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Chapter 1 – Introduction

Problem Statement

It is increasingly acknowledged that effective conservation is ultimately dependent on human behaviour and attitudes (Balmford & Cowling, 2006; Mascia et al., 2003). It is therefore critical to understand how best to communicate and engage with people, to ensure the conservation community can realise its goals effectively and efficiently (Jacobson, 2009). The principles and best practices of the marketing industry can provide many of these answers, and could make a useful addition to the conservation toolbox.

Marketing, defined by the Chartered Institute of Marketing as “the management process responsible for identifying, anticipating and satisfying customer requirements profitably” (CIM, 2009) has a well-established body of theory, having existed in some form since humans first started trading (Jones & Shaw, 2002; Moore & Reid, 2008). However the focus of marketing theory changed considerably in recent years from merely communicating the value of a product to influencing nearly every aspect of our society (Wilkie & Moore, 2003; Kotler, 2005). Marketing is becoming increasingly influential in modern life (Ellis et al., 2010) and is a key component in business practice (McCole, 2004). It is therefore both sensible and worthwhile for the conservation community to understand and adopt the current marketing research and best practices, which have been developed and refined in fields other than conservation.

Marketing has become increasingly sophisticated in the last century, particularly with the advent of the Internet. It has evolved from concentrating on the product to the current focus on relationship marketing; the constant connection and interplay between the consumer,
product and brand (O’Malley & Tynan, 2000). Large non-government organisations (NGOs) are increasingly using new marketing thought and practice to guide their strategies and communications (Andreasen & Kotler, 2008).

A widespread and popular technique for increasing marketing campaign effectiveness is the use of celebrities as spokespersons or endorsers (Erdogan, 1999; Amos, Holmes & Strutton, 2008). The Oxford English Dictionary defines celebrity as “the condition of being much extolled or talked about; famousness, notoriety” and as “a public character” (OED, 1925). Brockington (2014) elaborates on this by defining a celebrity as an individual who makes repeated public appearances, through which the celebrity, and connected stakeholders, benefit. The public’s sustained exposure to celebrities has resulted in their recognition as a powerful and effective tool in the marketing of a wide variety of goods and services (Pringle, 2004) as well as philanthropic causes (Andreasen & Kotler, 2008).

Marketing can be highly effective at promoting brands and increasing uptake of products: Gary Lineker, a British footballer, has represented Walkers crisps for 19 years to date. Between 1995 and 2002, Walkers saw a 105% uplift in sales, and a 6% increase in grocery market share, helped by this association (Pringle, 2004). British pop star Cheryl Cole (Cheryl Fernandez-Versini as of July 2014) has been a L’Oréal spokesperson since 2009. In the first 12 months of this partnership alone, L’Oréal saw their shampoo and conditioner sales rise by 13.9% and their hairspray sales rise by 14%, figures L’Oréal attribute to Cheryl Cole’s campaigns and appearances in the British media (Dawes, 2010). In July 2014 the British actress Emma Watson was announced as a Goodwill Ambassador for UN Women. The increased website visits resulting from the announcement caused the UN Women website to crash within a matter of hours (Figure 1.1) (UN Women, 2014).
Marketing is used by conservation organisations for fundraising, effecting behaviour change and raising awareness (Foxall et al., 1998; Leader-Williams et al., 2011). Sergio et al. (2008), Skibins, Powell & Hallo (2013) and Veríssimo et al. (2013) have discussed the impact of using flagship species, and Ladle et al. (2004) the news media, to market conservation organisations and their campaigns. However there has been comparatively little research done on the effectiveness of using celebrities in conservation marketing campaigns. Brockington (2008; 2014) has looked at selected issues when combining celebrities and conservation causes, including the public’s perception of the celebrity and the risk of celebrities obscuring the conservation message, however this is still a field largely unexplored in the literature.

**Study Aim:**
Conservation organisations are using celebrities to raise awareness of conservation issues and increase donations, with no evidence to suggest they are an effective approach. This study aims to understand if celebrities impact on the public’s Willingness-to-Engage with conservation organisations’ marketing communications.
Study Objectives:

1. To understand how current conservation organisations are using and evaluating celebrity endorsement.
2. To assess the impact of the presence of a celebrity versus non-celebrity endorser on public Willingness-to-Engage.
3. To assess the effect of a celebrity endorser’s credibility level on public Willingness-to-Engage.
4. To assess the effect of a celebrity versus non-celebrity endorser on recall of advertisement message.
5. To assess the effect of prior knowledge of celebrity endorsers support on public Willingness-to-Engage.
Chapter 2 – Background

2.1 Marketing

Marketing is the consumer-centric concept of creating value and satisfaction for consumers in order to derive value from them in return (Kotler & Armstrong, 2008; Jobber & Ellis- Chadwick, 2013). Traditionally marketing was a technique of ‘telling and selling’ a one-way communication informing consumers about a product or service to ensure its purchase (Cramphorn, 2004; Kotler & Armstrong, 2012; Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014). Recently however it has evolved to become a value-based process, in which brands must satisfy the consumers’ functional and emotional product needs (Kotler & Armstrong, 2008). As a result of this change, communications between brands and consumers are becoming two-way, as brands need to work ever harder to retain a fresh and competitive edge in an often saturated market (Pringle, 2004; Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014).

2.1.1 Branding

Branding is the use of a name, symbol, imagery or term that can be used to identify a seller or service provider (Kotler et al., 2013). Branding has become increasingly important in recent years as consumers ascribe meanings to brands and develop Brand-Personal Relationships (BPRs) (Cramphorn, 2004). The attributes conferred by the consumer can add value to a product and are a critical element of the marketing process.

Brand Equity is the measurable value of the consumer’s perception of the brand as opposed to the product or service. Favourable perceptions
of, and attitudes towards, a brand result in positive brand equity and vice versa (Wood, 2000; Kotler & Armstrong, 2008).

2.1.2 Advertising

Advertising is one of the central components of the marketing process and has three key functions: identification, information and persuasion. At the most basic level is the identification of a product, good or service, and where it can be found; shop signs are excellent examples. This function goes back to the very earliest trading civilisations and has not changed substantially since. If the market is unaware of the product or where to find it, they can’t purchase it (Pringle, 2004; Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014). The ability to provide information about a product or service increased substantially with advances in printing at the start of the Renaissance. The more literate the consumer market became, the more information could be provided to them about the goods and services available. Persuasion is the final and most recent function of advertising. As markets grow, and competition increases, it has become increasingly important to influence as large a proportion of the potential market as possible to ensure a viable market position (Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014).

There are four fundamental components of advertising: strategy, message, medium and evaluation. The last of which, evaluation, is crucial because a lack of proof as to which advertisements are most successful can lead to wasted resources, inappropriate or ineffective communications, or even a reduction in the marketing team or budget due to failure to fully understand its importance. Just as the conservation industry realises the critical importance of monitoring and evaluating its programmes, the marketing industry is prioritising evaluation skills for future work (Stem et al., 2005; Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014).
2.1.3 Evaluation: Pretesting

It is critical for any business or organisation to ensure a marketing budget is used in the most effective and efficient ways feasible, thereby ensuring the highest possible return on investment (ROI). Whilst this return is often financial, for example an increase in product sales or donations, equally it can be in raising or increasing brand or issue awareness, improving brand reputation or encouraging behaviour change (Cramphorn, 2004; Jobber & Ellis-Chadwick, 2013; Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014). Any campaign should therefore be rigorously tested at all stages prior to release or publication. Pretesting is the marketing industries’ standard process through which campaigns are evaluated. Pretesting takes two main forms, concept testing and copy testing (Gelb Consulting Group, Inc, 2010; Kotler & Armstrong, 2008).

Concept Testing

Concept testing is an exploratory technique used for preliminary ideas, or concepts, to establish the most suitable approach given a target audience’s preferences. The effectiveness of marketing is reliant on many factors unrelated to the advertisement itself, such as attitude upon exposure and previous positive attitude towards the advertisement, product or stimuli (Ledoux, 1998; Franzen, 1999; Damasio, 2008). It is therefore sensible to test early on to minimise both costs and staff power on advertisements that do not meet the objectives outlined in the strategy (Cramphorn, 2004).

Copy Testing

Copy testing is an evaluation approach, presenting several slightly different versions of an advertisement and testing respondents’ reactions to assess the impact or effectiveness of the attribute being
tested. These attributes vary from layout, colour scheme and font style to music, endorser or text (Cramphorn, 2004).

