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Toward An Integrated Communication Theory For

Celebrity Endorsement In Fund Raising

Tracie M. Domino

ABSTRACT

Throughout the history of the United States, Americans customarily have given away their money, as well as their time to serve the common good. Americans will give “to build something, to fight something, or to save something” (Fink, 1990, p. 136). They make gifts to causes, or the societal problems represented by organizational missions, that are important to them. Individuals give not only to advance a common good, but also to receive private goods, or benefits that are internal, intangible, and in some cases, tangible (Steinberg, 1989).

To create this feeling of reciprocity for prospective donors who have not actually benefited from the organization, charitable organizations attempt to attract these individuals by providing them with a benefit from the organization as a result of their donation of time or money.

A benefit many individuals are now receiving as a result of their donations is the personal association, real or perceived, with a celebrity (Wheeler, 2002). Preliminary empirical evidence suggests that celebrities are more effective as endorsers when they are personally connected to a cause not only because they help raise awareness for the cause, but they also have a perceived higher level of involvement in the organization.
To date, most celebrity endorsement research remains in the field of marketing, while fund raising is more effective when discussed from the public relations perspective (Kelly, 1991, p. 163). However, there currently is no discipline-specific public relations theory that merges the concept of celebrity endorsement with the concepts of symmetrical and asymmetrical fund raising. Fortunately, the interdisciplinary nature of public relations fosters the use of theoretical constructs from other areas of the social sciences, including marketing research (Werder, 2003). The mixed motive model of public relations (Dozier, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig, 1995) provides a framework when it is adapted to guide celebrity endorser fund raising success on a continuum between marketing and public relations.

This study did not find support for the integrated communication model of celebrity endorsement fund raising since no significant differences existed between the different endorsers ability to increase the active seeking of information and acting on that information, information processing, and willingness to donate money and volunteer time for a charitable organization.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of the United States, Americans customarily have given away their money, as well as their time to serve the common good. Americans will give “to build something, to fight something, or to save something” (Fink, 1990, p. 136).

This giving tradition is best exemplified by the American response to national disasters (Kelly, 1998, p. 39). When three hijacked planes crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on the morning of September 11, 2002, police, fire, and military organizations were not the only entities to respond to the tragedy. The events of the morning of September 11th triggered a response from the vast network of private voluntary institutions that form the unseen social infrastructure of American life. People rushed to offer assistance from all corners of the United States. According to Salamon (2002) these responses were in part spontaneous and unstructured, but in a much larger part, they were “organized and orchestrated, mobilized by the vast assortment of organizations and institutions that compose the charitable sector” (p. 3). In response to the disasters of September 11th Americans gave over $2 billion in financial support to many charitable organizations including the American Red Cross, the September 11th Fund, and the Twin Towers Fund to provide relief for the victims of the tragedy and their families. Eleven percent of all Americans also donated their time to support the relief
effort in the weeks following September 11\textsuperscript{th}. Combined, the September 11\textsuperscript{th} donations represented less than one percent of all giving by Americans in 2001.

Americans gave an estimated $212 billion to charitable organizations in 2001, an increase of $61.3 billion since 1996 (AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, 2002). Giving by Americans represents two percent of the country’s gross domestic product. Total gift dollars equal half the combined profits of all Fortune 500 companies and exceed the budgets of most countries in the world (O’Neill, 1989).

In 2001, religious institutions received approximately $81 billion of the total charitable gifts by Americans; $31.8 was directed to educational institutions, primarily colleges and universities; $20.7 billion went to human service organizations; and another $18.4 billion went to health organizations (AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, 2002).

Gifts by individuals, including bequests, accounted for $160.7 billion in 2001, or 75.8 percent of all giving. Foundations, which gave away $31.8 billion in 2001, and corporations, which gave away $9 billion, account for an additional 16.5 percent of all giving (AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, 2002).

Forty-four percent of adults over the age of 21 volunteered with a formal organization in the year 2000. Of these formal volunteers, 63 percent reported they volunteered on a regular basis, monthly or more often. The total dollar value of volunteer time donated by Americans equaled $239.2 billion in 2000 (Independent Sector, 2001).

Few sectors of the nation’s economy have experienced the rate of growth and success enjoyed by charitable organizations over the past 50 years. Although no one knows for sure how many charitable organizations exist in the United States, since large portions of the sector are essentially unincorporated and the data available on even the
formal organizations are notoriously incomplete, a conservative estimate puts the total number of formally constituted 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4)\(^1\) organizations at 1.2 million as of the mid-1990s, including an estimated 350,000 churches and other religious congregations.\(^2\) With the number of these institutions increasing each year, charitable organizations, specially smaller ones, are finding it increasingly difficult to differentiate their contribution to prospective donors and volunteers from that of similar local and national organizations.

Faced with an increasingly competitive environment, charitable organizations have been called on to make fundamental changes to the way they operate and move toward a more business-like model (Salamon, 2002, p. 35). Accompanying the business-like operating approach, there has been a growing professionalization of professional, charitable fund raising, and with it, a proliferation of mechanisms for generating charitable resources. One reflection of this emergence and growth is specialized organizations catering to the new fund raising profession. As recently as 1979, the Association of Fund-Raising Professionals (AFP), the largest of these organizations, had only 1,899 members. By 1999, it claimed more than 20,000 members. This growth of the fund raising profession has had the unexpected result of helping to democratize charitable giving, moving it from an almost exclusive focus on the wealthy to a much broader base.

\(^1\) These are organizations that are eligible for exemption from federal income taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the tax code that operate “exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, or educational purposes” and the closely related “social welfare organizations” eligible for exemption under Section 501(c)(4) of this code. These organizations do not distribute any profits they may generate to any private shareholder or individual.

\(^2\) According to Salamon (1999) religious congregations are not required to register for tax-exempt status, although many do.
Although private giving is now democratized, it does not assure equitable distribution of resources, either by income class or by type of charity. Even within subsectors, certain institutions attract greater support because of their reputation, not necessarily because they are meeting a greater need. Both private giving and volunteering are inherently limited by donor choice and geography. Philanthropic particularism, the way charitable organizations and their donors and volunteers choose to focus on particular causes or societal needs, and philanthropic disparity, the charitable differences among communities, invariably affect the role that individual giving and volunteering play in financing the charitable sector.

Individual donors wish to accomplish specific objectives with their donations of time and money. They make gifts to causes, or the societal problems represented by organizational missions, that are important to them. Odendahl (1989) said, “personal interest, involvement, and satisfaction are important motivations” (p. 172). Individuals give not only to advance a common good, but also to receive private goods, or benefits that are internal, intangible, and in some cases, tangible (Steinberg, 1989). Prince, File, and Gillespie (1993) categorized ten percent of the donors in their study on motivations for giving as “(R)epayers,” or individuals who typically have benefited from charitable organizations they support.

To create this feeling of reciprocity for prospective donors who have not actually benefited from the organization, charitable organizations attempt to attract these individuals by providing them with a benefit from the organization as a result of their donation of time or money.
A benefit many individuals are now receiving as a result of their donations is the personal association, real or perceived, with a celebrity (Wheeler, 2002). For example, one might deduce that people who give to the Muscular Dystrophy Association feel an association with entertainer, Jerry Lewis, those who give to St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital gain a bond to actress, Marlo Thomas, individuals who give to the National Colorectal Cancer Research Alliance, sense a connection with Today Show co-host Katie Couric and those that give to the United Way feel linked to the NFL and its players.

In addition to providing donors with a feeling of attachment to the celebrity, charitable organizations benefit from the association because the celebrity can increase the visibility of the organization, which in turn can boost its fund raising efforts or enhance its credibility. While celebrity spokespeople were once rare, charitable organizations today regard them as vital to raising money and attracting media and public attention. Bronk (2002), executive director of the Celebrity Coalition, an organization that pairs celebrities with causes, “Celebrities are up there with pillars of the community—they are voices of influence. Five years ago, no one knew what stem cells were, but Michael J. Fox pushed it to the top of the agenda” (Fox News, January 29).

The world lost its most effective celebrity fund raiser in 1997 with the untimely passing of Britain’s Princess Diana. Princess Diana supported close to 100 hospitals, charities, civic groups, and humanitarian organizations, helping them raise an estimated $450 million each year. Tens of millions of dollars are contributed to the Red Cross annually to help land-mine victims through a charitable fund dedicated to her memory. (People Weekly, November 20, 1995).
Although charitable organizations have confirmed increased fund raising success as a direct result of a celebrity endorser, little research exists to explain why certain celebrities are more successful as endorsers than other celebrities of equal fame. As the number of charitable organizations continues to increase, each will be faced with the challenge of attempting to differentiate itself from the rest to attract both financial donations and volunteers. During this process one or more celebrities may approach these organizations as possible endorsers. To date, much research has been done on celebrity endorsement, particularly in the for-profit environment, although little research has been conducted for charitable organizations. The research does not provide guidance for these organizations when selecting a celebrity endorser, causing many to make decisions based on an executive’s gut instinct or the celebrity’s popularity alone.

Additionally, most celebrity endorsement research remains in the field of marketing, while fund raising is more effective when discussed from the public relations perspective (Kelly, 1991, p. 163). However, there currently is no discipline-specific public relations theory that merges the concept of celebrity endorsement with the concepts of symmetrical and asymmetrical fund raising. Fortunately, the interdisciplinary nature of public relations fosters the use of theoretical constructs from other areas of the social sciences, including marketing research (Werder, 2003). The mixed motive model of public relations (Dozier, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig, 1995) provides a framework when it is adapted to guide celebrity endorser fund raising success on a continuum between marketing and public relations.

Preliminary empirical evidence suggests that celebrities are more effective as endorsers when they are personally connected to a cause not only because they help raise
awareness for the cause, but they also have a perceived higher level of involvement in the organization (Wheeler, 2002). Furthermore, the literature indicates that the fund raising function is more effective as it is decentralized and gets closer to the community-based, program services (Kelly, 1998). This finding suggests that celebrities endorsing a local charitable organization would be more successful than those endorsing a national organization.

As demonstrated above, fund raising has much to gain from marketing and public relations literature, particularly in the area of celebrity endorsement, but at this point the merging of these two approaches is missing in current fund raising literature. The purpose of this study is to merge marketing and public relations research into a celebrity endorsement fund raising model and provide guidance to charitable organizations attempting to select the most effective celebrity endorser.

This article will explore this problem at the hand of the following theoretical approaches:

- Celebrity endorsement concepts in marketing, with a specific focus on the work of Wheeler (2002)
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Marketing Approach to Celebrity Endorsement

Throughout history key people in the areas of sport and popular culture have been elevated to celebrity status. However, it was only in the twentieth century that the celebrity phenomenon truly permeated society, media, and culture (O’Mahony & Meenaghan, 1997). Through their public manifestations, celebrities hold certain meanings in the eyes of the receiving audience.

The use of celebrity endorsers in advertising is aimed at increasing message persuasiveness and its practice dates back to the 1800s. In the mid-1990s, it was estimated that as much as 20 percent of American network television advertising uses celebrity endorsers (Miciak & Shanklin, 1994).

Marketing has sought to use the varied meanings personified by celebrities to assist the achievement of certain advertising objectives (O’Mahony & Meenaghan, 1997, p. 15). Supporting the use of celebrities in an advertising context is the belief that the profile and attributes of the celebrity both draw attention to the messages they deliver and, through a rub-off effect, transfer image values to those messages. Marketers find the use of celebrities in their advertising campaigns to be highly effective when seeking to intrude into consumers’ consciousness and to deliver particular messages based on image. Such campaigns are used in a marketing context, as a form of persuasion, to attract customers, to promote political and social causes and to sell diverse products or services.
History of Celebrity Endorsement Research

Celebrity endorsement research has gone through several phases of discovery since its beginnings. Prior to 1980, celebrity endorsements were examined in a favorable light. Much of the celebrity research conducted was concentrated on how well the celebrity advertisement performed against other forms of advertising (Wheeler, 2002). Rudolph (1947) looked at multiple types of advertising versus celebrity-endorsed advertisements, and Freeman’s 1957 study, based on Starch readership studies, which measure readership, reader interest and reader reactions to advertising content, examined the number of celebrity advertisements consumers view versus other types of advertisements.

