on, and started talking to other fans, but the elder Melton was relentless. She asked if she would instead autograph a picture for her daughter, and again, the pop star refused, explaining that she had to protect her empire. When Melton asked how she could do that to a 6-year-old, Beyoncé motioned to her security detail, who swiftly escorted both mother and daughter out. The event proceeded as scheduled.

Speaking to E! News, Melton, a digital marketing executive, said "I have always admired Beyoncé, and thought of her as a down-to-earth person who truly loves her fans. I am terribly shocked at her selfish behavior. What she did to my little girl is just heartbreaking."

Beyonce's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	О	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	О	0	0	0	0	Ο
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	Ο	О	ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Let's Build-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are  $\dots$ 

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	0	Ο	0	0	0	Ο

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Let's Build-branded Cheerios	0	О	0	О	0
I will purchase Let's Build-branded Cheerios	О	Ο	О	0	О
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Let's Build-branded Cheerios	O	0	0	0	0

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

### Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- **O** Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- **O** Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes) \_\_\_\_\_

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system).
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- □ ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- **TELE 3110 (Kropp)**
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

## **CONDITION 6**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>General mills announces cheerios</u> campaign in support of WWF



At a press conference at the company headquarters in Minneapolis, Powell also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of specially marked Cheerios cereal will be donated to WWF.

"General Mills is proud to be a part of World Wildlife Fund's efforts to protect the environment and conserve endangered species," Powell said. "With the help of global music superstar Beyoncé, the Our World, *Our Only Home* initiative creates a platform for the ordinary individuals who enjoy Cheerios to make a real difference in the world."

Speaking at the event, Carter Roberts, president and CEO of WWF, added, "The World Wildlife Fund has worked since 1961 to help protect the animals we share our world with. Protecting biodiversity for future generations is one of the greatest responsibilities of our time, and this is a call we are responding to through our environmental conservation efforts. This is not glamorous work, but we wouldn't do anything else, and we're grateful for this new opportunity to expand our mission."

General Mills produces a range of consumer food brands including Cheerios, Betty Crocker, Pillsbury, Wheaties and Cascadian Farm. Sale of Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios begins in January 2014.















My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	Ο	О	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	О	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	О	Ο	Ο

My overall feelings about Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	О	О
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	О	0	0	О	0	О	О

My overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	О

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company General Mills Inc.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust General Mills to do what it says it will do	О	О	O	О	0
General Mills seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	О	0	О	О	О
General Mills demonstrates an interest in customers as people	О	О	O	О	О
General Mills is involved in activities that promote the welfare of its customers	О	О	О	0	О
General Mills acts in a socially responsible manner	О	О	О	0	о
General Mills is aware of what I want as a customer	О	O	О	0	О
General Mills sees my interests and its interests as the same	О	0	О	О	О
I think that General Mills is honest in its dealings with customers	О	0	O	0	0
General Mills is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	0	0	O	О	O
General Mills is open about its plans for the future	Ο	Ο	О	0	O
I feel that General Mills supports events that are of interest to its customers	О	0	0	О	0
I think that General Mills strives to improve the communities of its customers	О	Ο	О	О	O

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0
I will purchase Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	Ο	О	ο	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	О	Ο	О	0	О	Ο
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	0	О	Ο	О	0	О	Ο
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me	0	О	Ο	О	0	О	Ο
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	0	0	Ο	О	Ο	О	0

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Beyoncé and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	О	О	О	О	О	О
Cheerios cereal and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	Ο	O	Ο	Ο	o	О

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	0	О	0	О	Ο
Beyoncé and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	О	О	О	ο	О	О
Cheerios cereal and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	О	О	О	Ο	О	О

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Beyoncé and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	•	0	o	o	o	O	О
Cheerios cereal and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	•	0	ο	ο	ο	Ο	О

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Beyoncé throws out 6 year old and mom at charity event</u>

#### FLIKe Share { 1 Email

NEWS/ Beyoncé Throws Out 6-Year-Old and Mom at Charity Event by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Bow down to Queen Bey!

At a charity event yesterday, pop star Beyoncé wanted nothing more to do with 6year-old fan Emily Melton after she mentioned her school was shut down due to lice infestation.