Copy testing can be analysed in a variety of ways, including recall; the respondent’s ability to remember or recall information from the advertisement or message they saw after a set period of time, persuasion; the likelihood the advertisement has of effecting the desired action, and affective; how much the advertisement affects the consumer (Moriarty, Mitchell & Wells, 2014).

Recent advances in technology have made it possible to use methods such as eye-ball tracking to understand respondents’ engagement with an advertisement, giving unprecedented opportunities for analysis and evaluation. However, such techniques require highly specialist equipment, and trained operators. Consequently, much marketing research is still conducted using traditional survey methods (Heath & Nairn, 2005). Advertising agencies and marketing departments have access to panels of potential respondents, who will complete surveys and questionnaires for either payment, or a reward such as a gift voucher or entry in to a prize draw. This process of rewarding participants enables the survey designers to make the survey as long and comprehensive as they require. In such cases, each image or advertisement can be shown to the respondent, with detailed questions on each, though order-effect is critical, and therefore the order must be randomized (Hovland & Mandell, 1952; Brunel & Nelson, 2003).

**Copy Testing Evaluation Testing Techniques**

The Advertising Research Foundation’s Copy Research Validity Project (Haley & Baldinger, 2000) gave six key measures for copy testing: persuasion, brand salience, recall, communications, likeability and reaction (outlined in detail in Table 2.1).
Of the many ways in which an advertisement can be evaluated, likability is widely recognised in the marketing literature as being a highly reliable indicator of effectiveness. However, the importance of persuasion and recall are also stressed, and it is suggested that the three should be used in conjunction as key evaluation measures for marketing (Haley & Baldinger, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sub-Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Brand Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Message Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Salience</td>
<td>Awareness: Aided &amp; Unaided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition: Aided &amp; Unaided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Recall: Aided &amp; Unaided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall from product category cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall from brand cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Believability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Story / Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characters / other elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Amount learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyment level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleverness level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humour level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Celebrities

The word ‘celebrity’ is derived from the Latin root *celebrem*, meaning ‘fame’. Additionally, the French word ‘*célèbre*’ means ‘well known in public’. Both of these interpretations link the famous person, or celebrity, to the public, who ultimately control the rise and decline of any celebrity status (Rojek, 2001). Celebrity is not a modern invention, though the insight into their private lives (both invited, through social media platforms such as Twitter and Instagram, and uninvited, through paparazzi photographs) is relatively recent (Pringle, 2004). Since early civilisations, the public have been interested in the lives and actions of certain individuals, either due to the position they were born in to, or the position or notoriety they achieved due to their actions. An example is Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, who upon her marriage, and entry into society in the 1770s, quickly became an influential style leader, increasing sales of any newspaper she was featured in (Foreman, 2001).

Rojek (2001) has classified the different ‘types’ of celebrity, according to the origin of the individual’s fame:

- *Achieved Celebrities* are famous because of their talent or skill in a certain field or area, for example actors and actresses, performers and entertainers, and sports people.

- *Ascribed Celebrities* are famous due to their parents or lineage. Examples include members of a royal family or the children of Achieved Celebrities.

- *Attributed Celebrities* have become famous due to prolonged or repetitive media exposure, for example television presenters.

- *Celetoïd Celebrities* are extensions of Attributed Celebrity, but are usually manufactured by the media in a shortened time frame. They are typically characterised as being self-publicising and often
with no discernible talent or skill evident. Examples include reality show participants.

- **Celeactors** are limited to fictional characters who become famous within their own right. Examples include Peter Pan, Shrek, Goldilocks and James Bond.

However these classifications are not discrete, and celebrities can move between, or even bridge them. Examples include Ascribed Celebrities who actively seek increased press exposure, often by taking part in reality shows, or Attributed Celebrities who become Achieved Celebrities through a long and popular career. It should also be added that brand equity is an important factor for individuals as well as businesses (Kerrigan et al., 2011), and celebrities are increasingly aware of this. They therefore choose to act in ways that benefit themselves and their careers: from their choice of work, to their promotion of certain issues and causes, to their personal and business relationships (Littler, 2008).

2.2.1 Celebrities in Marketing

**Celebrities in Commercial Marketing**

Celebrities have traditionally been used extensively in commercial marketing, even the British monarch, Queen Victoria, was connected with Cadbury’s Cocoa at the end of the 19th Century (Figure 2.1) (Sherman, 1985).
A celebrity’s endorsement of a brand acts as an indicator of quality, and allows the brand to receive a shot of fame and access to the celebrity’s market, in addition to receiving, by association, some of the qualities linked with the celebrity (Pringle, 2004). Not only does celebrity endorsement generate and retain attention, but it also increases recall rates in an overly cluttered market space (Kamen, Azhari & Kragh, 1975; Croft, Dean & Kitchen, 1996). Indeed Erdogan (1999) argues that celebrity endorsement in marketing can now be considered a common strategy, and one that can markedly improve a company’s financial returns (Farrell et al., 2000; Erdogan, Baker & Tagg, 2001).

Not only are celebrities successful for commercial brands such as the Jamie Oliver (British television chef) campaign with Sainsbury’s (British supermarket) which generated a return-on-investment (ROI) of £27.25 for every £1 spent on advertising (Pringle, 2004), but there are also cases where brands try to remove their celebrity endorsement and use a more down-to-earth approach, often with disastrous consequences. In 2000 Revlon (US cosmetics company) decided to replace their supermodel ‘face’, Cindy Crawford, with a girl-next-door campaign. Sales fell 3.1% in nine months, and they lost 10.6% of their cosmetics market share in a year. Almost immediately, the girl-next-door was replaced by American actresses Julianne Moore and Halle Berry, and sales and market share quickly recovered (Pringle, 2004).

Celebrities in Philanthropic and Non-Profit Marketing:
Philanthropic and non-profit causes have been described by Frumkin (2009) as having an expressive character, meaning they allow an individual to demonstrate care for others. Pringle (2004) argues that in order to enhance their career, celebrities may seek to demonstrate their care for others, sometimes as a guilt response to increasingly luxurious lifestyles, and also to improve their reputation and brand equity.
Celebrity involvement with non-government organisations (NGOs) is widespread and varied (Brockington & Henson, 2014). Examples include Bob Geldof (British musician) and Live Aid; Diana, Princess of Wales (British royal family) and landmines; Bono (Irish musician) and Third World Debt; and Angelina Jolie (American actress) and varied humanitarian work including becoming Special Envoy to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. The money and awareness raised for these issues is substantial. Live Aid raised approximately £150 million (Mauger, 2012) and Angelina Jolie co-chaired the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict in London in June 2014 resulting in unprecedented media coverage. However, despite its successes, celebrity advocacy is not necessarily guaranteed to be as popular or effective as commonly thought. Thrall et al. (2008) found that celebrity endorsement did not guarantee mass media coverage and Brockington & Henson (2014) have reported that the majority of public charity support arises from personal connections, as opposed to the influence of celebrities. Interestingly Brockington & Henson (2014) also found that the majority of people believe others are influenced by celebrity, whilst they themselves are not. This disparity could be explained by the method of data collection, as self-reporting is susceptible to numerous biases (Gavin, Solomon & Blank, 2010), with people unaware of the effect celebrities have on them (Heath, 2001; 2002).

### 2.2.2 Evaluating Celebrity Effectiveness

Whilst there is strong evidence that clearly supports celebrity endorsement as a viable, and widely used, marketing strategy, there is a large body of literature that continues to test and further understand celebrity endorsement effectiveness (Erdogan, 1999; Amos, Holmes & Strutton, 2008; Elberse & Verleun, 2012). The literature shows the breadth of research that has been conducted on celebrity endorsement
effectiveness, including comparisons with created endorsers, levels of recall, Intention to Purchase and endorser/product selection techniques (Erdogan, 1999). The majority of pre-release evaluation techniques still rely on survey data for evaluation purposes (Heath & Nairn, 2005), though there are substantial advances in technology, resulting in techniques such as eyeball tracking. Consequently evaluators are restricted in the analysis available prior to release (Broadbent, 2000; Roberts, 2002).

**Celebrity versus Created Endorser**

Whilst there are substantial benefits to a celebrity endorser, this approach is not without risks, particularly given the costs involved, and the potential risk of any damaging behaviour by the celebrity reflecting on the brand (Agrawal, Kamakura & Kamakura, 1995). A created endorser or spokesperson is one that is created, developed and used solely by the company or organisation to specifically embody the values of the brand. A created endorser can be a real person, either an actor or a real customer or staff member, or a fictitious, and often animated, character. An example is Green Giant’s Jolly Green Giant, featuring in campaigns since 1928 (see Figure 2.2) (Green Giant, 2014).