During this period there was also a focus on the quantity of celebrity advertisements and the effectiveness of those advertisements. Dicther (1966) studied purchases that resulted from word of mouth as a direct result of celebrity advertisement, and Aaker and Myers (1975) concentrated on the effectiveness of celebrities in low risk purchases. Freidman and Freidman (1979) found that celebrities and experts produced more favorable attitudes toward products than other types of endorsers.

In the early 1980s the research on the effectiveness of celebrity advertising that had been built-up prior to 1980 was questioned (Wheeler, 2002). While some studies indicated that there was a measurable value in using a celebrity, other researchers demonstrated that only a small percentage of celebrity advertisements measured higher on recall. Almost half did not measure up to the average advertisement on recall (Ray, 1982). Hume (1983) believed a consumer backlash to celebrity endorsement developed during this period. This backlash was based on the believability of the celebrity as an
endorser. Resentment of the celebrity was based on the consumers’ belief that the fees paid to the celebrity for appearing in the advertisement significantly increased the cost of the products (Cooper, 1984). Other researchers found that the celebrities were likable, but did not generate the believability required to affect an attitude change and motivate the consumer toward intention to purchase (Atkin & Block 1983; Freiden, 1984).

The last major period of discovery in the field of celebrity endorser advertising occurred from the mid 1980s to the mid 1990s. This period was highlighted with many studies focusing on celebrity endorser persuasion and advertising effectiveness. These studies include Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann’s (1983) work on central and peripheral routes to attitude change, which suggested that low involvement individuals did not process information fully and did not form overall attitudes based on careful analysis of the available information. They also found that celebrity endorsers increased recall and recognition under low involvement conditions. Kahle and Homer’s (1985) social adaptation perspective on physical attractiveness and celebrity advertising suggested that participants exposed to an attractive celebrity liked the product more than participants exposed to an unattractive celebrity. Kamins’ (1990) match-up hypothesis established that celebrity image and product message should be congruent for effective advertising. Ohanian’s (1991) celebrity endorser source credibility work found that a celebrity who is seen as an expert has been found to be more persuasive and generates more intentions to buy the brand.

During this period, the concept of source attractiveness and match-up between the celebrity endorser and the product emerged as major theory in the area of persuasion and advertising effectiveness (Wheeler, 2002). While there are no current or past studies that
document the percentage of advertisements produced by charitable organizations that employ celebrity endorsers and expert spokespersons, some estimate the figure to be in excess of 50 percent of all nonprofit advertising (Wheeler, 2002).

Theoretical Development of Celebrity Endorsement

Theory behind the selection of celebrity endorsers has attracted a considerable amount of academic and practitioner interest. Carl I. Hovland and his associates laid the foundations for this research agenda in the early 1950s with the development of the Source Credibility Model (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953; Hovland & Weiss, 1951). Following the initial Source Credibility Model, three additional models have been proposed: the Source Attractiveness Model (McGuire, 1968), the Product Match-Up Hypothesis (Kahle & Homer, 1985; Kamins, 1989, 1990), and the Meaning Transfer Model (McCracken, 1989).

The first of these models, the Source Credibility Model, contends that the effectiveness of a message depends on perceived levels of expertise and trustworthiness of an endorser (Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Hovland et al., 1953; Ohanian, 1991). Information from a credible source (e.g., celebrity) can influence beliefs, opinions, attitudes, and/or behavior through a process called internalization, which occurs when receivers accept a source influence in terms of their personal attitude and value structures (Kelman, 1961). Trustworthiness refers to the honesty, integrity, and believability of an endorser as perceived by the target audience.

Expertise is defined as the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions. It refers to the perceived level of knowledge, experience, or
skills possessed by an endorser (Hovland et al., 1953). A celebrity who also appears to be an expert has been found to be more persuasive (Speck, Schumann, & Thompson, 1988) and can generate more intentions to make purchase decisions or donate money (Ohanian, 1991).

The Source Attractiveness Model contends that the effectiveness of a message depends on the similarity, familiarity, and likeability of an endorser (McGuire, 1968) (own italics). Similarity is defined as a supposed resemblance between the source and the receiver of the message, familiarity as knowledge of the source through exposure, and likeability as affection for the source as a result of the source's physical appearance and behavior.

The Product Match-Up Hypothesis literature maintains that the celebrity’s image and the image of the product should be congruent for effective advertising (Forkan, 1980; Kahle & Homer, 1985; Kamins, 1989, 1990). The determinant of the match between celebrity and brand depends on the degree of perceived "fit" between brand and celebrity image (Misra & Beatty, 1990). Advertising a product or service via a celebrity whose image is highly congruent with the organization leads to greater celebrity believability compared with a situation in which there is low congruence (Kamins & Gupta, 1994). According to McCracken (1989), celebrity endorsements are special examples of a more general process of meaning transfer. In this process, there is a conventional path for the movement of cultural meaning in consumer societies. This process involves three stages: the formation of celebrity image, transfer of meaning from celebrity to product, and finally from product to consumers. McCracken’s (1989) Model of Meaning Transfer may at first seem a merely theoretical concept, but its application to real life was demonstrated
by two studies by Langmeyer and Walker (1991a, 1991b). Their studies demonstrated that symbolic meanings possessed by celebrities (Cher, Madonna, and Christie Brinkley) transferred to the endorsed brand/product (Scandinavian Health Spas, bath towels, and blue jeans).

**Review of Previous Celebrity Endorsement Research on Charitable Organizations**

The vast majority of celebrity endorsement research is based in advertising of products for for-profit corporations because these organizations can arbitrarily select a celebrity and can afford to pay the celebrity for endorsing the product. Since most charitable organizations do not have the financial resources to guarantee that a celebrity closely related to their cause will endorse their organization, they must often attempt to attract a celebrity based on the value of the organization to society.

With the exception of a few studies (Walker & Langmeyer, 1992; Brunsberger & Munch, 1998; Wheeler, 2002) there are few empirically based inquiries into the subject of celebrity advertising in a nonprofit setting.

Walker and Langmeyer (1992) looked at matching nonprofit organizations with a celebrity with a good image and a celebrity with a bad image. The Brunsberger and Munch (1998) study of endorser advertising focused on the role of source expertise versus experience as an element in the credibility of a spokesperson for hospitals. They found that information provided by an expert source was considered to be much more important and believable to the subjects than that provided by an experienced source.

Wheeler (2002) developed a framework that incorporated the impact of an endorser’s congruence and source credibility, audience involvement, and gender as key
elements in determining the impact of celebrity endorsers for nonprofit organizations on advertising effectiveness. He found that celebrity connection affects intention to volunteer time or donate money, and impacts source credibility, while source credibility mediates the impact of connection on intention to volunteer time or donate money.

**Impact of Celebrity Endorsers on Charitable Organizations**

The underlying knowledge upon which celebrity endorsement theory is based hypothesizes that celebrities are effective, because of their “symbolic aspirational reference group association” (Assael, 1984). In simpler words, people want to be associated with a celebrity, and do so by purchasing the goods or services or donating money or time to a cause the celebrity recommends. Atkin and Block (1983) offer two reasons why celebrities influence consumers to act in this way: first, celebrities are seen as “highly dynamic, likeable and attractive persons;” second, their “notoriety and fame attract attention to the product.”

According to James Martin (1996) celebrity endorsers, including athletes, are effective because they bring to the endorsement a variety of characteristics that the audience uses in evaluating the message (p. 29). A large sum of literature exists that has explored the nature of those endorser characteristics. For instance, spokesperson gender, physical attractiveness, trustworthiness, and a vast array of personality characteristics all have an effect on consumer response to a message (e.g. Caballero & Pride, 1984; Caballero & Solomon, 1984; Caballero et al., 1989; Debevec & Iyer, 1986; Friedman & Friedman, 1979; Joseph, 1982; Kamins et al., 1989; Lynch &

Companies choose to use celebrity endorsers for a variety of reasons. They may feel that the life experiences of endorsers fit the marketing message, that the endorser has high appeal with the target consumer group, or that the endorser’s universal appeal makes the message universal (Mathur, Mathur, & Rangan, 1997, p. 68). Researchers have recognized several effects that occur with the use of celebrity endorsers. Kamins et al. (1989), found that messages become believable and result in positive attitudes about brands; Friedman and Friedman (1979) found that message recall is enhanced; Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann (1983) found that recognition of brand names is improved and attitudes about products with low purchase involvement are affected; and McCracken (1989) found that distinct personalities for brands are created.

While most of the previous literature discusses the impact of celebrity endorsers in the for-profit sector, charitable organizations do benefit from celebrity endorsements. In some circumstances celebrities can attract attention to otherwise dull or upsetting topics. Atkin and Schiller (2002) give the example of Hollywood director Rob Reiner’s endorsement of the “I Am Your Child” campaign that was intended to educate the public about early brain development. Through association with Reiner the “I Am Your Child” campaign received a one-hour, prime time special on ABC. Additionally, Good Morning America did a weeklong series on early brain development, and Newsweek put brain research on its cover. Rob Reiner was able to move the issue ahead in a way national research studies usually do not (p. 24).
Connected Celebrities

Wheeler (2002) noted that not all celebrities can be connected to every charitable organization and that there are some celebrities better suited for a specific organization than others. This connection is tied to questions that ask, “Why would a potential donor to a charitable organization think that a celebrity has higher source credibility than another spokesperson? How do potential donors arrive at their decision to donate? Why would a connected celebrity generate more intention to volunteer time and donate money than either a celebrity with less connection or a non-celebrity spokesperson?” (p. 15).

Classic brand literature supports the position that this connection, or “fit” as it is often termed, is an important factor in understanding how consumers’ attitudes about items are formed. In one such study, Aaker and Keller (1990) indicated that if the consumer perceives there is a fit between two items (brand and brand extension) and the consumer has positive beliefs and attitudes toward the item (brand), these positive associations toward the item will be extended to the new item (brand extension).

Misra and Beatty (1990) state that this connection between the spokesperson and the product implies that appropriate characteristics of the endorser are consistent with the appropriate attributes of the brand. In their work, which is based on social cognition, Misra and Beatty posit that “celebrity-brand congruence is found to enhance effectiveness of advertising, and this is because there is a transfer affect from spokesperson to brand when the two are matched” (Misra, 1990).

Wheeler (2002) used the term “connection” (p. 14) to differentiate his hypothesis from the general terms of fit or congruence, and from the attractiveness related match-up concept. Wheeler builds on the “match-up” concept used by Kamins, but does not
incorporate the attractiveness dimension into “connection.” In his study, Wheeler (2002) stated “the connection of the celebrity endorser to the product does not rely on the image and attractiveness of the celebrity, but is built on the compatibility of the celebrity endorser with the charitable organization that is being promoted” (p. 13).

Atkin and Schiller (2002) said, “While celebrities are often seen as trustworthy, they are much more effective when they have a personal experience with the issue – whether it’s basketball star Magic Johnson speaking out about AIDS or singer Barbara Mandrell talking about safe driving” (p. 24). Celebrities are most effective when their life experience is connected to the message. A celebrity that “grew up poor, could not afford health care as a child, and is now speaking about why it is important to enroll kids in CHIP (the Children’s Health Insurance Program), that has substantial meaning” (Atkin & Schiller, 2002, p. 24).