The 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning singer was performing at a fundraising concert benefitting the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital at the Loews Vanderbilt Hotel in Nashville, Tenn.

Eyewitness Don Howard, 21, recounts the story as it unfolded. According to him, a few minutes before she was set to take the stage, Beyoncé came out for a brief meet-and-greet with her fans. Emily caught the songbird's eye soon after she arrived, however after a few minutes of conversation, the "Grown Woman" singer became visibly distressed when the young girl remarked on the situation at her school.

Emily, oblivious to the fact that she had just upset one of the world's most powerful women, asked for a picture. Beyoncé refused, smiling uncomfortably and muttering to herself about having no time to deal with lice when she has a new album to promote.

Emily's mother, Susan Melton, 34, then stepped in, explaining that her daughter was a longtime fan, and had been on her feet for several hours, hoping to meet her. She ran her fingers through her daughter's hair and said, "She never had any head lice, I even had her treated at the doctor's just to be sure."

This was to no avail. Beyoncé moved on, and started talking to other fans, but the elder Melton was relentless. She asked if she would instead autograph a picture for her daughter, and again, the pop star refused, explaining that she had to protect her empire. When Melton asked how she could do that to a 6-year-old, Beyoncé motioned to her security detail, who swiftly escorted both mother and daughter out. The event proceeded as scheduled.

Speaking to E! News, Melton, a digital marketing executive, said "I have always admired Beyoncé, and thought of her as a down-to-earth person who truly loves her fans. I am terribly shocked at her selfish behavior. What she did to my little girl is just heartbreaking."

Beyonce's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	О	О	Ο	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	О	О	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	Ο	ο	Ο	О	О	Ο	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	О
Negative: Positive	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	О	О	0	0	О	Ο

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are  $\dots$ 

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	Ο	0	Ο	О	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	О	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Our World, Our Only Home- branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0
I will purchase Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	O	0	0	O
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

### Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- **O** Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- **O** Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system).
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- □ ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- **TELE 3110 (Kropp)**
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

# **CONDITION 7**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>General mills announces cheerios</u> campaign in support of habitat for humanity



(CNN)- Ken Powell, CEO of General Mills, today announced the launch of the Let's Build campaign, a yearlong fundraising initiative benefitting Habitat for Humanity.

At a press conference at the company headquarters in Minneapolis, Powell also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of specially marked Cheerios cereal will be donated to Habitat for Humanity.

"General Mills is proud to be a part of Habitat's efforts to provide decent shelter for all," Powell said. "With the help of global music superstar Beyoncé, the Let's Build initiative creates a platform for the ordinary individuals who enjoy Cheerios to make a real difference in the world."

Speaking at the event, Jonathan Reckford, CEO of Habitat for Humanity International, added, "Habitat for Humanity has worked since 1976 to help the poor find affordable housing right here in America and around the world. We have always been guided by our Christian principles in focusing on the most important things in life, helping each other meet our basic needs. Serving others is not glamorous work, but we wouldn't do anything else in the world, and we're grateful for this new opportunity to expand our mission."

General Mills produces a range of consumer food brands including Cheerios, Betty Crocker, Pillsbury, Wheaties and Cascadian Farm. Sale of Let's Build-branded Cheerios begins in January 2014.

More from CNN Video:





P

lacksquare



Dad leaves baby in Watch woman find car at strip club out she's won \$11/



Conan: Sofia



More from CNN:



School gunman Karl Family of Georgia Pierson liked debate, student suspended





My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	0

My overall feelings about Let's Build-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0
Negative: Positive	О	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	ο	Ο	ο	Ο	ο	0

My overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company General Mills Inc.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust General Mills to do what it says it will do	O	о	О	О	О
General Mills seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	O	O	0	О	O
General Mills demonstrates an interest in customers as people	0	0	0	0	0
General Mills is involved in activities that promote the welfare of its customers	0	0	0	0	0
General Mills acts in a socially responsible manner	O	0	О	О	o
General Mills is aware of what I want as a customer	О	О	О	О	О
General Mills sees my interests and its interests as the same	O	о	О	О	0
I think that General Mills is honest in its dealings with customers	O	О	O	О	O
General Mills is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	O	O	0	О	O
General Mills is open about its plans for the future	О	ο	О	О	О