![Green Giant's Jolly Green Giant](image)

**Figure 2.2 - Green Giant’s Jolly Green Giant is a created endorser, first appearing in their campaigns in 1928 (Green Giant, 2014)**
Tom et al. (1992) found that a created endorser is more effective in generating links between the endorser and brand for respondents, in comparison to a celebrity endorser. Additionally, Mehta (1994) found no significant differences in consumers’ Intention-to-Purchase (ITP) or attitudes towards the brand between created and celebrity endorsers, but when testing the cognitive processes, consumers focused on the brand and advert features more with a created endorser. A celebrity endorser caused them to focus on the celebrity. However, the use of a celebrity endorser was found to produce more positive attitudes and a higher ITP than a non-celebrity endorser by both Atkin & Block (1983) and Petty et al. (1983).

**Recall**

Recall; taking account of the lapses in time between communication exposure and purchase, was introduced as an effectiveness measure by Gallup in the 1930s, and by the 1960s, the primary gauge of advertising effectiveness was recall (Heath & Nairn, 2005; Barclay, Doub & McMurtrey, 1965). As shown by Rockney & Greene (1979) and Cooper (1984) brand or product recall ability increased when there was a good fit between product and celebrity endorser.

**Intention to Purchase (ITP)**

In nearly all cases the main goal of an advertisement is to convince consumers to purchase the product or service, therefore testing the viewers ITP is critical. The existing literature is equivocal over the effect of celebrity endorsement on ITP, with Baker & Churchill (1997) and Till & Busler (2000) finding no significant effect, whilst Pornpitakpan (2003) found that celebrity endorsement was a powerful predictor of ITP.
Selection Strategy Techniques

As the use of, and research into, celebrity endorsement has grown, selection strategy techniques have been proposed to explain the most effective ways to partner with and use celebrity endorsers for campaigns. The key techniques are listed below.

Source Credibility Model

The Source Credibility Model states that a credible, expert or trustworthy source (i.e. an endorser) will positively impact the effectiveness of the advertisement, by shaping consumer beliefs, opinions and actions (Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Solomon, 1996). Interestingly, Hovland et al. (1953) and Ohanian (1991) have found that the perceived expertise of the endorser is the important factor and actual expertise level is unimportant.

Source Attractiveness Model

Research has shown that physically attractive endorsers are more effective at changing beliefs (Baker & Churchill, 1977; Debevec & Kernan, 1984) and increasing ITP (Friedman, Termini & Washington, 1976; Petty & Cacioppo, 1980) than unattractive ones, in part because consumers react positively to attractive people (Erdogan, 1999). However the Source Attractiveness Model is not limited to physical attractiveness, but instead uses the similarity, familiarity and liking for an endorser by the consumer (McGuire, 1985). The literature is in agreement that attractive celebrity endorsers determine positive consumer attitudes, both in regards of advertising and brand, whilst their ability to generate ITP is more equivocal (Erdogan, 1999).
**Product Match-Up Hypothesis**

The Product Match-Up Hypothesis states that an advertisement’s effectiveness will increase if there is a link between the endorser and the product (Forkan, 1980; Kamins, 1990). The closer the link between endorser and product, the more effective the communication (Misra & Beatty, 1990; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Kotler & Dupree, 1997).

Indeed, Evans (1988) found that a lack of connection between the celebrity endorser and the product resulted in consumers believing the celebrity was being substantially remunerated to appear. In addition, a lack of a clear match between the endorser and the product resulted in consumers remembering the celebrity and not the product or brand, a phenomenon referred to as the “vampire effect” (Evans, 1988).

**Meaning Transfer Model**

Individual celebrities represent different aspects and values of society to individual consumers. Their appearance in advertisements or campaigns confers these values to the products or services, resulting in ‘meaning transfer’ (McCracken, 1989; Erdogan & Baker, 2000). As recommended by McCracken (1989), practitioners should examine the values associated with the proposed endorser to ensure they are congruent with the brand and product, in order to ensure maximum effectiveness.

**Risks of using celebrities**

Whilst celebrity endorsers enable communications to ‘stand out’ from market clutter (Sherman, 1985), there are risks attached to their use. Celebrity popularity can wax and wane throughout a career and a celebrity’s failures or transgressions can impact negatively on endorsement effectiveness (Agrawal, Kamakura & Kamakura, 1995; Erdogan & Baker, 2000; Amos, Holmes & Strutton, 2008). In this instance, brands often take swift action to distance themselves from a celebrity’s misconduct. For example, in 1993, Pepsi (American soft
drinks brand) ended their nine year endorsement arrangement with Michael Jackson (American pop singer) after allegations were brought against Jackson for child sexual abuse (Swerdlow & Swerdlow, 2003). Additionally, celebrities associated with several brands may become less powerful, as there is no distinctive partnership between the endorser and the brand (Mowen & Brown, 1981), which in turn can also jeopardise the perceived trustworthiness of the celebrity endorser (Tripp, Jensen & Carlson, 1994).

2.3 Conservation Marketing

2.3.1 The Use of Flagship Species
Conservation organisations have historically used flagship species to raise awareness, effect behaviour change and fundraise because it is thought that a positive attitude towards the species will be linked with desirability for conservation intervention (Leader-Williams & Dublin, 2000; Walpole & Leader-Williams, 2002; Eckert & Hemphill, 2005; Home et al., 2009). However there is still confusion within the conservation community as to the definition of a flagship species (Veríssimo, MacMillan & Smith, 2011) and much debate within the literature as to how successfully, and in what ways, flagship species have been used in conservation marketing (Bowen-Jones & Entwistle, 2002; Ball, 2004; Favreau et al., 2006; Home et al., 2009). Veríssimo et al. (2011) argue that the most commonly used flagship species, such as elephants and tigers, are at risk of being associated with too many organisations and campaigns, thus diluting their power and effectiveness to the public. This is the same phenomenon observed by Mowen & Brown with regards celebrity endorsement (1981). A search of the peer reviewed literature reveals that, to date, only Veríssimo et al. (2013) have conducted research into the effectiveness of conservation marketing.
2.3.2 The Use of Celebrities

Celebrities, and in particular European Royalty, have long been connected to conservation and wildlife preservation charities. For example, in the UK, H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh was WWF-UK’s founding President from 1961 to 1982 (Schwarzenbach, 2011). His son, H.R.H. The Prince of Wales was announced as the Zoological Society of London’s Vice Patron in March 2014 (Zoological Society of London, 2014), and his grandson, H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge, has continued to support wildlife charities by bringing together seven of the world’s foremost conservation organisations to create United For Wildlife (Kensington Palace, 2013). Notable other examples of celebrities demonstrating interest in the world of conservation include American actor Leonardo DiCaprio’s support for environmental and conservation causes. In addition to donating US$3 million in 2013 (WWF, 2013), he attended the International Tiger Conservation Forum in St Petersburg in 2010 (WWF, 2010). Furthermore Harrison Ford (American actor) is Vice Chair of Conservation International’s Board of Directors, where he plays an active role, such as attending the Convention on Biological Diversities’ 10th Conference of the Parties (Conservation International, 2010).

A preliminary examination of conservation organisations websites and research by Brockington & Henson (2014) indicates that celebrities are used for the following reasons:

- To increase brand credibility
- To provide access to new audiences
- To provide opportunities to effect behaviour change in target market
- To provide opportunities to raise awareness (either for an organisation, or for specific issue)
• To provide opportunities to raise funds (either for organisations, or for specific programme)

The celebrity can fulfil these goals by:
• Acting as a Patron
• Acting as a Trustee
• Acting as an Ambassador
• Being a spokesperson for the organisation
• Being a spokesperson for a programme or campaign
• Attending a fundraising event (this could be for the public, or for specific groups of elites)
• Publicly committing to a certain behaviour
• Promoting the organisation, programme or campaign through their social media and professional connections

Organisations tailor their approach depending on the type of organisation they are, the impact strategy and the type of celebrity. For example Royalty are often asked to act as Patrons, but rarely to attend fundraising events or publically commit to a certain behaviour. With the recent rise in the prevalence of social media, celebrities are increasingly being used to spread conservation organisation’s messages to their fans through social media channels such as Twitter or Facebook.