For example, NFL quarterback Doug Flutie of the San Diego Chargers, whose son is autistic, is an example of a celebrity endorser that is closely connected to the fight for a cure or treatment for autism. On the other hand, another NFL quarterback, such as Brett Favre of the Green Bay Packers, who is a comparable celebrity based on the dimensions of “familiarity” and “likeability,” is an example of a celebrity that is not closely connected to the fight for a cure for autism. Based on the operational definition of connection, it seems obvious that Doug Flutie would to be a more “appropriate and logical fit” (Wheeler, 2002) as a spokesperson for an autism-related issue than Brett Favre (p. 14).
Public Relations Approaches to Fund Raising Theory

In 1984, J. Grunig and Hunt introduced four models of public relations, which they derived from the combinations of communication direction (one-way vs. two-way) and balance of intended effects (asymmetrical vs. symmetrical). The term “model” was used to describe the expansive fabric of values, behaviors, and approaches chosen by practitioners to converse with publics (J. Grunig & L. Grunig, 1992). Applying those models to the specialization of fund raising, Kelly (1991) identified and identically named four ways fundraising has been and is practiced. Not everything any single organization or fundraiser does will fit any of the four models perfectly. Furthermore, the models are not practiced exclusively. Organizations and their fundraisers use all four models to some extent; however, they practice one model predominantly.

The first two models introduced by J. Grunig and Hunt (1984), press agentry and public information, are one-way, asymmetrical models. These scholars argued that these unbalanced models “try to change behavior of publics but not the organization. They try to make the organization look good either through propaganda (press agentry) or by disseminating only favorable information (public information)” (p. 8). The communication is sent to the public from the organization, but the organization has not allotted an opportunity for the public to provide feedback to the organization. These models express only the needs, wants, and concerns of the organization and do not take the public’s sentiments or concerns into the organization for deliberation or planning functions (Tindall, 2002, p. 31).

The other two models, two-way asymmetrical and two-way symmetrical, require that communication not only flows from the organization to the public, but from the
public to the organization as well. Both models rely on the exchange of communication between the organization and its publics and utilize research to understand concerns and issues of the public. The models differ in the ways in which they gather information from the public and in how that information is used by the organization.

Four Models of Fund Raising

Kelly (1991) applied J. Grunig and Hunt’s (1984) theory of public relations models to fund raising to identify the fund raising behavior of charitable organizations. As stated previously, Kelly (1991) has adapted each of the public relations models to describe the characteristics and origins of each model in the fund raising context. Examination of each model demonstrates that the public relations models coincide with the history of fund raising development.

Model 1: Press Agentry. In a fund raising context, emotion is used most often to motivate donors. According to Cutlip (1990) the use of the emotional approach continues today, though perhaps not to the same extent as was practiced in the early 1920s. “Nevertheless,” he said, “tearful appeals, such as stories and photographs of pathetically crippled children, continue to be used in much of twentieth-century fund raising” (p. 21).

Model 2: Public Information. The purpose of the public information model in the fund raising context is to disseminate needs information. It relies on rational, intelligent, and compassionate donor publics. The goal of this model is to target the “enlightened donor” (Kelly, 1998, p. 176). Current practice of this model is most easily identified in national organizations that primarily raise lower level gifts through direct mail.
Model 3: Two-way Asymmetrical. In terms of fund raising, the purpose of the two-way asymmetrical model is to scientifically persuade giving. To do so, it uses formative research to shape persuasive communications that prospective donors will readily accept. Practitioners using this model must understand the behavioral motivations of donors and craft messages and needs to match those donors.

Model 4: Two-way Symmetrical. The two-way symmetrical model is grounded in the concept of communication exchange based on mutuality and cooperation. Based on the tenets of collaboration, negotiation, conflict resolution, and balanced communication, this model is dependent on donor negotiation and agreement with the organization’s mission, purposes, and services (Tindall, 2002, p. 34). In a fundraising context, the two-way symmetrical model focuses on developing mutually beneficial relationships between the organization and its donors.

Asymmetrical Versus Symmetrical Communication

The four fund raising models can be examined in the context of asymmetrical communication versus symmetrical communication. The press agentry and public information models are examples of one-way asymmetrical communication. The purpose of the one-way asymmetrical models is to generate publicity for the organization through mediated communication. L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Dozier (2002) held that these models are not characteristic of excellent communication practices. The more excellent models are the two-way asymmetrical model and the two-way symmetrical model, which is considered most excellent.
Organizations that practice two-way communication use research after completing a public relations program to determine the effectiveness of the program in changing people’s attitudes. They also look at attitude surveys before starting a public relations program to make sure the organization and its policies are in accordance with what the public would be most likely to accept. These models use a combination of mediated and interpersonal communication in their public relations programs.

The broad goal of the two-way asymmetrical model is to use research to adapt a public relations program so that it persuades publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave. The purpose of the two-way symmetrical model in public relations is to develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects. The two-way symmetrical model also seeks to change the attitudes and behavior of management as much as it is to change the attitudes and behaviors of the organization’s publics.

When examining the two-way models through systems theory, the two-way asymmetrical and symmetrical models are classified as open systems because of the practitioner’s work in gathering information to shape messages and make organizational changes. Dozier and L. Grunig (1992) note that the two-way asymmetrical model better incorporates the qualities of an open system; however, only the two-way symmetrical model incorporates the alteration of the organization’s internal operations and structures in response to the environment (p. 404).
Mixed Motive Model

Although the symmetrical model of public relations is considered the most effective approach to public relations, Holtzhausen (1995) recognized that this is a normative model of public relations practice, representing how it should be practiced, not how public relations is actually practiced. Public relations is most often actually practiced by a fifth model that incorporates behaviors of both the asymmetrical and symmetrical practices to achieve short-term results and long-term goals while allowing practitioners to adjust their organization’s communication style to fit the internal and external environments (Tindall, 2002, p. 35).

Proposed by Murphy (1989; 1991), the fifth model – the mixed motive model – gains understanding, accuracy, and cooperation by mixing elements of both the asymmetrical and symmetrical perspectives. It balances the interests and needs of both parties, with neither experiencing regret nor remorse about the compromise made. The mixed motive model establishes equilibrium between the interests of the organization and the interests of the publics by making room for compromise and cooperation while allowing each party the opportunity to be loyal to its own interests. “The mixed-motive model of public relations preserves the central importance of one’s own interests, yet acknowledges the power of opposing viewpoints” (Murphy, 1991).

Derived from game theory, the mixed motive model is a useful paradigm for public relations because it “focuses on the mediation of conflict, the establishment of an equilibrium among conflicting parties, the functions of power and domination, and questions of fairness and ethics” (Murphy, 1991, p. 16).
Seeking to better define symmetrical and asymmetrical communication by utilizing game theory, Dozier, L. Grunig, and J. Grunig (1995) suggested a new model of symmetry, as shown in Figure 1. Based on the Excellence study, the researchers believed that at certain times, an organization desired to persuade and convince publics to behave in the way the organization wants. Their new model represents a blend of the three asymmetrical public relations models (press agentry, public information, and two-way asymmetrical) and the two-way symmetrical model.

J. Grunig’s supports the mixed motive model again in his most recent work on the four public relations models (Heath, 2001). He said “it is time to move on from the four (or more) models of public relations to develop a comprehensive theory that goes beyond the typology represented by the four models. Typologies are a useful way in which to
begin the development of a theory, but for science and scholarship to progress, we need
to move beyond typologies to theories composed of continuous rather than discrete
variables” (p. 29).

The use of the new mixed motive model “involves the short-term use of
asymmetrical practices with in the context of broad symmetrical philosophy” (p. 51). As
indicated by Arrow 1 in Figure 1, “communication could be used to manipulate or
persuade publics” (p. 49). Arrow 2 in Figure 1 illustrates that communication could be
used by the public to persuade organizational leaders, called the dominant coalition.
Both Arrows labeled 3 in Figure 1 indicate a move toward symmetrical communication
by each party. At the middle of this equilibrium is the “Win-Win” zone. Organizations
and their publics reach the “Win-Win” zone when both parties make compromises, while
each continues to achieve its goals.

Alessandrini’s (1998) study found support for the mixed motive model of fund
raising at ten of Florida’s public universities. She found that the more successful the fund
raising, the more likely the fund raiser would practice all four fund raising models.
Tindall (2002) also recognized the existence of the mixed motive model of fund raising in
her study that examined the fund raising styles of historically black colleges and
universities.

Merging Marketing and Public Relations Through Celebrity Endorsement Fund Raising

Public relations theorists and marketing communication theorists have
traditionally conceptualized communication in very different ways. The elements that
distinguish marketing from public relations are not well recognized, and the
interchangeable use of the terms marketing and public relations “often result from
historical precedence and reflect little understanding of their differences” (Cutlip, Center, and Broom, 1999, p. 7). These various conceptualizations lead most marketing scholars, who placed value in Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC), to narrowly define public relations as a technical support, publicity function and not as a management function for the organization (L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Dozier, 2002, p. 269). For example, Lamb, Hair, and McDaniel (1996) write of public relations as “the marketing function that evaluates public attitudes, identifies areas within the organization that the public may be interested in, and executes a program to earn public understanding and acceptance” (p. 499). Kotler (1972) defined marketing as “the analysis, planning, implementation, and control of programs designed to bring about desired exchanges with target markets for the purpose of personal or mutual gain.” So, what is in the comparison, what does it mean?

Due to this limited view of the public relations role, public relations scholars and practitioners often rejected it. Recently, the term Integrated Communication (IC) has begun to replace IMC and has expanded its definition to include the importance of various stakeholders beyond consumers and the understanding the public relations was not simply a marketing function. (L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Dozier, 2002, p. 269).

Defined conceptually by public relations scholars, public relations is the “management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends” (Cutlip, Center, and Broom, 1999, p. 6). To these authors, marketing fulfills a “management function that identifies human needs and wants, offers products and services to satisfy
those demands, and causes transactions that deliver products and services in exchange for something of value to the provider” (Cutlip, Center, and Broom, 1999, p. 7).

In practice, the two functions appear to perform similar activities and share comparable duties. Both marketing and public relations are functions of management. Both deal with communication, and both functions can segment the population (Tindall, 2002, p. 26). However, the objectives of the two departments are different, and they are motivated by different factors. Marketing chooses those whom it actively seeks to persuade to use products, and it has high control over its messages and designs. Public relations cannot always choose the public with whom it must communicate. “Publics arise from both the internal and external environment—publics that may not have a discernible link to the organization but with whom the organization must still interact” (Tindall, 2002, p. 26).

The change from IMC to IC recognizes that different publics are more or less strategic to the organization as situations change. For example, during different situations, a charitable organization may recognize its clients, donors, volunteers, employees, or the surrounding community as its most strategic public. Drobis (1997-1998, p. 9) found that public relations practitioners were actually in the best position to manage IC because, unlike other communication disciplines, it is their job to be involved in every facet of the organization and listen and respond to a full range of stakeholders.

According to Gronstedt (1996), public relations practitioners must understand the need for stewardship because they are responsible for relationships with internal and external audiences. “An organizational communicator cannot understand one group of
stakeholders without relating them to all other groups and individuals that have a stake in
the organization’s activities” (p. 292).

The assumption has been that fund raising is comparable to marketing (Kelly, 1996, p. 9). Believing that the effective management of relationships between charitable organizations and their donor publics contribute to organizational success, Kelly contended that, historically, marketing has been the adopted approach to fund raising. In her 1991 book, Kelly gave three reasons why marketing is an inappropriate method for fund raising:

1. Marketing is concerned with consumer publics, but donors and consumers are not synonymous.
2. The role of marketing in an organization is to generate sales through the change of product and services. The role of the fundraiser is to support a charitable organization’s programs and offerings by generating gifts and building donor relationships.
3. In the exchange of philanthropic gifts, the benefits of the gift will spill over into society, unlike marketing, which requires equal exchanges. “When making a gift, however, donors seek benefits for the public good” (p. 163).