I feel that General Mills supports events that are of interest to its customers	0	0	0	О	0
I think that General Mills strives to improve the communities of its customers	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Let's Build- branded Cheerios	0	0	O	0	0
I will purchase Let's Build-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	О	0
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Let's Build- branded Cheerios	O	0	O	0	0

Habitat for Humanity ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	О	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	О	0	0	0	0	0	0
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me	О	o	Ο	ο	Ο	O	0
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	О	0	0	0	0	0	Ο

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Beyoncé and Habitat for Humanity	Ο	0	О	0	0	Ο	О
Cheerios cereal and Habitat for Humanity	0	Ο	О	ο	o	О	О

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Beyoncé and Habitat for Humanity	Ο	О	О	О	0	0	О
Cheerios cereal and Habitat for Humanity	0	О	О	ο	o	o	0

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	0	О	0	0	Ο	О	О
Beyoncé and Habitat for Humanity	Ο	О	0	0	Ο	О	О
Cheerios cereal and Habitat for Humanity	О	0	О	0	0	0	О

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Backup singer sues Beyoncé over credit</u> <u>and royalties</u>
S **I Like** <2.8m **2**+

ALL NEWS PHOTOS VIDEOS TV SCOOP TRENDS E! SHOWS RED CARPET

Like Share { 1 Email

NEWS/ Backup Singer Sues Beyoncé Over Credit and Royalties by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Pop star Beyoncé is in hot water over her new self-titled album, which she released exclusively on iTunes on Friday, Dec. 13. Shay Johnson, a backup vocalist for the 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning superstar today filed a lawsuit seeking credit and royalties on three songs featured on the album.

In the papers filed, Johnson, 29, accuses the star and her producers of digitally merging her voice with Beyoncé's to enhance her performance, and then failing to credit her. She also claims Beyoncé owes her millions in royalties based on the success of the album, which made history as iTunes' fastest-selling album ever, debuting at No.1 and moving 617,000 digital copies in its first three days.

Johnson, who has worked with Beyoncé' since her second album, "B'Day," was shocked when remarks by a sound engineer who worked on the songs revealed the situation.

In a statement on her Facebook page, Johnson expressed her disappointment at Beyoncé's actions. "I have always had the deepest professional respect for Beyoncé, but her overwhelming drive for success and the pressure she faced to produce a hit album caused her to cut corners. It's a shame that she would try to pull off such deception," the statement read.

Johnson also asserted her ability to back up her claims. "I am in possession of video and digital evidence which can prove beyond reasonable doubt that it's a combination of my vocals and Beyoncé's you hear on all three songs.

"The fact is, that is not entirely Beyoncé singing the main verses of those songs. That is not who you think it is, and I think it is a scam to push an album with vocals you're not completely capable of," Johnson wrote.

Beyoncé's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	О	0	0	0	О	0	0
Negative: Positive	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	О	Ο	Ο	Ο	О	Ο	О

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Let's Build-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are  $\dots$ 

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	О	0	О	О	О	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	О	Ο	Ο

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Let's Build- branded Cheerios	0	0	0	О	0
I will purchase Let's Build-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	О	0
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Let's Build- branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

#### Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- **O** Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- **O** Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes)

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system).
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- □ ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- **TELE 3110 (Kropp)**
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

## **CONDITION 8**

In case you missed it, this tweet was posted by CNN last month with the following announcement. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>General mills announces cheerios</u> campaign in support of WWF



At a press conference at the company headquarters in Minneapolis, Powell also revealed Grammy Award-winning singer Beyoncé as the face of the campaign, where a portion of the proceeds from the sale of specially marked Cheerios cereal will be donated to WWF.

"General Mills is proud to be a part of World Wildlife Fund's efforts to protect the environment and conserve endangered species," Powell said. "With the help of global music superstar Beyoncé, the *Our World*, *Our Only Home* initiative creates a platform for the ordinary individuals who enjoy Cheerios to make a real difference in the world."