2.4 A Multidisciplinary Approach for Conservation

As conservation develops from the natural sciences approach (conservation biology) to a multidisciplinary field (conservation science), the importance of incorporating the social sciences is being increasingly recognised (Kareiva & Marvier, 2012; Milner-Gulland, 2012; Raymond & Knight, 2013). The conservation community benefits from integrating other disciplines into their wider programme strategies. Wilson et al. (2006) and Murdoch et al. (2007) have discussed the importance of implementing ROI frameworks given the lack of resources.
available to conservation programmes. Raymond & Knight (2013) have stressed the value of incorporating social scientists and their techniques into conservation programme planning and Margolius et al. (2009) have emphasized the role good evaluation design can play.

As the conservation community become increasingly multidisciplinary it is vital it uses the best practices of the marketing industry to effectively communicate how to raise awareness, change behaviour, and raise funds. There is an increasing call for the evaluation of effectiveness of conservation programmes (Ferraro & Pattanayak, 2006). However a search of the peer reviewed literature reveals that, to date, only Veríssimo et al. (2013) have conducted research into the effectiveness of conservation marketing.
Chapter 3 – Methods

3.1 Methodological Framework

Given the lack of existing literature on the use, and effect, of celebrities in conservation marketing, it was necessary to gather both qualitative and quantitative data in order to gain a deeper understanding of the public’s attitudes towards celebrities, and their potential effectiveness in conservation. Focus groups were held with individuals ranging in age from 22 to 70, from both conservation and non-conservation backgrounds and with a range of occupations, to uncover key themes and issues relating to celebrity endorsement of conservation. The qualitative data gathered were used to shape and design an online survey, which used copy testing, a novel technique in the field of conservation science to quantitatively assess attitudes towards celebrities. Finally, semi-structured interviews were held with the personnel responsible for marketing at conservation organisations to understand more about how such organisations perceive the use of celebrities, and the factors that control how they are used.

3.2 Exploratory Focus Groups

Focus groups are a popular form of qualitative data collection, allowing the researcher to understand the thoughts and opinions of a group of people on a given topic (Newing, 2010). Focus groups usually consist of between six and 12 participants and require a plan or guide to the session. This can take the form of open-ended questions or topics to discuss and are designed to develop a conversation, through which the facilitator can learn what is important or relevant to the participants (Newing, 2010). The focus group approach is widespread since it allows additional information to surface, which the facilitator or researcher
might have previously been unaware of, or not fully appreciated the relevance of. Additionally, focus groups allow important aspects of the conversation to be enforced or emphasised, given a more natural conversation flow. However, focus groups are open to criticisms as they can be easily biased by group dynamics, incomplete answers can be given or even topics ignored completely. Care must therefore be taken regarding the choice of focus group participant, and the group discussion must be well facilitated (Newing, 2010).

3.2.1 Focus Group use in Market Research:
Focus groups are extensively used in marketing research, primarily because the data is gathered from the target audience, is easy to understand, and can refine and focus the information required from a questionnaire or survey (Cramphorn, 2004; Newing, 2010). Accordingly, preliminary focus groups were conducted to discover the broad themes and issues associated with the use of celebrities in conservation communications.

3.2.2 Focus Group Design
The focus group script and tools were developed based on existing literature and best practice guidelines (Berg & Lune, 2004; Newing, 2010). A pilot focus group was conducted with four individuals; three female, one male, ranging in age from 23 to 39, whose feedback allowed for minor changes to be made to the questions and display of materials, prior to the start of the full study. See Appendix 1 for focus group script.

The focus groups were structured to encourage group participation and visual tools were used both to facilitate conversation early in the session, and to aid conversation flow throughout. After an introduction and explanation of the research and relevant ethics, participants were
asked to choose the image or advert, from the 16 laid out (see Appendix 2), which appealed to them most. Each participant was given the opportunity to explain their choice, which prompted the conversation to flow from these choices to a discussion of their opinions and thoughts about conservation marketing in general. The topic of celebrities in conservation was then introduced, or raised again where appropriate, and the participants were asked to suggest names of celebrities they associate with conservation. These names and the reasons for these suggestions were discussed, as well as the participant’s feelings about celebrity endorsement. Finally, the participants were asked if they had any further comments, and the focus group was drawn to a conclusion, incorporating a summary of the key points from the facilitator to ensure an accurate depiction was recorded.

3.2.3 Focus Group Undertaking

In total, five focus groups were held, with three of the groups made up of individuals with no strong interest in, or ties to, any conservation organisation. The remaining two groups consisted of individuals who self-identified as having an interest in, or commitment to, conservation, for example as volunteers for a conservation organisation (See Table 3.1 for details on the focus groups).

Table 3.1 - Details of Focus Group Composition and Sourcing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Number</th>
<th>Conservation / Non Conservation</th>
<th>Sourced From:</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Gender Split (male: female)</th>
<th>Approximate Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Silwood Park Administration Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>28 - 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>ZSL volunteers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>24 – 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non Conservation</td>
<td>Mixed group, sourced via social media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>22 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non Conservation</td>
<td>Local book group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>45 – 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non Conservation</td>
<td>Mixed group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>45 - 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus groups lasted between 66 minutes and 83 minutes, with a mean length of 76 minutes. Where possible, the participants in each group fell within the same age group and/or socio-economic division, to ensure comfort and freedom of expression, and to ensure a free-flowing conversation.

3.3 Internet Survey

The survey was designed in response to the key findings of the focus groups. In accordance with advertising pre-testing procedure, four identical advertisements (treatments) were created. The measurable variable was the personality featured in each. Online survey distribution has become increasingly popular in recent years, owing to the increase of personal online access and the reduced financial and staff costs required to distribute and collect responses. Whilst face-to-face interviews and group discussions can yield detailed and valuable data, they are difficult and costly to organise and conduct, particularly if a large sample size is required (Newing, 2010).

3.3.1 Survey Software

Qualtrics version 57201 (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) survey software was chosen because of its flexibility and suitability to this style of survey design, its prevalence in academic and marketing research (Rolison, Hanoch & Miron-Shatz, 2012; Sams et al., 2013) and the access provided by Imperial College London.

3.3.2 Survey Structure

The survey was designed to be short and easy to complete to avoid respondent fatigue, at the same time as gathering the key points. Consequently the survey was structured to show each respondent one
of the four personalities (randomly selected by Qualtrics, see Appendix 3) and ask a series of questions to gather data on their attitude towards the personality, their awareness of the involvement of the personality and other impressions of the communication as well as testing recall. Respondents were then shown all four personalities and asked a series of questions regarding their attitudes towards each personality, and which image they preferred. See Appendix 4 for survey layout and questions.

3.3.3 Survey Design

Composition & Execution

In a fully experimental pre-test, all aspects of the advertisement would be identical, apart from the attribute being tested. For this study the presentation of the personalities should be identical, from the style of photography to the clothing and context of the image. Critically, the statement or quote should also be identical across the board. Given the nature of a study such as this, it is not feasible to photograph each personality in the same context and style, or to attribute the same quote to each. Therefore it was necessary to find publically available images and quotations which could be combined to create promotional images that were as similar as possible. Substantial care was taken to choose images that were as close in style as possible, for example a serious expression and looking directly at the camera. Furthermore, constraints were imposed by public availability of the images. Given that research in both the consumer behaviour and cognitive psychology literatures shows the power of the picture-superiority effect (that pictures or images are more effective than words in conveying messages) in terms of its effect on both memory and judgement, it was considered acceptable for each personality to have their own quote (Paivio, 1969; Lutz & Lutz, 1977; Childers & Houston, 1984).
Subject Content
To ensure the messages in each image were cohesive and consistent, a specific conservation issue was chosen. Given the current public awareness surrounding it, the illegal trade in wildlife was selected. The statements to accompany the images of each personality were chosen for their focus on legacy, i.e. the risk that these species will be extinct for future generations.

Gender, Ethnicity & Nationality
To eliminate any possibility of gender bias as a factor in the comparison, it was decided all four personalities would be male. As with gender, ethnicity and nationality are complex factors, beyond the scope of this study. Consequently the personalities were of the same ethnic background and nationality: Caucasian and British. It was not possible to account for education and socio-economic background, given the limited availability of potential personalities, and the expertise level required.