Kelly (1998, p. 6) recognized that many universities, colleges, and hospitals have begun to use the term development primarily because of the negative connotations associated with fund raising. Fund raising refers to the solicitation of gifts at the exclusion of the other important aspects of the fund raising process, including research, goal-setting, cultivation, and stewardship. A perception exists that those charitable organizations that practice development utilize a more symmetrical, public relations-
oriented model than those organizations focusing on the marketing aspect of fund raising alone. While a debate about the terminology may seem inconsequential, it is significant in reflecting just how new and underdeveloped research is in the field (Alessandrini, 1998).

When charitable organizations use celebrities to endorse their cause, it is necessary to merge the previous celebrity endorsement theory, which is based in marketing, with public relations theory to best benefit both the organization and its publics.

Situational Theory of Publics

J. Grunig’s (1989) situational theory of publics provides a means of segmenting a general population into groups relevant for public relations practitioners, or in this case fund raisers. Similar to market segmentation theories, the segments of the population must be mutually exclusive, measurable, accessible, pertinent to the organization’s mission, and large enough to be substantial. Most importantly, however, the market segments must have a differential response to market strategies (Kotler & Andreasen, 1987, p. 124). The situational theory of publics allows public relations professionals to predict these differential responses, including responsiveness to issues; amount of and nature of communication behavior; effects of communication on cognitions, attitudes, and behavior; and the likelihood of participating in collective behavior to pressure organizations (J. Grunig, 1994).

The situational theory consists of two dependent variables (active and passive communication behavior) and three independent variables (problem recognition,
constraint recognition, and level of involvement). According to J. Grunig (1994), the two dependent variables, active and passive communication behavior, also can be called information seeking and information processing. Clarke and Kline (1974) called “premeditated information seeking” the “planned scanning of the environment for messages about a specific topic.” They described information processing as “message discovery” or the “unplanned discovery of a message followed by continued processing of it”.

The independent variables, problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement, describe the perceptions people have about specific situations. J. Grunig (1994) defined the independent variables as follows:

1. **Problem recognition.** People detect that something should be done about a situation and stop to think about what to do.

2. **Constraint recognition.** People perceive that there are obstacles in the situation that limit their ability to do anything about the situation.

3. **Level of involvement.** The extent to which people connect themselves with a situation.

J. Grunig (1982) and J. Grunig and Ipes (1983) summarized the relationship between the variables in this manner:

High problem recognition and low constraint recognition increase both active information seeking and passive information processing. Level of involvement increases information seeking, but has little effect on information processing. Stated differently, people seldom seek information about situations that do not involve them. Yet, they will randomly process information about low-
involvement situations, especially if they recognize the situation as problematic. Because people participate more actively in information seeking than in information processing, information seeking and the independent variables that precede it produce communication effects more often than information processing. In particular, people communicating actively develop more organized cognitions, are more likely to have attitudes about a situation, and more often engage in a behavior to do something about the situation.

J. Grunig (1994) uses Clark and Wilson (1961) and Wilson (1973) to extend the situational theory to explain the incentives for people who join voluntary organizations. These included:

1. **Material incentives.** Money or things and services that can be priced in monetary terms.

2. **Solidary incentives.** Intangible rewards enjoyed by being a member of a group, such as “convivialbility of coming together,” prestige of membership, or collective status.

3. **Purposive incentives.** Satisfaction from having contributed to a worthwhile cause even if the member “contributes nothing but his name.”

When Moe (1980) examined voluntary organizations, he found that solidary and purposive incentives predominated for people involved in charitable organizations. The situational theory of publics can be applied to charitable organizations when attempting to determine who will donate time or money to the organization and which celebrities may become endorsers for the organization.
Decentralization and Postmodern Values in Fund Raising

Centralization is the extent to which decision-making is concentrated at the top of an organizational hierarchy (Hage, 1980; Robbins, 1990; Kelly, 1998). Fund raisers in centralized organizations “are managed by one department reporting to the CEO” (Kelly, 1998, p. 214). Decentralized organizations assign the fund raising responsibilities to local organizational chapters or units. According to Kelly (1998), centralization is inversely related with organization complexity, “the extent of specialization, or differentiation of skills, within the organization” (p. 213). To examine the impact of these variables on the fund raising function, three national charitable organizations are discussed.

An example of a charitable organization with a centralized structure is the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation (Mixer, 1993; Kelly, 1998). Headquartered in White Plains, New York, March of Dimes is a top-down organization that creates local fund raising chapters, while retaining the power to hire, promote, and fire local staff. The local chapters rely on a centralized direct-mail fund raising campaign and must adhere to the headquarters’ policies and procedures for fund raising (Mixer, 1993, p. 227).

An example of a decentralized program with little centralization is the Girl Scouts of the USA. Mixer described the Girl Scouts as “almost completely decentralized, securing private support through local units” (p. 225). The national office, also based in New York, mainly handles the renewal process of charters for the individual organizations and annual cookie sales (Kelly, 1998, p. 213). Girl Scouts’ programs are offered in most communities across the United States and to be effective, they must be
adaptable to their individual populations. A highly centralized structure will detract from this adaptability.

The American Red Cross utilizes a hybrid structure that solicits funds at the national level and locally through its 2,400 chapters. According to Mixer (1993), the local chapters have the responsibility to hire their own CEOs and exercise considerable authority in fund raising. Fund raising efforts at the local level include soliciting gifts for swimming and life saving classes, the national organization solicits for disaster relief and both the national organization and local chapters are responsible for soliciting blood donations. The national organization also sets specific quotas and requirements that the local chapters must meet (Kelly, 1998, p.213).

Considerable fund raising literature supports the effectiveness of fund raising as the function moves closer to the program services (Kelly, 1998, p. 216). For example, Evans (1993) found that fund raisers housed in local chapters were often more closely linked and more knowledgeable with the populations they serve than the centralized fund raisers located at the national headquarters. Connecting this proximity to donors, he added, “A prospect will find it easier to become interested in and attached to a unit with a mission close to the prospect’s beliefs and values” (p. 282).

These views follow similarly with postmodern theory. Postmodernists emphasize that there is no single truth and that one should value and listen to multiple voices (Holtzhausen, 2000). The postmodern concept of micropolitics – which emphasizes the role and impact of multiple interest groups in organizational decision making – explains the value of decentralization. Additionally, postmodern scholar Vasquez (1994) proposed the practice of microsegmentation, which enables public relations practitioners
to determine how specific individuals or communities will process and seek information. Microsegmentation in a fund raising environment would benefit from a decentralized structure because it enables the practitioner to make fund raising decisions locally, based on the needs of the community.

*Adapted Mixed Motive Model for Celebrity Endorsement Fund Raising*

As the practice of fund raising lies on a continuum between the fields of marketing and public relations, fund raising practitioners must utilize theories from both fields, specifically celebrity endorsement theories from marketing and fund raising theory and the situational theory of publics from public relations, to best benefit both the organization and its publics.

It has been previously determined that celebrity connection to an issue enhances source credibility, the endorser’s perceived level of trustworthiness and expertise, and the ability of local charities or local chapters of national charities to more effectively raise funds than their national counterparts. As a response to this conclusion, national charities should decentralize their fund raising efforts and utilize local celebrities in each community to best connect with prospective donors. Although it might not always be possible for an organization to find celebrity endorsers in every community, they must find a balance between national and local celebrity endorsers in their fund raising campaigns.
Adapted from Dozier, L. Grunig & J. Grunig’s (1995) Mixed Motive Model of Public Relations, this study seeks to find support for a new fund raising model for charitable organizations interested in utilizing celebrity endorsement in their campaigns. Figure 2, the Mixed Motive Model for Celebrity Endorsement Fund Raising seeks to merge marketing and public relations theory to create the most effective scenario for celebrity endorsement fund raising.

The fund raising approach indicated by Arrow 1 in Figure 2, would be marketing focused. It would utilize asymmetrical, publicity-based tactics and a celebrity that endorses a national charitable organization that in all likelihood follows a centralized fundraising approach. Arrow 2 in Figure 2 illustrates the public relations approach to
fund raising. This approach would make use of mostly two-way symmetrical communication between the organization and its donors and would use a connected, local celebrity to endorse the charitable organization. In the case of a national charity, it would utilize different celebrities in each community to best connect with the donors in that community, i.e. a decentralized approach. The celebrity would also be involved in the organization beyond its fund raising campaign.

Both Arrows labeled 3 in Figure 2 indicate a move toward integrated communication (IC) by the charitable organization. In the middle of this continuum is the “Win-Win” zone, which represents complete IC. An organization will reach IC when it utilizes both marketing and public relations strategies in its fund raising efforts. Since it is not always possible for national charities to find a connected celebrity endorser in each community. In that case, organizations practicing IC would benefit from connected celebrity endorsers in communities that have a celebrity connected to the cause, in addition to a national, connected celebrity that could have over-arching appeal to all communities, although not based locally. These organizations would practice mostly two-way symmetrical communication between the organization and its publics combined with the short-term use of the asymmetrical models. This approach will help move charitable organizations toward a symmetrical communication style without forcing them to completely give up some of their otherwise effective fund raising practices.

Based on the mixed motive model adapted for celebrity endorsement fund raising and the situational theory of publics, this study tests the following hypotheses.
H1. When a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to seek information and become involved in the charitable organization than when another endorser is present.

H2. When a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to process information than when another endorser is present.

H3. When a local, connected celebrity endorses a local charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will plan to donate significantly more money than when any other endorser is present at either the local or national locations.

H4. When a local, connected celebrity endorses a local charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will plan to volunteer significantly more time than when any other endorser is present at either the local or national locations.

H5. Regardless of endorser type, demographic variables will significantly impact the potential donors’ and volunteers’ desire to seek information, process information, and act on that information.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Participants

Research participants were recruited from a population of undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory mass communications class at a large Southeastern university. Students were asked to participate as part of an assignment at the beginning of one of their classes. Participation was voluntary. Although this course is a requirement for students wishing to enroll in the mass communications sequence, most of the students are not mass communications majors and enroll in the class to fulfill general education requirements.

Experimental Design

To test these hypotheses, this study examined the fund raising effectiveness of local, national, connected, and non-connected celebrity endorsers on the giving and volunteer behavior of prospective donors and volunteers for both local and national charitable organizations. A controlled experiment was conducted using stimulus material based on a hypothetical case of celebrity endorsement fund raising. The case involved a fictional national charitable organization, Pediatric Disease Research Foundation (PDRF), and its Tampa Bay chapter. A fictional organization was chosen to eliminate any previous attachment to the organization that the research participants may have.
Athletes from the National Football League (NFL) were selected as the celebrity endorsers for this study because the NFL is currently one of the most successful professional sports leagues in America, most major cities across the United States have a team, and NFL players are recognized as local celebrities in their communities while also being well-known on the national level. NFL fans also connect to the players throughout the football season as the television and radio announcers and newspaper reporters describe the details of the individual players’ lives.

For this study, PDRF announced its 25\textsuperscript{th} anniversary and the fund raising occasions that will commemorate the event, including a black-tie gala and silent auction, a benefit concert, and a 5k run. To examine the influence of the celebrity endorser, the participants were exposed to a news release from the organization (see Appendix A). Participants rated their level of information seeking, information processing, problem recognition, constraint recognition, level of involvement, and intention to donate money and time, based on J. Grunig’s (1994) measures specified by the situational theory of publics. However, due to time constraints, this current study did not examine the effect of celebrity endorser on actual behavior such as giving or volunteering.

\textit{Procedures}

Each participant was randomly assigned to one of ten different conditions resulting from a 2x5 factorial. Variation in conditions was achieved through the use of booklets containing various stimulus materials and an instrument designed to measure the variables of interest (see Appendix A).
At the beginning of each booklet, participants were provided with instructions on the purpose of the experiment. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the ten cells through random distribution of the booklets. According to David Martin (1999), each cell should have at least 20 participants assigned to it (p. 154). Since there were more than 300 students enrolled in the class, each cell averaged over 20 participants.