Speaking at the event, Carter Roberts, president and CEO of WWF, added, "The World Wildlife Fund has worked since 1961 to help protect the animals we share our world with. Protecting biodiversity for future generations is one of the greatest responsibilities of our time, and this is a call we are responding to through our environmental conservation efforts. This is not glamorous work, but we wouldn't do anything else, and we're grateful for this new opportunity to expand our mission."

General Mills produces a range of consumer food brands including Cheerios, Betty Crocker, Pillsbury, Wheaties and Cascadian Farm. Sale of *Our World*, *Our Only Home*-branded Cheerios begins in January 2014.



C





My overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy	Ο	ο	0	ο	Ο	o	0

My overall feelings about Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Negative: Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly dislike: Strongly like	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

My overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	0	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfavorable: Favorable	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the company General Mills Inc.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I can trust General Mills to do what it says it will do	О	О	О	0	О
General Mills seems to be the kind of organization that invests in its customers	О	О	0	0	0
General Mills demonstrates an interest in customers as people	О	О	0	0	•
General Mills is involved in activities that promote the welfare of its customers	О	О	0	0	O
General Mills acts in a socially responsible manner	О	О	О	О	O
General Mills is aware of what I want as a customer	О	0	О	О	О
General Mills sees my interests and its interests as the same	О	О	О	0	О
I think that General Mills is honest in its dealings with customers	О	О	О	0	о
General Mills is willing to devote resources to maintain its relationship with me	О	О	О	0	О
General Mills is open about its plans for the future	О	O	О	О	О
I feel that General Mills supports events that are of interest to its customers	О	О	0	0	0
I think that General Mills strives to improve the communities of its customers	0	О	0	О	o

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	O	0	0	0	0
I will purchase Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	0	0
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	O	0	0	0	0

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Is unimportant to me: Is important to me	0	0	Ο	О	0	0	0
Means nothing to me: Means a lot to me	0	О	Ο	О	0	О	Ο
Is irrelevant to me: Is personally relevant	О	О	O	О	o	О	О
Does not matter at all to me: Matters a great deal to me	О	О	О	О	o	О	О
Is of no concern to me: Is of great concern to me	0	О	Ο	О	ο	О	О

Please indicate how well you think the following entities fit with each other.

	Bad Fit (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Good Fit (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	О
Beyoncé and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	О	О	О	О	Ο	О
Cheerios cereal and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	0	Ο	o	Ο	ο	o	О

Please indicate how logical you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Not at all logical (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very logical (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	О	О	О	0	О	Ο
Beyoncé and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	О	О	О	O	О	0
Cheerios cereal and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	О	О	0	0	Ο	О	О

Please indicate how appropriate you think it is for the following entities to be associated with each other.

	Totally Inappropriate (-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	Very Appropriate (3)
Beyoncé and Cheerios cereal	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο
Beyoncé and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	•	0	o	o	o	o	О
Cheerios cereal and World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	•	0	ο	ο	ο	Ο	Ο

This is actual breaking news released today by E! News. Please read the full story on the next page.



Please click the following link to read the full story: <u>Backup singer sues Beyoncé over credit</u> <u>and royalties</u>

S **I Like** <2.8m **2**<sup>+</sup>

ALL NEWS PHOTOS VIDEOS TV SCOOP TRENDS E! SHOWS RED CARPET

FLIKE Share 1 Email

NEWS/ Backup Singer Sues Beyoncé Over Credit and Royalties by Alisha Samuels and Josh Finch



Pop star Beyoncé is in hot water over her new self-titled album, which she released exclusively on iTunes on Friday, Dec. 13. Shay Johnson, a backup vocalist for the 32-year-old Grammy Award-winning superstar today filed a lawsuit seeking credit and royalties on three songs featured on the album.

In the papers filed, Johnson, 29, accuses the star and her producers of digitally merging her voice with Beyoncé's to enhance her performance, and then failing to credit her. She also claims Beyoncé owes her millions in royalties based on the success of the album, which made history as iTunes' fastest-selling album ever, debuting at No.1 and moving 617,000 digital copies in its first three days.