Brand Familiarity
Given the role of brand familiarity and potential for bias based on the respondents existing levels of brand awareness, it was necessary to ensure there was no brand association for any of the images (Stammerjohan et al., 2005). There were also legal implications to consider, due to the nature of the partnerships celebrities have with certain organisations.
**Layout**

Feedback from the pilot study ensured the survey flowed sensibly and the structure was easy to understand and follow. Questions were made as short and internationally comprehensible as possible. The layout and format of the survey images were in line with similar brand communications from a variety of conservation organisations. However given the lack of testing currently being undertaken by said organisations, there is little way of knowing how popular this formatting is with consumers.

**Randomisation**

In accordance with Wakefield *et al.* (2011) question response options and image display order were randomised to ensure order effect was minimised. The only exceptions were options that were alphabetised to aid respondent comprehension.

**Demographic Data**

Demographic data were collected at the end of the survey to prevent respondent fatigue. Additionally, sensitive questions such as age were categorized (Newing, 2010).

**3.3.4 Anonymity and Ethics**

The survey was designed in full accordance with the Marketing Research Association’s (MRA) Code of Marketing Research Standards (MRA, 2013). Respondent anonymity was ensured by not collecting any personally identifiable information (PII) such as location or email address. Due care was taken to ensure both the source materials and questions were presented impartially and respondent participation was entirely optional. Respondents were thanked upon completion, as well as receiving online links to learn more about the topic if they so wished,
and contact details in case they had any questions about the survey or research itself. Additionally care was taken to ensure each personality was not misrepresented; the statement was a direct quote and images were publically available and credited appropriately.

3.3.5 Pilot Testing

The survey was pilot-tested by 17 individuals. Feedback was generally positive with only minor issues concerning clarification of wording to make questions clearer and display issues such as font sizing. Corrections and improvements were made where appropriate.

3.3.6 Survey Distribution

Much of the literature on celebrity effectiveness is either carried out using panels available to advertising or marketing bodies, or using undergraduate students (Goldsmith, Lafferty & Newell, 2000; Till & Busler, 2000). Indeed Amos et al. (2008) found statistically significant differences in results of celebrity endorsement effectiveness tests between students and non-students. Given this, and the fact neither panels nor undergraduate students accurately represent the target audience for conservation messages, a broader cross section of the population was required. The survey was distributed online, through a variety of channels, including social networks (Twitter and Facebook), conservation organisation volunteer mailing lists and social (for example book club) mailing lists. Whilst social media use is most prevalent in younger people (Pew, 2013), members of these lists and social media users ranged in age from teenagers to retired individuals of 75 and older. Additionally, the respondents were asked at the end of the survey to forward it on to three of their friends; a technique known as snowballing. This has inherent biases, as people are restricted to sharing only within their own personal networks, however it is a
common way of increasing sample size and respondent variety (Sudman, 1976; Salganik, 2006).

3.3.7 Data Collection

3.3.7.1 Willingness-to-Engage
To assess Willingness-to-Engage (WTE), survey respondents were shown one of four possible advertisements (a treatment, see Figure 3.1), each featuring a different personality (Table 3.2). They were randomised through Qualtrics survey flow, and respondents were asked if they would click on the link to find out more, representing their WTE with the advertisement.

Figure 3-1 - Four Treatments to Test Respondent Willingness-to-Engage

Table 3.2 - Table Showing Treatment Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crawford Allen</th>
<th>Chris Packham</th>
<th>David Beckham</th>
<th>H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coded as</strong></td>
<td>Created Endorser</td>
<td>Celebrity Endorser</td>
<td>Celebrity Endorser</td>
<td>Celebrity Endorser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Famous For</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Presenting nature and wildlife television shows in the UK, and being outspoken on controversial conservation issues</td>
<td>Former England and International footballer. Married to Victoria Beckham, a former Spice Girl</td>
<td>Member of the British Royal Family, second in line to the throne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to Issue</strong></td>
<td>Currently working with Traffic and WWF to combat the illegal trade in wildlife</td>
<td>None, has not spoken officially about the issue, though has spoken on other issues, such as the killing of migratory birds in Malta</td>
<td>Recently joined United for Wildlife as Lead Ambassador</td>
<td>Created United for Wildlife, a group of seven large conservation organisations, to combat the illegal trade in wildlife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.7.2 Reasons for WTE decision

Respondents were then asked to indicate, using Likert-type statements, why they made the decision they did (Figure 3.2).

![Likert-type Statements used to Uncover Reasons for Respondents WTE Decision](image)

Figure 3.2 - Likert-type Statements used to Uncover Reasons for Respondents WTE Decision
3.3.7.3 Respondent Awareness of Personalities’ Prior Support

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were aware of the personali-ty’s support for the issue prior to starting the survey.

3.3.7.4 Personality & Issue Recall

To assess recall, midway through the survey, respondents were asked to enter both the name of the personality, and the issue featured in the advertisement they saw at the start. Responses that contained any of the following words, or a combination of them were coded as ‘full recall’; ‘crime’, ‘poaching’, ‘illegal’ and ‘trade’. Responses that mentioned ‘wildlife’, ‘conservation’, ‘animals’ or similar were coded as ‘incomplete recall’ and responses that were left blank or the respondent entered ‘no’ were coded as ‘no recall’.

3.3.7.5 Treatment Comparison

Respondents were shown all four treatments and asked to select the one they would be most likely to engage with. They were then asked to give their reasons using a selection of tick boxes.

3.4 Data Analysis

Marketing and advertising research utilises a wide range of analysis tools, particularly to understand how different market sectors will react to the advertisement. When pretesting, the concept will have been designed based on extensive research and best practice guidelines, and in accordance with the brief’s strategy. Therefore the analysis required for copy testing is simpler as the primary goal is to understand which ‘treatment’ is preferred by the appropriate market sector.
3.4.1 Survey Analysis

All analysis was conducted in R (R Core Team, 2013). Pearson’s Chi-Squared Test was used (Fisher’s Exact Test was used if any of the observed values were below 5) to assess the significance of the factors which influenced the respondents Willingness-to-Engage, awareness of personality’s support for issue, recall, and choice of image. Standardised Residuals were used for further analysis. In addition a Cumulative Logit Model (CLM) was used to look at the factors which influenced the respondents WTE using the “ordinal” package in R (Christensen, 2013). A CLM is appropriate when the response variable is ordinal (Agresti, 2014). The model of best fit was found by removing variables with no significance in a stepwise procedure until all variables were significant.

3.4.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The commonly occurring themes identified in the qualitative data, gathered in both focus groups and semi-structured interviews, were collated and categorised and are presented, accompanied by relevant quotations (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

3.5 Semi-Structured Interviews with Conservation Practitioners

In addition to gathering data on the thoughts and opinions of the ‘consumer’ of conservation marketing, it was also necessary to investigate how conservation practitioners perceive and use celebrities. Semi-structured interviews were used to gather this data. Responses have been kept anonymous at the request of the interviewees.
3.5.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews (SSIs) are similar to focus groups as both require a plan or guide to shape the interview, but it can be informal, and include topics for discussion and open ended, structured and closed questions (Newing, 2010). However SSIs consist of a single interviewee, making it possible to ensure the participant is unable to rely on assistance from another when responding (Bailey, 1987).

The SSIs were arranged through a combination of direct contacts and snowballing (asking for suggestions of people to contact) with marketing personnel at a variety of organisations. These were predominantly conservation-based non-governmental organisations (NGOs) within the UK. Additionally personnel from two humanitarian organisations were interviewed, both of which were large child protection charities, with dedicated celebrity management teams. Where possible, face-to-face meetings were arranged, if this was unfeasible, the interview was held via telephone or email. Table 3.3 shows the organisations interviewed and the method by which they were sourced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Sourced by</th>
<th>Interview Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Save The Rhino</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Face-to-Face SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley Fund for Nature</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Face-to-Face SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WildAid</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Email Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save The Children</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>Telephone SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant for NSPCC</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>Face-to-Face SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna &amp; Flora International</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Email Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfowl &amp; Wetlands Trust</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Email Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF-UK</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Telephone SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>Email Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoological Society of London</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Telephone SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Telephone SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
<td>Telephone SSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus of each SSI was to learn about how that particular organisation used celebrities in their marketing, and to discover if and how they track or monitor the effectiveness of using celebrities.
Chapter 4 – Results