*Manipulation check for endorser type*

According to Wimmer and Dominick (2003) a manipulation check must be performed prior to conducting an experiment to maximize potential differences between experimental groups (p. 222). A manipulation check was conducted to assess the degree to which the PDRF spokesperson in both the national charity and local chapter news releases fits one of the following categories: a local, connected celebrity; a local, non-connected celebrity; a national, connected celebrity; a national, non-connected celebrity; and a non-celebrity.

An instrument was developed for the manipulation check and administered to approximately 40 students in a public relations research undergraduate class (see Appendix C). Participants received a 7-page questionnaire. The first page contained the following instructions: “Please carefully read the news releases on the five following pages. Although they will appear similar at first, each is different and all must be read completely. After you finish all of the readings, please respond to the statements on the last two pages of this packet. Thank you.” The following five pages were the news releases for all five endorser-types: local, connected celebrity; local, non-connected celebrity; national, connected celebrity; national, non-connected celebrity, and non-
celebrity. The last two pages of the questionnaire contained ten 5-point Likert scale items from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), where the respondents indicated their level of agreement with each endorser’s connection to pediatric disease (i.e. Joe Jurevicius has a personal connection to pediatric disease) and celebrity status (i.e. Joe Jurevicius is more of a Tampa celebrity than a national celebrity).

An average of 4.0 was required for Joe Jurevicius and Doug Flutie to represent a true manipulation of connected celebrities. An average below 3.0 was required for Mike Alstott and Doug Flutie to represent a true manipulation of celebrities not connected to the cause. The average of 4.0 was also required for Joe Jurevicius and Mike Alstott to represent a true manipulation of Tampa celebrities. An average below 3.0 was required for Doug Flutie, Jeremy Shockey, and Scott Ross to represent a true manipulation of endorsers who are not Tampa celebrities. The results of the manipulation check are displayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorser</th>
<th>Connected Average</th>
<th>Tampa Celebrity Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Jurevicius</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Flutie</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Ross</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Shockey</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Alstott</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate strong support for the manipulation of endorser type. Due to this level of support for the selected endorser manipulations, the experiment continued without changing any of the celebrities or the control endorser.
Stimulus Material

To achieve a 2x5 factorial, eight treatment conditions and two control conditions were created (see Figure 3). Participants in each of the ten cells were exposed to stimulus material featuring a news release from PDRF. Five cells received news releases from the national charitable organization (Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America) and the other five cells received news releases from the local chapter of the national charitable organization (Tampa Bay chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation).

For both the local chapter and national charitable organization cell sets, endorsers were either local or national and connected or non-connected to the organization. As mentioned previously, connected celebrities have had a close personal experience with the issue or charitable organization under discussion. The following endorsers were represented in a cell for both the local chapter and the national charitable organization:

- Local, connected celebrity (Tampa Bay Buccaneer wide receiver, Joe Jurevicius)
- Local, non-connected celebrity (Tampa Bay Buccaneer full back, Mike Alstott)
- National, connected celebrity (San Diego Charger quarterback, Doug Flutie)
- National, non-connected celebrity (New York Giant tight end, Jeremy Shockey)
- Non-celebrity (fictional public relations manager, Scott Ross).

These specific NFL players were selected based on specific criteria so most variables could be controlled. Each NFL player selected for this experiment is a white
male, first-string offensive player, known for his community involvement, and the NFL produces his jersey for fan purchase.

Joe Jurevicius and Doug Flutie were also specifically picked because both have a son who was afflicted with a pediatric disease. Jurevicius’ son Michael died March 24, 2003 of fetal sialidosis. Michael’s battle became a national story because his birth came in the midst of the Tampa Bay Buccaneers’ run to the Super Bowl championship in 2002. The San Diego Chargers quarterback Doug Flutie and his wife, Laurie, in honor of their nine-year-old son, Doug, Jr. who was diagnosed with autism at age three, established the Doug Flutie, Jr. Foundation for Autism in 1998. The Foundation's mission is to aid financially disadvantaged families who need assistance in caring for their autistic children; to fund education and research into the causes and consequences of childhood autism; and to serve as a clearinghouse and communications center for new programs and services developed for autistic children.

FIGURE 3
Experimental Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Endorser-type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local chapter</td>
<td>Local, connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local chapter</td>
<td>Local, non-connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local chapter</td>
<td>National, connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local chapter</td>
<td>National, non-connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Local chapter</td>
<td>Non-celebrity (control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>National charity</td>
<td>Local, connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>National charity</td>
<td>Local, non-connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>National charity</td>
<td>National, connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>National charity</td>
<td>National, non-connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>National charity</td>
<td>Non-celebrity (control)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All ten conditions used the same instrument to measure the variables of interest.

Thirty booklets were created for each of the ten conditions. All news releases were
printed with black ink on white paper and contained 28 lines and 153-155 words (see Appendix A). A total of 300 booklets were randomly distributed to students.

**Measures**

After viewing the news release from PDRF or the Tampa Bay chapter of PDRF, participants were asked to complete an instrument (see Appendix B) containing items that measured the variables indicated by J. Grunig’s (1994) situational theory of publics and intention to donate money and time. Specifically, scales were created to measure the following variables: 1) information seeking (searching for information about PDRF or pediatric disease in general); 2) information processing (unplanned discovery of a message about PDRF or pediatric disease followed by continued processing of it); 3) problem recognition (belief that something should be done to eliminate or prevent pediatric disease); 4) constraint recognition (obstacles that limit the ability for a person to do anything about pediatric disease or donate money or time to PDRF); 5) level of involvement (the extent to which people connect themselves to PDRF or pediatric disease); 6) intention to donate money (to PDRF); 7) intention to volunteer time (for PDRF); 8) demographic variables (including gender, age, previous connection to pediatric disease for individual participant, previous donations of time or money to organizations involved in eliminating pediatric disease, and preference of newspaper section).

Four separate items were created to measure information seeking. Each of the following items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by *totally disagree/totally agree*: “I would be inclined to visit PDRF’s website”; “I would NOT be
inclined to sign-up for PDRF’s e-mail updates”; “I would be inclined to request a brochure from PDRF to learn more about the organization”; and “I would be interested in receiving more information about PDRF.”

To measure information processing, the following three Likert scale items, each anchored by totally disagree/totally agree, were created: “I would likely pay attention when PDRF’s spokesperson discussed the cause on TV”; “I would likely read an online article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title”; and “I would NOT likely read a newspaper article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title.”

Problem recognition was measured by the following five separate Likert items, anchored by totally disagree/totally agree: “I am currently aware of the effects of pediatric diseases on children and their families”; “I believe that pediatric disease devastates families”; “I desire to understand pediatric disease better”; “PDRF’s mission to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases is a worthy cause, which deserves support”; and “I believe that pediatric disease is NOT a problem facing this country.”

To measure constraint recognition, participants rated the following three statements, anchored by totally disagree/totally agree, on a 7-point Likert scale: “Pediatric disease is more difficult for me to understand than other diseases”; “I will likely attend one of the events mentioned in the PDRF news release”; and “I feel my donation to PDRF would NOT make a difference to the organization.”

Level of involvement was measured by the following three items on a 7-point Likert scale, anchored by totally disagree/totally agree: “I see a connection between pediatric disease and myself”; “I would recommend the PDRF events to my
family/friends who might be interested”; and “I will NOT become involved in this cause.”

To measure intention to donate money to PDRF, participants answered two separate items. The first item, rated on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by \textit{totally disagree/totally agree} is “Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF.” The second item, “If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between 0 and 100” is a ratio level variable where the participant responded with any whole dollar amount between zero and one hundred.

Intention to volunteer time for PDRF was measured by three separate variables. The first, on a 7-point Likert scale is, “Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF” anchored by \textit{totally disagree/totally agree}. The second item, “If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred” is a ratio level variable where the participant responded with a number of hours between zero and one hundred. The final question to measure intention to volunteer time for PDRF, “My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time” was measured on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by \textit{totally disagree/totally agree}.

In addition to the variables outlined above, participants were asked to provide demographic information, including whether or not pediatric disease personally affected them or someone they know; whether or not they have lost a family member or close friend to pediatric disease; whether or not they have donated money or volunteered time
for charitable organizations similar to PDRF; their gender; age; and newspaper section they prefer to read first.

Tests of Hypotheses

The items were divided into groups according to J. Grunig’s situational theory of publics, including information seeking, information processing, problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement. Each group was subjected to reliability analysis. However, the alpha value for the majority of the groups was too low to be accepted as reliable (see Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Seeking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be inclined to visit PDRF’s website.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would NOT be inclined to sign-up for PDRF’s e-mail updates. (reverse)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be inclined to request a brochure from PDRF to learn more about the organization.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be interested in receiving more information about PDRF.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Processing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would likely pay attention when PDRF’s spokesperson discussed the cause on TV.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would likely read an online article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would NOT likely read a newspaper article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title. (reverse)</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently aware of the effects of pediatric diseases on children and their families.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that pediatric disease devastates families.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire to understand pediatric disease better.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDRF’s mission to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases is a worthy cause, which deserves support.</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that pediatric disease is NOT a problem facing this country. (reverse)</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraint Recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric disease is more difficult for me to understand than other diseases.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will likely attend one of the events mentioned in the PDRF news release.</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my donation to PDRF would NOT make a difference to the organization. (reverse)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see a connection between pediatric disease and myself.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend the PDRF events to my family/friends who might be interested.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will NOT become involved in this cause. (reverse)</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Donate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF.</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between 0 and 100.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Volunteer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF.</td>
<td>43.89</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time.</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Volunteer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for Situational Theory Variables
Because of the low reliability of the above indices, it was decided to subject the items to an exploratory factor analysis. However, before this could be done, specific conditions had to be met. According to Nunnally (1978), the first issue to consider before deciding to subject data to factor analysis is that there must be a ratio of at least ten subjects to each questionnaire item. Since there were 21 items measured on a 7-point Likert scale and 266 participants, this data set is eligible for factor analysis based on this rule. Additionally, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) recommend the Bartlett’s test for sphericity should produce a significant result (p>.05) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) index of sampling adequacy, which ranges from 0 to 1, should be above .6 for factor analysis to be an appropriate statistical test. In this instance the Bartlett’s test for sphericity produced a significant result (p<.0001), and the KMO index equaled .91, again supporting factor analysis as an appropriate statistical test for this data.

Once the data was subjected to factor analysis, five factors emerged. The two factors that related directly to the hypotheses (see Table 4) included: Factor 1 (desire to seek information and act on that information) and Factor 2 (desire to process information). Each of the remaining three factors was rejected because it either contained multiple variables that, when combined, did not apply to the stated hypotheses or it only contained one variable. The first four hypotheses were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) between the groups, the two retained factors, and the variables that measured donation of time and money to evaluate the relationship stated in each specific hypothesis. To evaluate the final hypothesis, correlation coefficients were computed among the factors and the demographic variables.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Data were analyzed using SPSS 10.1 for Windows. An alpha level of .05 was set for significance in all statistical analyses. Statistical procedures included one-way analysis of variance and follow-up post hoc tests. Prior to conducting hypothesis tests, a manipulation check was conducted for the endorser conditions.