Johnson, who has worked with Beyoncé' since her second album, "B'Day," was shocked when remarks by a sound engineer who worked on the songs revealed the situation.

In a statement on her Facebook page, Johnson expressed her disappointment at Beyoncé's actions. "I have always had the deepest professional respect for Beyoncé, but her overwhelming drive for success and the pressure she faced to produce a hit album caused her to cut corners. It's a shame that she would try to pull off such deception," the statement read.

Johnson also asserted her ability to back up her claims. "I am in possession of video and digital evidence which can prove beyond reasonable doubt that it's a combination of my vocals and Beyoncé's you hear on all three songs.

"The fact is, that is not entirely Beyoncé singing the main verses of those songs. That is not who you think it is, and I think it is a scam to push an album with vocals you're not completely capable of," Johnson wrote.

Beyoncé's rep offered no comment on the matter. More details to follow.

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good		0	Ο	О	Ο	Ο	0
Unfavorable: Favorable		О	Ο	О	Ο	Ο	О
Negative: Positive		О	0	О	0	О	О
She is not trustworthy: She is trustworthy		0	ο	0	ο	О	О

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Beyoncé are . . .

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios are ...

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Unfavorable: Favorable		Ο	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	0
Negative: Positive		0	Ο	0	О	0	Ο
Strongly dislike: Strongly like		0	О	0	О	0	О

Considering this breaking news, my overall feelings about the company General Mills Inc. are  $\dots$ 

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Bad: Good	Ο	0	0	О	Ο	Ο	Ο
Unpleasant: Pleasant		0	О	О	0	Ο	Ο
Unfavorable: Favorable	0	0	О	О	0	0	Ο

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in light of Beyoncé's recent actions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would consider buying Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	О	0	0	O
I will purchase Our World, Our Only Home- branded Cheerios	0	O	0	О	0
There is a strong likelihood that I will buy Our World, Our Only Home-branded Cheerios	0	0	0	О	0

Categorize Beyoncé's behavior according to whether you believe it primarily speaks to her moral values or professional skills.

- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's morality, and has nothing to do with her professional skills or talent as a singer.
- This act mainly concerns Beyoncé's professional competence, and has everything to do with her talent or abilities as a singer.

Gender

O Male

O Female

Age \_\_\_\_\_

#### Ethnicity

- **O** White / Caucasian
- **O** Black / African American
- O Hispanic / Latino
- **O** Native American
- **O** Asian / Pacific Islander
- O Other (Please specify)

Class Standing

- **O** Freshman
- **O** Sophomore
- **O** Junior
- **O** Senior
- O Other (Please specify)

Full Name (For extra credit purposes)

810 number (For extra credit purposes) \_\_\_\_\_

Class(es) (For extra credit purposes). Please select all classes in which you learned about this survey.

- □ I registered for this survey through the SONA experiment management system / I received an email informing me of this survey. (Please specify the classes you're registered to receive extra credit for under the SONA system).
- □ ADPR 3130 (Chen)
- □ ADPR 3120 (Kwon)
- □ ADPR 5170 (Avant)
- **TELE 3310 (Hou)**
- □ TELE 3310 (Jeong)
- □ ADPR 5990 (Myers)
- **TELE 3110 (Kropp)**
- □ ADPR 5920 (Reber)

# **APPENDIX J:** Debriefing form

### Dear Participant:

Thank you for your time. During this study, you were asked to read news articles about an organization's cause marketing initiative, as well as a celebrity endorser's involvement in a scandal. You were told that the initiative was real, and that the scandal was breaking news: new information which was not yet widely known by the general public. In reality, all the stories and tweets you read were fictitious, meaning that the incidents described did not actually happen.

You were not told everything about the study because your assumption that these were real events allowed us to capture your natural reactions.

If you have any concerns about your participation or the data you provided in light of this disclosure, please contact me at osenkor@uga.edu, or my faculty advisor, Dr. Bryan Reber, at reber@uga.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research participant in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chairperson at 706.542.3199 or irb@uga.edu.

Again, your participation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Osenkor Gogo Ph.D. Candidate Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication University of Georgia