The results are ordered as follows. The results of the semi-structured interviews with marketing professionals from non-profit organisations comprise section 4.1. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with marketing professionals at ten conservation organisations and two humanitarian organisations. Individuals spoke on behalf of their organisations, therefore all opinions expressed represent the views of the organisation. The Internet survey analysis and findings, complemented with appropriate focus group data, including the results of the pre-testing, comprise section 4.2. Supplementary focus group data shaped the survey design and is summarised in section 4.3. Five focus groups were held between 22\textsuperscript{nd} May and 6\textsuperscript{th} June 2014. Focus group results were used to investigate brand familiarity and attitudes towards conservation marketing and celebrity endorsement in conservation. Responses to the Internet survey were collected between 17\textsuperscript{th} July and 9\textsuperscript{th} August 2014 with a 71\% completion rate (N=535). Respondent demographics are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 - Summary of Internet Survey Respondent Demographics (N=379)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 24</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 84</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess a Degree</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Possess a Degree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Current Use and Evaluation of Celebrities in Conservation Marketing

4.1.1 Organisation’s Attitudes Towards Use of Celebrities

Every organisation agreed there were advantages and disadvantages to using celebrities and that on balance they believed celebrities were worth the work, and potential risk. Advantages included the increased exposure and media awareness the celebrities’ presence garnered for the organisation. Additionally, Royalty in particular were considered beneficial due to their international appeal and recognisability, and therefore particularly advantageous in developing countries. They were also considered to bring cachet and prestige to an organisation. Royal patronages are rarely bestowed, and consequently the granting of one indicates an organisation has been inspected and verified. This ‘stamp of approval’ can then encourage other businesses and influential individuals to partner with the organisation. Disadvantages included the risk of negative information arising about the celebrity, and potentially tainting the organisation by association.

For example, a conservation marketing professional stated:

“In our experience, leveraging celebrity endorsement for conservation has had a tremendous impact on the success and reach of our campaigns. Provided you do your research and choose a celebrity that is well known, popular, highly esteemed, and influential, a communication campaign has a significantly better chance of reaching, teaching, and influencing a larger population and effecting both attitudinal and behavioral (sic) change.”
4.1.2 Ways in which Celebrities are Used

Celebrities were used in different ways by different organisations. Some organisations chose to use celebrities to gain credibility, with the celebrity endorsement acting as a ‘stamp of approval’ or to access new market sectors. Often this was using celebrities, for example as an after dinner speaker, to attract ‘elites’ (high net-worth individuals, often in influential careers) to prestigious fund raising events. These niche events are specifically targeted to entice such elites, who, it is hoped, will donate generously, especially when surrounded by their peers and celebrities they respect or admire. Alternatively some organisations used celebrities to gain press coverage or column inches, or to use their presence on social media to raise awareness.

For example a conservation marketing professional stated:

"Celebrities can bring friends to our events, and introduce new people as potential donors."

4.1.3 Development of Celebrity Partnerships

A common theme throughout the conservation organisations was the lack of strategy for developing and maintaining celebrity partnerships. The majority of the conservation organisations interviewed stated that they did not have a formal strategy, and that, often celebrity engagement was done on an ad-hoc basis. Some organisations researched a potential celebrity prior to contact to ascertain suitability, but this was not standard across the board.

For example, a conservation marketing professional stated:

"We have no testing on what celebrities to use, it is more like an interview; we choose someone who is a good fit."
4.1.4 Marketing Evaluation

All organisations interviewed had a method of tracking or monitoring their marketing, either through web analytics, column inches or social media engagement. However only one conservation organisation and the two humanitarian organisations had any formal evaluation process in place to monitor the impact of celebrities. Additionally no testing was carried out, by any organisation interviewed, on the attributes of the celebrities that were most effective for target markets.

For example, conservation marketing professionals stated:

"We have no formal feedback on celebrities, we have comms [communication] metrics, but they are not tied to celebrities."

"We have no formal process of choosing celebrities or how to work with them."

4.1.5 Payment of Celebrities for Endorsement

Every organisation interviewed stated that they had not, to date, paid a celebrity to appear or act as a spokesperson, particularly if the celebrity was a patron or trustee. However some organisations did state they would cover the costs incurred by the celebrity as a result of their appearance or involvement. For example if they were hosting a fundraising event, or fulfilling a role they are normally paid to do, such as a band performing at an event.

For example, a conservation marketing professional stated:

"While all of our celebrity ambassadors’ time is donated, we do cover the associated travel and lodging costs for them to attend a filming, photo shoot, or press conference."
4.2 Effect of Celebrity Endorser on WTE

4.2.1 Willingness-to-Engage by Treatment (celebrity versus non-celebrity endorser)

Willingness-to-Engage (WTE) (how likely the respondent would be to click on the link) varied significantly between treatments ($\chi^2 = 13.43$, df = 6, $P = 0.037$) (Figure 4.1).

![Figure 4.1 - Respondent Willingness-to-Engage with Advertisement (likelihood of clicking on link) by Treatment (N=379)](image)

Whilst respondent gender had no significant effect on WTE ($\chi^2 = 1.96$, df = 2, $P = 0.38$), respondent age ($P = < 0.01$, Fisher’s Exact Test) and education level ($\chi^2 = 11.8654$, df = 2, $P = < 0.001$) did.

Standardised residuals indicate which factors contribute to the significance of the relationship. The further the residual from 0 the more effect that factor has. A high positive residual indicates respondents were more likely to undertake that action, a lower negative residual
indicates they would be less likely to. The standardised residuals for age indicate that respondents in the 25 to 34 age group were less likely to engage with the advertisement, whereas respondents in the 65 to 74 age group were more likely to engage (Table 4.2). Respondents educated to degree level or above were less likely to engage with the advertisement than respondents without degree level education (Table 4.3).

![Table 4.2 - Standardised Residuals showing effect of age on respondent WTE. P = 0.05 (significant values indicated by *). Critical values 1.96 & -1.96]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Would Not Click</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Would Click</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 – 24</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>3.55 *</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-3.08 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>-2.11 *</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>-2.14 *</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>3.33 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 4.3 - Standardised Residuals showing effect of degree level education on respondent WTE. P = 0.05 (significant values indicated by *). Critical values 1.96 & -1.96]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Would Not Click</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Would Click</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2.51 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.41 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>-2.51 *</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.41 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2 Reasons for Willingness-to-Engage Decision

All factors were significant in influencing respondents’ WTE decision, with likeability of personality, interest in personalities’ support of issue, statement and engagement with promotional image highly significant. Standardised residuals were used to explore the factors contributing to the significance levels.

The data unequivocally show the strength of the Source Attractiveness Model; respondent liking of the personality was significantly more likely to support positive engagement decisions whilst dislike of the personality resulted in negative engagement decisions (Table 4.4a). It is known that physically attractive celebrity endorsers are more
effective than less physically attractive ones, and this could explain the high positive WTE responses for David Beckham. Respondents who were interested in the personalities support for the issue were significantly more likely to engage with the advertisement, whilst those with little or no interest were more likely not to engage (Table 4.4b). This suggests that an unusual choice of celebrity could provide a stimulus for engagement as a curiosity factor. However, there is no evidence to prove this will translate to any meaningful action, and could potentially have negative consequences if the celebrity is considered inappropriate or ill-matched, in line with the findings of the focus groups. Statements that caught the respondent’s attention were significantly more likely to support positive engagement behaviour than those that didn’t (Table 4.4c). The effect of statement would appear to be in contrast to the picture-superiority effect reported by Paivio (1969), and Childers & Houston (1984). Respondents who were reluctant to engage with promotional images in general were considerably less likely to engage with the advertisement (Table 4.4d). This could in part be due to an increase in market clutter, with the public becoming progressively more selective with regards the advertisements they interact with (Pieters & Wedel, 2004). Respondents with an existing interest in the issue were more likely to engage, however no prior interest did not make respondents less likely to engage (Table 4.4e). Respondents were less likely to engage if they did not believe the personality to be knowledgeable about the issue (Table 4.4f). This was an important consideration for focus group participants too. Respondents who recognised the personality were considerably more likely to engage with the advertisement, whilst those who did not recognise the personality were more likely to not engage (Table 4.4g). This suggests that higher-profile celebrities are more successful at effecting positive WTE behaviour. As a note of caution it is important to remember the potential risk of the ‘vampire-effect’ by which the high-profile celebrity overpowers the campaign.
Table 4.4 a-g - Standardised residuals of factors effecting respondent WTE. P = 0.05 (significant values indicated by a *). Critical values 1.96 & -1.96