Research Participants

The responses of 266 participants were included in data analysis. Of these participants, 34.6 percent (N=93) were male, 64.6 percent (N=172) were female, and 0.8 percent (N=1) respondent declined to answer this question. The average age of participants was 19.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A life-threatening pediatric disease has personally affected me/someone I know.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lost a family member or close friend to pediatric disease.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have volunteered my time for a charitable organization similar to PDRF.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have donated money to a charitable organization similar to PDRF.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics for Research Participants
Reliability of Measurements

Prior to hypothesis testing, the internal consistency of the multiple-item factors used to measure the variables of interest was assessed. Stacks (2002) stated that alpha values between .70 and 1.00 indicate high reliability. As mentioned before, reliability measurements for the constructs information seeking, problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement were well below .70. As a result, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted, as mentioned before. Five factors emerged, but only two factors were related to the stated hypotheses so the other three were rejected. The two remaining factors, Factor 1 (desire to seek information and act on that information) and Factor 2 (desire to process information) were subjected to Cronbach’s reliability analysis. The alpha value for Factor 1 was .88, demonstrating high reliability within the factor. The alpha value for Factor 2 was .69, which was high enough reliability for it to also remain as a factor. Both factors were then collapsed into individual indices.
### TABLE 4
Factor Analysis of Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Desire to seek information and act on the information</strong></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would NOT be inclined to sign-up for PDRF’s e-mail updates. (reverse)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be inclined to request a brochure from PDRF to learn more about the organization.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will likely attend one of the events mentioned in the PDRF news release.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will NOT become involved in this cause. (reverse)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: Desire to process information</strong></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would likely pay attention when PDRF’s spokesperson discussed the cause on TV.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would likely read an online article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title.</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would NOT likely read a newspaper article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title. (reverse)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tests of Hypotheses*

**Hypothesis 1**

H1: When a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to seek information and become involved in the charitable organization than when another endorser is present.

Hypothesis 1 seeks to determine if potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to seek information and become involved when a local, connected celebrity endorses the charitable organization, than when another endorser is present. To test
Hypothesis 1, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the endorser conditions and Factor 1 (desire to seek information and act on that information). The independent variable, *endorser conditions*, included ten levels: a local, connected celebrity (Tampa Bay Buccaneer wide receiver, Joe Jurevicius); a local, non-connected celebrity (Tampa Bay Buccaneer full back, Mike Alstott); a national, connected celebrity (San Diego Charger quarterback, Doug Flutie); a national, non-connected celebrity (New York Giant tight end, Jeremy Shockey); a non-celebrity (a fictional public relations manager, Scott Ross) for both the local and national charity. The dependent variable was Factor 1 (desire to seek information and act on that information). Table 5 contains the means and standard deviations on the dependent variable for the ten groups. Since there were no statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of their response to Factor 1, follow-up post hoc tests were not conducted. Hypothesis 1 was, therefore, not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Endorser type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ross - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jurevicius - local</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ross - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alstott - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jurevicius - national</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shockey - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flutie - national</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alstott - local</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shockey - local</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flutie - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis 2**

H2: When a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to process information than when another endorser is present.

Hypothesis 2 seeks to determine if potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to process information when a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization than when another endorser is present. To test Hypothesis 2, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the endorser conditions and Factor 2 (desire to process). The independent variable, *endorser conditions*, included the ten levels listed above. The dependent variable was Factor 2 (desire to process information). Table 6 contains the means and standard deviations on the dependent variable for the ten groups. Since there were no statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of their response to Factor 2, follow-up post hoc tests were not conducted. Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Endorser type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jurevicius - national</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alstott - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ross - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jurevicius - local</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shockey - local</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shockey - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alstott - local</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ross - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flutie - national</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flutie - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3

H3: When a local, connected celebrity endorses a local charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will plan to donate significantly more money than when any other endorser is present at either the local or national locations.

Hypothesis 3 seeks to determine if potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to donate money when a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization than when another endorser is present. To test Hypothesis 3, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the endorser conditions and the amount of money the participants planned to donate. The independent variable, endorser conditions, included the ten levels listed above. The dependent variable was the amount of money the participants intended to donate. Table 7 contains the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable for the ten groups. Since there were no statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of their response to amount of money the participants intended to donate, follow-up post hoc tests were not conducted. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Endorser type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flutie - national</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.87</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shockey - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.59</td>
<td>34.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ross - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td>34.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jurevicius - local</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>28.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alstott - local</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>33.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jurevicius - national</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>29.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flutie - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>37.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alstott - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>37.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ross - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>27.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shockey - local</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>27.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4

H4: When a local, connected celebrity endorses a local charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will plan to volunteer significantly more time than when any other endorser is present at either the local or national locations.

Hypothesis 4 seeks to determine if potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to volunteer time when a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization than when another endorser is present. To test Hypothesis 4, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the endorser conditions and the amount of time the participants planned to volunteer. The independent variable, *endorser conditions*, included the ten levels listed above. The dependent variable was the amount of time the participants intended to volunteer. Table 8 contains the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable for the ten groups. Since there were no statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of their response to amount of money the participants intended to donate, follow-up post hoc tests were not conducted. Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Endorser type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shockey - local</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>27.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flutie - national</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>30.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alstott - local</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>28.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jurevicius - national</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>32.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alstott - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>30.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ross - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td>25.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ross - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>30.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jurevicius - local</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shockey - national</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>30.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flutie - local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>25.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 5

H5: Regardless of endorser type, demographic variables will significantly impact the potential donors’ and volunteers’ desire to seek information, process information, and act on that information.

Hypothesis 5 seeks to determine if potential donors and volunteers donate or volunteer time based on demographic variables. To test Hypothesis 5, correlation coefficients were computed to evaluate the relationships between the demographic variables and Factor 1 (intention to seek information and act on that information) and Factor 2 (intention to process information). The questionnaire items for the demographic variables included: “My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time;” “Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF;” “Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF;” “I will NOT become involved in this cause;” “If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between 0 and 100;” “If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred;” “A life-threatening pediatric disease has personally affected me/someone I know;” “I have lost a family member or close friend to pediatric disease;” “I have volunteered my time for a charitable organization similar to PDRF;” “I have donated money to a charitable organization similar to PDRF;” “Gender;” and “Age.” The results
of the correlation analyses presented in Table 9 show that statistically significant relationships occur.\(^3\)

Statistically significant relationships with a large effect size and a strong relationship occurred between Factor 1 and four items: “My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time” \((r=.719, p<.001)\); “Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF” \((r=.830, p<.001)\); “Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF” \((r=.821, p<.001)\) and “I will NOT become involved in this cause” (reverse coded) \((r=.752, p<.001)\). A statistically significant relationship with a medium effect size and a moderate relationship occurred between Factor 1 and the item “If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred” \((r=.414, p<.001)\). Statistically significant relationships with a small effect size and a weak relationship occurred between Factor 1 and the following items: “If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between 0 and 100” \((r=.270, p<.001)\); “A life-threatening pediatric disease has personally affected me/someone I know” \((r=.140, p<.05)\); “I have volunteered my time for a charitable organization similar to PDRF” \((r=.249, p<.001)\); and “I have donated money to a charitable organization similar to PDRF” \((r=.227, p<.001)\). An independent-samples \(t\) test was conducted to evaluate the effect of gender on the responses for Factor 1. The test was significant,

---

\(^3\) Stacks (2002) mentions that a negative or positive correlation of .30 indicates a small effect size with a weak relation, .40 to .70 indicates a medium effect size with a moderate relationship, and .70 and above points to a large effect size with a strong relationship.
$t(262)=-3.90, p = .001$. Females ($M=3.73, SD=1.30$) on average were more likely to seek information and act on that information than males ($M=3.08, SD=1.31$).

Statistically significant relationships with a medium effect size and a moderate relationship occurred between Factor 2 and three items: “My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time” ($r=.412, p<.001$); “Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF” ($r=.441, p<.001$); “I will NOT become involved in this cause” (reverse coded) ($r=.413, p<.001$). Statistically significant relationships with a small effect size and a weak relationship occurred between Factor 2 and the following items: “Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF” ($r=.386, p<.001$); “If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between 0 and 100” ($r=.137, p<.032$); “If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred” ($r=.277, p<.001$); “I have volunteered my time for a charitable organization similar to PDRF” ($r=.176, p<.004$); and “I have donated money to a charitable organization similar to PDRF” ($r=.134, p<.029$). An independent-samples $t$ test was conducted to evaluate the effect of gender on the responses for Factor 2. Contingent on the fact that there were a vast majority of females in the sample, the test was significant, $t(262)=-2.20, p = .001$. Females ($M=4.60, SD=1.34$) on average were more likely to process information than males ($M=4.21, SD=1.27$). Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was supported.
TABLE 9
Correlations among Factors 1 and 2 and the Demographic Variables (N = 266)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson would increase my desire to volunteer time.</td>
<td>$r = .719^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .412^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF.</td>
<td>$r = .830^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .441^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF.</td>
<td>$r = .821^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .386^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will NOT become involved in this cause. (reverse)</td>
<td>$r = .752^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .413^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between 0 and 100.</td>
<td>$r = .270^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .137^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.032$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred.</td>
<td>$r = .414^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .277^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A life-threatening pediatric disease has personally affected me/someone I know.</td>
<td>$r = .140^*$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.022$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have volunteered my time for a charitable organization similar to PDRF.</td>
<td>$r = .249^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .176^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.004$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have donated money to a charitable organization similar to PDRF.</td>
<td>$r = .227^{***}$</td>
<td>$r = .136^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = 0.000$</td>
<td>$p = 0.027$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{***} < .001$

$^{**} < .01$

$^* < .05$
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This study attempted to merge public relations and marketing research toward an integrated communication theory for celebrity endorsement research. Kelly’s (1991, 1998) work on the four models of fund raising and Dozier, L. Grunig, and J. Grunig’s (1995) research on the mixed motive model of public relations provide the public relations theoretical foundations for this study. Coupled with Wheeler’s (2002) examination of celebrity endorsement for charitable organizations from a marketing perspective, both approaches were examined through the lens of J. Grunig’s (1982, 1989, 1994) situational theory of publics. The intention of this study was to determine celebrity endorser influence on individuals’ personal and financial involvement in a charitable organization.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 addressed the situational theory of publics and stated that when a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to seek information and become involved in the charitable organization than when another endorser is present. The results of the study do not support the hypothesis and suggest that endorser type makes no significant difference on intention to seek information and act on that information. Furthermore, the first factor extracted by the construct validity factor analysis demonstrated that potential donors and
volunteers that seek information would act on that information; this supports J. Grunig’s situational theory of publics (1982, 1989, 1994) which argues people seldom seek information about situations that do not involve them, yet, they will randomly process information about low-involvement situations, especially if they recognize the situation as problematic. Although there were no significant differences between the groups the following results provide direction for the use of celebrity endorsement in public relations practice.

- In agreement with the Walker and Langmeyer (1992) research, this study found that information provided by an expert source was considered to be much more important and believable to the subjects than that provided by an experienced source. Public relations practitioners, who are experts in their field, might be more believable than any type of celebrity endorser and have a higher ability to influence information seeking and involvement behaviors. Specifically, this study demonstrated that the national public relations practitioner, who would have the highest level of expertise among the endorsers, generated the highest level of information seeking and involvement behaviors (M=3.92). Additionally, the local public relations practitioner generated the third highest level of information seeking and involvement behaviors (M=3.65).

- Supporting the research of Atkin and Block (1983) and Freiden (1984), this study found that although celebrities might be likable, they did not generate the believability required to affect an attitude change and motivate the prospective donors and volunteers to give to the organization.
• The local, connected “expert” celebrity endorser produced the highest level of information seeking and involvement behavior among the celebrity endorsers (M=3.66). This suggests that while local, connected celebrity endorsers are less effective than expert public relations practitioners; they are more effective than other endorser types. This finding supports the work of Speck, Schumann, and Thompson (1988), Misra (1990), and Ohanian (1991) who found that from the marketing perspective, celebrities who are seen as experts are more persuasive and generate more intentions to buy the specified product.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 addressed the situational theory of publics and stated that when a local, connected celebrity endorses a charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will be more likely to process information than when another endorser is present. The results of the study do not support this hypothesis and suggest that endorser type makes no significant difference on intention to process information. Furthermore, the second factor extracted by the construct validity factor analysis demonstrated that potential donors and volunteers that process information would not necessarily act on that information, again, supporting J. Grunig’s situational theory of publics (1982, 1989, 1994). Although there were no significant differences between the groups the following implications can help public relations practitioners find direction when considering the use of celebrity endorsers:

• While celebrity endorsers can increase the visibility and raise the level of awareness of a charitable organization, the endorser does not necessarily impact giving behavior.
or make people act. In this study the means for information processing were consistently higher than for information seeking. However, this did not translate into giving or volunteering action.

- In accordance with J. Grunig’s situational theory of publics (1982, 1989, 1994) this study found that just because prospective donors and volunteers process information when a celebrity endorser is present it does not mean that they will necessarily seek information, donate, or volunteer. There needs to be another factor that will mobilize the person and make them act. Celebrity endorsement alone will not accomplish this goal.

- The participants were more likely to process information when the two local endorsers represented the national organization (Jurevicius, M=4.80; Alstott, M=4.64). The public relations practitioner who represented the national organization produced the third highest level of information processing (M=4.62). It might be that the national attention gives these endorsers a perception of higher expertise, which in turn generates higher levels of information processing. As stated in the discussion of Hypothesis 1, it is possible that public relations practitioners are viewed as the most expert endorsers and may be more believable than celebrity endorsers overall.

- McCracken’s (1989) Model of Meaning Transfer found that the characteristics of the celebrity are transferred to the product or in the case of this study, the organization. This study demonstrates that while the attributes of the celebrity may be transferred to the organization and thus increase the level of information processing, it does not imply that prospective donors and volunteers will take after they process that
information. As mentioned previously, Atkin and Block (1983) offer two reasons why celebrities influence consumer information processing levels: first, celebrities are seen as “highly dynamic, likeable and attractive persons;” second, their “notoriety and fame attract attention to the product.” Again, while these qualities might increase information processing, they do not generate a statistically significant effect on information seeking and level of involvement.

Hypotheses 3 and 4

Hypotheses 3 and 4 tested the influence of endorser type on intention to donate money and volunteer time for the charitable organization. Hypothesis 3 stated that when a local, connected celebrity endorses a local charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will plan to donate significantly more money than when any other endorser is present at either the local or national locations. Results indicated that endorser type did not significantly influence the amount of money the potential donors intended to donate (Table 8). Hypothesis 4 stated that when a local, connected celebrity endorses a local charitable organization, potential donors and volunteers will plan to volunteer significantly more time than when any other endorser is present at either the local or national locations. Results indicated that endorser type did not significantly influence the amount of time the potential donors intended to volunteer (Table 9). Support was not found for these hypotheses. This finding is inconsistent with Wheeler’s celebrity endorser research for charitable organizations from a marketing perspective, which stated that connected celebrities generate a high source credibility and intention to volunteer time and donate money (p. 44).
Although previous research supports the belief that a decentralized fund raising function has been shown to be more effective (Evans, 1993, p. 282) this study does not find support for an increased level of giving for a local charitable organization when a celebrity endorser is present. While one would anticipate that local organizations are more connected to their communities than their national counterparts and local celebrities are more connected to the needs of the local organization than national celebrities the results of this study do not verify that claim. The lack of significant differences between the group means suggests that the endorser for the national organization, being viewed as a higher-level expert, balances out with the endorser for the local organization, who is seen as being more connected with the community. This finding also supports the notion that the endorser really does not have a significant impact on giving behavior and is not the factor that determines whether or not people will donate or volunteer.

Another surprising result is that connected celebrities did not produce a significantly higher willingness to give than non-connected celebrities or non-celebrities. For years, marketing research (Aaker & Keller, 1990; Misra & Beatty, 1990; and Wheeler, 2002) has found support for the positive effect of a connected celebrity, but that effect was not evident in this study. Potential donors and volunteers provided similar responses for all endorser types regardless of connection.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 examined the demographic variables of the participants and found that they were much more likely to be influenced by these variables for their level of seeking information and then acting on that information and their level of information
processing than by the endorser associated with the organization. This finding is consistent with Odendahl’s (1989) conclusion that “personal interest, involvement, and satisfaction are important motivations” for people before determining to which organizations they will contribute.

The results of Hypothesis 5 also support the situational theory of publics as they demonstrate that while celebrity endorsers create awareness other historical and psychological factors encourage action. Although the effect size is small ($r=.140$, $p<.05$ for information seeking), the results indicate that, to some measure, people who have been affected by pediatric disease were more likely to seek information and act on that information. However, there was no statistically significant correlation between personal involvement in pediatric disease and information processing.

**Rejection of Mixed Motive Model for Celebrity Endorsement Fund Raising**

The lack of support for the first four hypotheses and the support for the fifth hypothesis demonstrates that an endorser alone cannot influence information seeking, level of involvement, information processing, and willingness to donate time or money to a charitable organization. Thus, the proposed Mixed Motive Model for Celebrity Endorsement Fund Raising (Figure 2, p. 34) must be rejected.

What this study did discover is that celebrity endorsement is a marketing strategy that is a foreign concept to public relations and does not truly impact giving behavior. Public relations’ situational theory of publics is a much more successful approach to explaining giving behavior. Applying the situational theory of publics helps practitioners determine why and how potential donors and volunteers will be influenced to act.
This finding also points to the incompatibility of marketing and public relations theory, which do not exist on a continuum of pure persuasion on one side and pure symmetry on the other. Instead, this research agrees various public relations scholars (including L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Dozier, 2002, p. 269) who have criticized Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC). The two approaches are incompatible and should be practiced separately because they represent competing communication philosophies.

A practical approach to public relations fund raising with celebrity endorsers would use celebrity endorsers to build awareness about the cause, specifically if the cause is relatively unknown to the general public. Then, charitable organizations must incorporate the situational theory of publics, which will explain why particular people will give, to determine what will mobilize their prospective donors and volunteers to become involved.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has important implications for the development function of organizations. However, the limitations of this research must be addressed to provide a comprehensive picture. Primarily, it will be important to note that intent to behave does not constitute actual behavior and that it is possible that the subjects will not do what they indicated they would do. Furthermore, this experiment, as sometimes happens with experimental research, could have suffered from a lack of validity. Specifically, this study is impacted by history and selection. History refers to historical events, which may occur during the course of the experiment or just prior to the experiment and that might confound the experimental results (Martin, 1999, p. 346).

History could have affected this experiment because Jeremy Shockey (the national, non-connected celebrity), the NFL player who fit the criteria closest for the category, received a lot of negative media attention in the weeks prior to the experiment for using a gay slur when discussing Bill Parcells, the new head coach of the Dallas Cowboys (Sports Illustrated online, 2002, August 8).

Sampling was also a threat to internal validity because although the subjects were appropriate in that they represent an age range that is often vulnerable to manipulation by celebrity endorsement, and many college age students are actively interested in the NFL and its players, these subjects do not constitute a random sample of the entire student population. Additionally, college students with an average age of 19.8 do not represent
the all potential donors and volunteers and typically donate less than older people. Thus, the results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the subjects tested. The students were also enrolled in an introductory mass communications class, which may have caused them attach more significance to the public relations manager than if they were enrolled in another programs.

This study did not examine the Source Credibility Model (Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Hovland et al., 1953; Ohanian, 1991) that examines the perceived levels of expertise and trustworthiness of an endorser. The results of this study do not account for these levels specifically, but expertise is measured as a by-product of multiple questionnaire items. Trustworthiness, which accounts for the perceived level of honestly, integrity and believability of the endorser, was not measured. Additionally, this study did not test the Source Attractiveness Model (McGuire, 1968), which measures the similarity, familiarity, and likeability of the endorsers. This research can serve as a springboard to further investigate these models.

Finally, the findings are confined to the arena of NFL celebrities. By focusing on NFL celebrities, all other local and national celebrities were ignored and the research did not address or examine the effect of these other celebrities on intention to seek information, act on that information, process information, donate money, and volunteer time among potential donors and volunteers.

With those limitations, this research merely provides another lens through which researchers can observe, record, and study the effect of celebrity endorsers on fund raising practices. The concepts presented in this study are an initial attempt to establish an integrated communications model for celebrity endorsement fund raising. Although
this study did not find support for the model, it is important for researchers to continue to examine celebrity endorsement from a fund raising context.

*Guidance for Practitioners*

As previously mentioned, fund raising has much to gain from marketing and public relations literature, particularly in the area of celebrity endorsement, but at this point the merging of these two approaches is not realistic in practice or theory. This study intended to provide guidance for charitable organizations attempting to select the most effective celebrity endorser, but the results show that any endorser can be equally effective or ineffective to an organization. The situational theory of publics seemed to be the most effective way of predicting why people would become involved, donate money, and volunteer time.

Primarily, as noted earlier, marketing and public relations approaches should be practiced separately, but they should still be used in conjunction instead of having one dominate the other. While the marketing, asymmetrical approach creates awareness only, it does help set the stage for the public relations, symmetrical approach that focuses on personal involvement.

Secondly, there is a significant difference between celebrity endorsement for charitable organizations and for-profit organizations. Prospective donors and volunteers require a higher level of involvement before giving to a charitable organization than when purchasing a commercial product. In for-profit environments celebrity endorsement can persuade a consumer to purchase one brand over another where the difference is inconsequential. When charitable organizations use the services of a celebrity endorser,
their goal should be increased awareness for their cause, not necessarily increased giving behavior. Only when this increased awareness is coupled with a strategic public relations program will giving behavior increase.

Thirdly, media coverage should not be confused with endorser effect. While media are far more likely to cover charitable organizations that have celebrity endorsers, this coverage does not translate into increased giving behavior. While participants in this study did react and decide to become involved based on the news release, the role of publicity and media coverage are important simply because they draw attention to the organization and its special events that otherwise may have remained unknown to this segment of the population. One can therefore argue that publicity is not totally redundant, but that it might have some value in that it galvanizes at least some people to become involved. However, this is not an effect deducted from this study.

A Look Back at the Four Models of Fund Raising

While Kelly (1991, 1998) recommended a two-way symmetrical model of fund raising as the best fund raising practice, this study suggests that this model with its aim of mutual behavior change is not always applicable to fund raising practice. Instead, using all of the models simultaneously will get people involved and acting in different ways. For example, celebrity endorsers as a whole are part of a publicity strategy that is characteristic of the press agentry model. Specifically, connected celebrity endorsers employ an emotional, press agentry style approach to raise awareness for their cause by relating the cause to their sick child or a past experience that they were able to overcome. While this approach is asymmetrical, it did get people to respond. Symmetry would be
more effective once the people were involved or have been personally affected by the cause, at that time there would be value in a mutual behavior exchange between the parties.

*Recommended Studies for Future Research*

This study was an exploratory examination of how marketing and public relations theory could be merged into an integrated communication theory for celebrity endorsement fund raising. Additional steps should be taken to further understand if the model provides practicality for real-world fund raising practice. The data collected in this study suggests many new directions for future research in the field. For example, the following studies are needed to determine if support for the model exists in different arenas:

1. A replication of the current research. Further research should be conducted to determine if similar results are produced when different celebrities are used in the experiment, such as, film or television celebrities, local or national news anchor people, and celebrities from other sports.

2. A replication of the current research with different groups of potential donors and volunteers. This study would look at a representative sample of typical donors and volunteers in the Tampa Bay area to determine if the results are the same as indicated by this study.

3. An examination of effect on corporations and foundations. This type of study would determine if corporations and foundations would look to increase their community
status by associating their name with a celebrity, thus giving more money to 
organizations endorsed by specific endorser types.

Practitioners can use this research as a tool to explain to charitable organizations 
that they should not rely heavily on a celebrity endorser to dictate the success of their 
fund raising campaign, but only to raise awareness for their cause. This research can be 
used to strengthen their practices, helping practitioners synchronize organizational needs 
with those of the potential donors and volunteers by finding ways to increase 
involvement through the application of J. Grunig’s situational theory of publics (1982, 
1989, 1994).
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APPENDIX A:

STIMULUS MATERIALS
Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation
to Celebrate 25th Anniversary

Tampa Bay Buccaneer Joe Jurevicius scheduled to speak at anniversary events

Tampa, FL – The Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation (PDRF) will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction at the Don Cesar Beach Resort in St. Petersburg.