### 4.4a Personality Likeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
<td>3.01*</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
<td>-2.98*</td>
<td>-3.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-2.43*</td>
<td>-2.98*</td>
<td>-1.97*</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4b Respondent Interest in Personalities Support of Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>5.28*</td>
<td>2.28*</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-4.28*</td>
<td>-4.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-3.40*</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-3.01*</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-2.01*</td>
<td>3.21*</td>
<td>5.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4c Impact of Personalities Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
<td>4.65*</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-3.73*</td>
<td>-5.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-2.18*</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-3.82*</td>
<td>-3.44*</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>3.75*</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4d Respondent Engagement with Promotional Images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>6.19*</td>
<td>-3.32*</td>
<td>-2.98*</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-2.78*</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-4.70*</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
<td>2.70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4e Respondent Interest Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-2.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-2.15*</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4f Respondent Belief in Personalities Knowledge of Issue

\[ \chi^2 = 19.95, \text{ df} = 8, P = < 0.01 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>2.97*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-2.68*</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-2.44*</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4g Respondent Recognition of Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Click</td>
<td>3.87*</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-3.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Click</td>
<td>-3.27*</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Cumulative Logit Model (CLM)

The following Cumulative Logit Model (CLM) (summary in Table 4.5) reinforces the findings above. The multivariate analysis shows that personalities’ knowledge of issue, effective statement and knowledge of personalities’ pre-existing support were all highly important factors in influencing positive WTE behaviour. Chris Packham, David Beckham and H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge are all significantly more likely to lead to positive WTE behaviour than Crawford Allen, who is the baseline.

Couldry & Markham (2007) found a clear relationship between youth and interest in celebrities, which would suggest that the use of celebrity endorsers would be most appropriately targeted towards young people. However this study, and Brockington & Henson’s (2014) cluster analysis of survey responses, found that older people (> 45 years of age) were more likely to engage with, or approve of, celebrity endorsement. This study also found that the age group least likely to engage was 25 – 34, which would indicate that celebrity endorsement is particularly ineffective, and possibly detrimental to conservation marketing for young people. It is possible that respondents in this age group did not like any of the four personalities presented, however given the link between youth and interest in celebrity, and range of personalities, this finding is surprising.
4.3 Effect of Personality Credibility

Respondent’s belief in a personality's knowledge of the issue was used as an indicator for credibility. As shown previously (Table 4.4f), the effect of a personality's knowledge on WTE was significant. In addition, the effect of personalities knowledge when treatments were compared was also significant (P = < 0.001, Fisher's Exact Test). Whilst 80% of respondents believed Crawford Allen was knowledgeable, and 60% Chris Packham, only 8% and 3% believed H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge and David Beckham were respectively.
4.3.1 Focus Group Findings on Personality Credibility

The perceived credibility of a celebrity was consistently highlighted in each focus group. In addition to believing the celebrity was knowledgeable about the topic, focus group participants expected the celebrity to have personal integrity. Whilst a celebrity could be credible with little perceived personal integrity, it was deemed an important quality by focus group participants. Celebrities not considered intelligent were regularly commented on as being unlikely to persuade participants either to engage with the advertisement, or to believe that the celebrity knew anything about the issue they were endorsing.

In addition, focus group participants expected a celebrity to possess a level of authority when speaking about an issue. Celebrities that participants did not believe, or know, to be informed about and well connected to the issue were reacted to negatively and often derisively.

For example:

"What does Harrison Ford actually do?"
Female, Group 2, Participant Number 2

"Celebrities don’t help at all; I would rather have a professional in the subject."
Female, Group 4, Participant Number 4

"I don’t like it when it is random and the celebrity is parachuted in. It needs to be explained why the celebrity is there."
Female, Group 2, Participant Number 2

"I want someone who has an association; I don’t want people to come out of the blue."
Male, Group 5, Participant Number 1
“Celebrities for celebrities sake is off-putting. We know that celebrities are paid to do things, and therefore don’t know how much they care. We assume they do it because it looks good for their profile and image.”

Female, Group 3, Participant Number 6

Celebrities with a track record of involvement with science or the natural world were reacted to favourably, regardless of their area of expertise. For example, Dr Brian Cox (British physicist and television science show presenter) was suggested as a personality the participants would believe and pay attention to if he spoke about any scientific or conservation issue.

Focus group participants discussing credibility:

“Simon Barnes does articles on nature and so I would trust his recommendations, especially rather than being pressurised by an advert.”

Female, Group 4, Participant Number 4

“Credibility is key.”

Female, Group 3, Participant Number 5

“Need to know they have done their research and not just been parachuted in.”

Female, Group 4, Participant Number 5

“If there is no relevance, then the involvement of a celebrity acts as a negative.”

Male, Group 5, Participant Number 7
4.4 Effect of Personality on Recall

Treatment had a significant effect on personality recall ($P = < 0.001$, Fisher’s Exact Test) and issue recall ($P = < 0.001$, Fisher’s Exact Test). Figure 4.3 shows the percentage of respondents who recalled the issue by treatment.

![Figure 4.3](image)

Figure 4-2 - Respondent Recall of Advertisement Issue by Treatment (N=354)

Standardised residuals show that whilst Chris Packham and David Beckham had no effect on recall, Crawford Allen had a significant positive effect on Full Recall and a significant negative effect on Incomplete Recall. This means respondents were significantly more likely to accurately recall the advertisement featuring Crawford Allen; the created endorser. H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge had a significant positive effect on Incomplete Recall, but a significant negative effect on Full Recall, meaning respondents were more likely to recall general wildlife issues, but not the specific issue of the illegal trade in wildlife for H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge (Table 4.6).
Table 4.6 - Standardised residuals for respondent recall of issue by treatment. P = 0.05 (significant values indicated by *). Critical values 1.96 & 1.96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crawford Allen</th>
<th>Chris Packham</th>
<th>David Beckham</th>
<th>H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Recall</td>
<td>3.98 *</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-2.98 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Recall</td>
<td>-4.25 *</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.98 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Recall</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Effect on WTE of knowledge of personalities support

The effect of respondent’s prior knowledge of a personalities support on WTE was significant (P < 0.001, Fisher’s Exact Test) (Figure 4.4). The standardised residuals indicate that respondents who were unaware of the personalities’ support for the issue prior to the survey were significantly more likely to not engage with the advertisement, whereas existing knowledge of the personalities support increased respondent WTE (Table 4.7).

![Figure 4-3 - Effect of Respondent’s Awareness of Personalities Support on WTE (N=371)](image)
Table 4.7 - Standardised residuals for effect of respondents awareness of personalities support on WTE. P = 0.05 (significant value indicated by *). Critical values 1.96 & -1.96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unaware</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Click</strong></td>
<td>-3.07 *</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>3.48 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsure</strong></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Not Click</strong></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-4.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Evidence of Previous Support

Focus group participants repeatedly emphasised the importance of being aware of a celebrity’s support for an issue prior to seeing an advertisement if they were to believe in and trust the endorsement made by the celebrity. Focus group participants also expected to have seen or read about the celebrities involvement in the campaign through other channels, for example on the celebrity’s own website, on social media channels, or through appearances on television shows or in magazines.

Focus group participants discussing evidence of previous support:

“I would take it more seriously if I see them on TV or Twitter talking about the issue.”

Female, Group 5, Participant Number 6

“If you see people who have never been engaged, what authority do you think they have?”

Male, Group 2, Participant Number 4
4.6 Personality Comparison

When shown all four personalities, Chris Packham was the most likely to trigger respondent engagement, with 37% of respondents selecting the advertisement featuring him. H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge received 34%, David Beckham received 17% and Crawford Allen received the least with 12%. Of the reasons respondents gave for their selection, respondent’s preference for a personality, knowledge of a celebrity’s support for the issue, attractiveness of the imagery used in the advertisement and belief that the personality is the most knowledgeable were all highly significant in explaining choice of advertisement. However gender, age, education level of respondent, and personality statement were not significant.