Tampa Bay Buccaneer wide receiver Joe Jurevicius, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Jurevicius lost his infant son, Michael, this past March, to sialidosis, a very rare inherited metabolic disorder characterized by a deficiency of the enzyme alpha-neuraminidase.

Jurevicius said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF will sponsor a benefit concert at the St. Pete Times Forum on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Vinoy Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Jurevicius will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-TPA or through the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrf-tb.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the St. Pete Times Forum box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation, in association with PDRF of America and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF funds the All-Children’s Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children, and the Children’s Cancer Center of Tampa Bay.
Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation

to Celebrate 25th Anniversary

Tampa Bay Buccaneer Mike Alstott scheduled to speak at anniversary events

Tampa, FL – The Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation (PDRF) will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction at the Don Cesar Beach Resort in St. Petersburg.

Tampa Bay Buccaneer full back Mike Alstott, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Alstott recognizes the necessity to treat and eliminate catastrophic childhood diseases. The Mike Alstott Foundation raises funds annually for the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF.

Alstott said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF will sponsor a benefit concert at the St. Pete Times Forum on Friday, October 10th and a “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Vinoy Park on Sunday, October 12th to commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Alstott will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-TPA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrf-tb.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the St. Pete Times Forum box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation, in association with PDRF of America and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF funds the All-Children’s Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children, and the Children’s Cancer Center of Tampa Bay.
APPENDIX A (CONTINUED)

Contact: Tracie Domino
Public Relations Coordinator
Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF
Tel: (813) PDRF-TPA
Fax: (813) 249-4907

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

September 29, 2003

Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation

to Celebrate 25th Anniversary

San Diego Charger Doug Flutie scheduled to speak at anniversary events

Tampa, FL – The Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation (PDRF) will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction at the Don Cesar Beach Resort in St. Petersburg.

San Diego Charger Quarterback Doug Flutie, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Flutie’s son, Doug Jr., was diagnosed with autism at age three. Autism is a developmental disorder that interferes with a person’s ability to communicate with others.

Flutie said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the Foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, it will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF will sponsor a benefit concert at the St. Pete Times Forum on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Vinoy Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Flutie will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-TPA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrf-tb.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the St. Pete Times Forum box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation, in association with PDRF of America and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF funds the All-Children’s Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children, and the Children’s Cancer Center of Tampa Bay.
Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation to Celebrate 25th Anniversary

New York Giant Jeremy Shockey scheduled to speak at anniversary events

Tampa, FL – The Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation (PDRF) will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction at the Don Cesar Beach Resort in St. Petersburg.

New York Giant tight end Jeremy Shockey, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Shockey recognizes the necessity to treat and eliminate catastrophic childhood diseases. The Jeremy Shockey Foundation raises funds annually for the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF.

Shockey said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF will sponsor a benefit concert at the St. Pete Times Forum on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Vinoy Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Shockey will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-TPA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrf-tb.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the St. Pete Times Forum box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation, in association with PDRF of America and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF funds the All-Children’s Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children, and the Children’s Cancer Center of Tampa Bay.
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Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation
to Celebrate 25th Anniversary

PDRF public relations manager Scott Ross scheduled to speak at anniversary events

Tampa, FL – The Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation (PDRF) will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction at the Don Cesar Beach Resort in St. Petersburg.

Public relations manager Scott Ross, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Ross was hired as public relations manager for the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF in 1995 and has raised $50 million to treat and eliminate rare and catastrophic childhood diseases.

Ross said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, it will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF will sponsor a benefit concert at the St. Pete Times Forum on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Vinoy Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Ross will speak and be available for interviews at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-TPA or through the Foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrf-tb.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the St. Pete Times Forum box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Tampa Bay Chapter of the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation, in association with PDRF of America and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Tampa Bay Chapter of PDRF funds the All-Children’s Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children, and the Children’s Cancer Center of Tampa Bay.
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Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America to Celebrate 25th Anniversary in New York City

Tampa Bay Buccaneer Joe Jurevicius scheduled to speak at anniversary events


Tampa Bay Buccaneer wide receiver Joe Jurevicius, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Jurevicius lost his infant son, Michael, this past March, to sialidosis, a very rare inherited fetal metabolic disorder characterized by a deficiency of the enzyme alpha-neuraminidase.

Jurevicius said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, it will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation will sponsor a benefit concert at Madison Square Garden on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Central Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Jurevicius will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-USA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrfusa.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the Madison Square Garden box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America, in association with its 156 community chapters and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America funds the American Cancer Society, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, the Mayo Clinic, and March of Dimes.
Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America to Celebrate 25th Anniversary in New York City

Tampa Bay Buccaneer Mike Alstott scheduled to speak at anniversary events

New York – The Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction in the Grand Ballroom of the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Times Square.

Tampa Bay Buccaneer full back and Super Bowl Champion, Mike Alstott is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Alstott recognizes the necessity to treat and eliminate rare and catastrophic childhood diseases. The Mike Alstott Foundation raises funds for PDRF of America.

Alstott said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation will sponsor a benefit concert at Madison Square Garden in Manhattan on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run in Central Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Alstott will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-USA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrfusa.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the Madison Square Garden box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America, in association with its 156 community chapters and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America funds the American Cancer Society, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, the Mayo Clinic, and March of Dimes.
Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America to Celebrate 25th Anniversary in New York City

San Diego Charger Doug Flutie scheduled to speak at anniversary events

New York – The Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction in the Grand Ballroom of the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Times Square.

San Diego Charger Quarterback Doug Flutie, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Flutie’s son, Doug Jr., was diagnosed with autism at age three. Autism is a developmental disorder that interferes with a person’s ability to communicate with others.

Flutie said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America will sponsor a benefit concert at Madison Square Garden on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run in Central Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Flutie will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-USA or through the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrfusa.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the Madison Square Garden box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America, in association with its 156 community chapters and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America funds the American Cancer Society, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, the Mayo Clinic, and March of Dimes.
Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America to Celebrate 25th Anniversary in New York City

New York Giant Jeremy Shockey scheduled to speak at anniversary events

New York – The Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction in the Grand Ballroom of the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Times Square.

New York Giant tight end Jeremy Shockey, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Shockey recognizes the necessity to treat and eliminate rare and catastrophic fetal and childhood diseases. The Jeremy Shockey Youth Foundation raises funds annually for PDRF of America.

Shockey said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, it will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation will sponsor a benefit concert at Madison Square Garden on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run in Central Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Shockey will speak and be available to sign autographs at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-USA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrfusa.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the Madison Square Garden box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America, in association with its 156 community chapters and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America funds the American Cancer Society, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, the Mayo Clinic, and March of Dimes.
Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America to Celebrate 25th Anniversary in New York City

PDRF public relations manager Scott Ross scheduled to speak at anniversary events

New York – The Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America will celebrate its 25th Anniversary of fighting childhood disease October 11, 2003 at it’s “Reach for the Stars” black-tie gala and silent auction in the Grand Ballroom of the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Times Square.

Public relations manager Scott Ross, is scheduled to be this year’s keynote speaker. Ross was hired as public relations manager of PDRF of America in 1995 and has raised over $500 million through multiple fund raising initiatives to treat and eliminate rare and catastrophic childhood diseases.

Ross said, “Since its founding 25 years ago, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation has made great strides to increase the survival rate for children with rare or catastrophic diseases. Continued support for the foundation, through financial donations and the contributions of volunteers, will make it possible to further improve those survival rates.”

In addition to the “Reach for the Stars” gala, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America will sponsor a benefit concert at Madison Square Garden on Friday, October 10th. A “Race for the Kids” 5k run beginning in Central Park on Sunday, October 12th will also commemorate the foundation’s 25th anniversary. Ross will speak and be available for interviews at all events.

Tickets for the “Reach for the Stars” gala and silent auction are available for $100 each and can be purchased by calling 1-800-PDRF-USA or though the foundation’s web site at http://www.pdrfusa.org. Tickets for the benefit concert are $15 and can be purchased through Ticketmaster outlets or at the Madison Square Garden box office. The “Race for the Kids” is open to the public and free of charge. All participants are encouraged to pre-register through the web site.

Established in 1978, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America, in association with its 156 community chapters and its network of volunteers, continues to lead the fight against fetal and childhood disease. The foundation’s mission is to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases by advancing research, education, and treatment. Among others, the Pediatric Disease Research Foundation of America funds the American Cancer Society, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, the Mayo Clinic, and March of Dimes.
APPENDIX B:

QUESTIONNAIRE
Please circle the number between 1 and 7 that indicates your level of agreement with each statement.

1. I would be inclined to visit PDRF’s website.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

2. I would likely pay attention when PDRF’s spokesperson discussed the cause on TV.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

3. I am currently aware of the effects of pediatric diseases on children and their families.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

4. Pediatric disease is more difficult for me to understand than other diseases.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

5. I see a connection between pediatric disease and myself.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

6. My ability to meet the PDRF spokesperson will increase my desire to volunteer time.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

7. I would be inclined to request a brochure from PDRF to learn more about the organization.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

8. I would NOT likely read a newspaper article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

9. I desire to understand pediatric disease better.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree

10. I would recommend the PDRF events to my family/friends who might be interested.
    Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I would NOT be inclined to sign-up for PDRF’s e-mail updates.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I believe that pediatric disease devastates families.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would be interested in receiving more information about PDRF.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I would likely read an online article when PDRF’s spokesperson’s name is in the title.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>PDRF’s mission to eradicate pediatric, rare and catastrophic diseases is a worthy cause, which deserves support.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel my donation to PDRF would NOT make a difference to the organization.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I believe that pediatric disease is NOT a problem facing this country.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I will likely attend one of the events mentioned in the PDRF news release.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to donate money to PDRF.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I will NOT become involved in this cause.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Based on the previous news release, I intend to volunteer my time for PDRF.</td>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)

22. If someone gave you $100 and said you had to give it all to charitable organizations, how much would you give to PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred.

_______

23. If USF required each student to perform 100 hours of volunteer service to be eligible for graduation, how many of those hours would you fulfill by volunteering for PDRF? Please write a whole number between zero and one hundred.

_______

24. A life-threatening pediatric disease has personally affected me/someone I know.
   □ No
   □ Yes
   □ Unsure

25. I have lost a family member or close friend to pediatric disease.
   □ No
   □ Yes
   □ Unsure

26. I have volunteered my time for a charitable organization similar to PDRF (example: St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, March of Dimes, All-Children’s Hospital, etc.).
   □ No
   □ Yes

27. I have donated money to a charitable organization similar to PDRF (example: St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, March of Dimes, All-Children’s Hospital, etc.).
   □ No
   □ Yes

28. Please indicate your sex
   □ Male
   □ Female

29. Please indicate your age _______

30. Please indicate which section of the newspaper you most often select to read first.
   □ Nation/World (Front Section)
   □ Metro
   □ Sports
   □ Business
   □ Arts & Entertainment

You have completed the survey. Please turn close this booklet and remain seated until everyone is finished. Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX C:

MANIPULATION CHECK
After reading all of the news releases, please mark a number between 1 and 5 indicating your level of agreement with each statement.

Joe Jurevicius has a personal connection to pediatric disease.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Mike Alstott has a personal connection to pediatric disease.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Doug Flutie has a personal connection to pediatric disease.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Jeremy Shockey has a personal connection to pediatric disease.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Scott Ross has a personal connection to pediatric disease.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Joe Jurevicius is more of a Tampa celebrity than a national celebrity.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Mike Alstott is more of a Tampa celebrity than a national celebrity.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Doug Flutie is more of a Tampa celebrity than a national celebrity.
Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree
APPENDIX C (CONTINUED)

Jeremy Shockey is more of a Tampa celebrity than a national celebrity.

Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Scott Ross is more of a Tampa celebrity than a national celebrity.

Totally Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Totally Agree

Thank you for your time. You are now finished.