Crawford Allen’s highest score was for respondent’s belief that he was the most knowledgeable. Whilst his statement had some effect, all other factors were very low. Chris Packham scored highest for being the most knowledgeable about the issue, and respondents being aware of his support prior to the survey. He also scored well in likeability, photo, statement and when respondents were unaware others supported it. David Beckham’s highest score was when respondents didn’t recognise the others and for his photo, whilst his other scores; statement and likeability were slightly less. H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge scored most highly when respondents didn’t recognise the others, he also fared well in all other categories, apart from his perceived knowledge of the issue, which was very low. These results show that preference for a personality is reliant on a myriad of factors. For example Chris Packham was the most selected whilst only achieving the highest score in two of the categories, whilst H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge scored consistently highly in all topics excepting his knowledge level. The reasons for choosing (per treatment) are shown in Figure 4.5 and the significance of each factor is shown in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8 - Significance Tests for Factors Influencing Respondent Selection of Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-Squared Test Result</th>
<th>Fisher’s Exact Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Personality</td>
<td>P = &lt; 0.001 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Knew of Personalities Support</td>
<td>P = &lt; 0.001 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Caught Respondents Attention</td>
<td>P = 0.373</td>
<td>χ² = 3.12, df = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography Caught Respondents Attention</td>
<td>P = &lt; 0.001 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Belief that Personality is Most Knowledgeable</td>
<td>P = &lt; 0.001 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Did Not Know Other Celebrities</td>
<td>P = &lt; 0.01 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Unaware Other Personalities Supported Issue</td>
<td>P = 0.05 .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Gender</td>
<td>P = 0.98</td>
<td>χ² = 1.96, df = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Age</td>
<td>P = 0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Education Level</td>
<td>P = 0.44</td>
<td>χ² = 2.73, df = 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge
- David Beckham
- Chris Packham
- Crawford Allen

Figure 4-4 - Respondents Reasons for Selecting Personality (N=379)
4.7 Supplementary Findings from Focus Groups

In addition to the findings listed previously, other key themes that arose are detailed below.

4.7.1 Brand Familiarity

A common theme throughout the focus groups was the lack of knowledge or awareness about conservation organisations. The only conservation organisation that non conservation-orientated participants were able to identify was WWF, from the logos featured in the images used. Whilst the conservation-orientated group participants had a higher awareness of conservation organisations and their branding, there was still a lack of awareness across all focus groups for brands such as Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and Fauna and Flora International. This lack of awareness led to participants stating that they would be less likely to engage with the advertisement, even if the imagery, statement or issue appealed to them, because they didn’t know where their money would be going.

For example, a focus group participant discussing brand familiarity stated:

"I would only donate to WWF as it’s the only one I’ve heard of."

Female, Group 3, Participant Number 6

4.7.2 Celebrity use in conservation in general

Each focus group contained at least one example of an unprompted declaration of annoyance and distrust of celebrity involvement in conservation. During the first activity, in which participants were asked to choose from the advertisements laid out the one that appealed to
them most, this reaction was observed in all focus groups. When the facilitator introduced the topic of celebrities, the same response was repeated, for the following reasons:

- Belief that there is a high likelihood of the celebrity being remunerated for his or her involvement
- Belief that the celebrity does not know enough about the issue to endorse it
- Preference for a different communication technique:
  - An appealing or charismatic animal
  - A shocking or interesting fact or statistic
  - A shocking image
  - An unusual or interesting medium or way of engaging

For example, focus group participants discussing the likelihood of celebrity remuneration:

"I would like to know how much they are getting paid."
Female, Group 3, Participant Number 6

"I think the company must have a lot of money to get a celebrity."
Female, Group 3, Participant Number 2

"A celebrity being paid is a massive no-no."
Female, Group 4, Participant Number 5

Focus group participants discussing lack of celebrity expertise:

"I would be led by expertise and not by celebrity. I feel that actors are paid to recite lines as part of their job, therefore who is feeding them the lines for this campaign?"
Male, Group 4, Participant Number 2
“You need someone who knows what they are talking about.”
Female, Group 4, Participant Number 5

Focus group participant discussing different communication techniques:

“If an animal is suffering, I am more likely to act to help stop it.”
Female, Group 5, Participant Number 6

In general, focus group participants were unimpressed and unmoved by celebrity endorsement, and struggled to find examples of celebrities whose involvement they approved of. Those they did approve of were primarily either British Royalty or associated with natural history television programmes such as Springwatch.

4.7.3 The Celebrity versus the Issue
An interesting comment to arise from Focus Group 3 was in reference to images shown of Harrison Ford and David Attenborough endorsing Conservation International and Fauna & Flora International respectively. The participant stated that he preferred these two campaigns, because he really liked and respected the two individuals featured. However at the end of the focus group, the same participant admitted:

“I like them more as people for appearing in a conservation campaign, but I can’t remember which organisation or what the issue is, just that they [the personalities] have gone up in my estimations.”
Male, Group 3, Participant Number 4

This demonstrates the potential for the presence of a celebrity to eclipse the issue being endorsed, rendering the advertisement, and partnership opportunity with the celebrity, meaningless.
Chapter 5 – Discussion

It is increasingly recognised within the conservation community that conservation interventions and programmes must be evidence based (Sutherland et al., 2004; Ferraro & Pattanayak, 2006). The ways in which the conservation community communicates with the public should be no different. This study provides evidence of the effect celebrities have in conservation marketing. Furthermore it serves as a starting point and should be expanded on to inform the marketing campaigns of conservation organisations in order to maximise the benefits gained from celebrity endorsement.

A key finding of this study is the lack of testing and evaluation of marketing undertaken by conservation organisations. Additionally, celebrities are used with limited or no formal strategy. Survey and focus group data from members of the public shows that consumer buy-in of celebrity endorsement is nuanced and not restricted to a single effectiveness technique, with several factors impacting on their WTE with the advertisement.

5.1 Lack of Celebrity Endorsement Evaluation in Conservation Marketing

The lack of any literature on the evaluation of celebrity endorsement in conservation reinforces the findings from interviews with the marketing personnel of conservation organisations in this study. Conservation organisations use celebrities extensively, but with little or no testing or evaluation. There appears to be a discord between the importance placed on monitoring and evaluation in most other areas of conservation, and the lack of it in the business management side.
Research needs funding, and behaviour needs to change in order for conservation interventions to be effective. It is therefore imperative that the conservation community examines how it communicates with the public, both to ensure it can realise these goals, and to ensure it can remain visible on the global philanthropic stage.

5.1.1 Reasons for the Current Lack of Evaluation

A key reason for the lack of evaluation of marketing, and in particular celebrity endorsement, undertaken by conservation organisations is the scarcity of resources available. Organisations do not have the finances or staff available to monitor and evaluate their marketing output. Whilst this is understandable given the conservation-funding deficit, it is at odds with the emphasis on monitoring and evaluation so prevalent in other areas. Conservation marketing and communication has to be prominent, effective and engaging for conservation interventions to be successful, given the increasing realisation of the dependence on humans for conservation effectiveness. Furthermore conservation organisations need to ensure they increase their market share of philanthropic giving in the United Kingdom, given it is currently just 2% of the GBP£9.3 billion donated by British adults annually (Charities Aid Foundation, 2012).

In addition to a lack of resources, it is understandable that organisations do not want to risk wasting a celebrity endorsement opportunity through testing its effectiveness. The majority of celebrity endorsement in conservation marketing is reliant on goodwill and personal connections. With no formal strategy for selection of endorser, let alone technique for use, conservation organisations are predominantly grasping at any celebrity endorsement opportunity available. As shown by this study, this does not necessarily equate into effective marketing, and in some case could potentially be detrimental
to the issue or the organisations. An example of this is recall, with celebrity endorsement having significantly less effect on full recall than a created endorser. Furthermore conservation organisations are rarely approached by celebrities looking for partnership opportunities, instead the organisations draw up a ‘wish list’ of celebrities they hope to engage with, and successively work down the list until they find ones who are willing and available. Whilst it is understandable that for many organisations this is the only process available to them to attract celebrity endorsement, it is inappropriate, particularly given the body of literature reinforcing the importance of celebrity endorser and brand congruence. Celebrity endorsement is not unequivocally effective (Erdogan, 1999), and there is increasing philanthropic fatigue from the public (Moeller, 1999). Therefore a key recommendation, based on the marketing literature, and the findings from this study, are for conservation organisations to focus on building brand awareness and equity. Not only will increased brand presence in the market increase public engagement, but increased brand equity will serve as a useful tool in securing celebrity endorsement. Given the reasons for the lack of research currently conducted by conservation organisations outlined above, this is an area where the research community could make a valid contribution to conservation organisations. Researchers can bypass the risk to reputation and celebrity endorser relationship that the organisations would undertake if they were to carry out the research themselves.

5.2 Why is Celebrity Endorsement Evaluation Critical?

A generally held opinion to arise from the interviews with the conservation organisation personnel was that celebrity endorsement was considered beneficial, regardless of application. This study shows this is not necessarily the case. Whilst celebrity endorsement has been proved to be effective for positive WTE behaviour (Atkin & Block, 1983;
Petty et al., 1983), and this study corroborates it; the created endorser was significantly more likely to facilitate full recall than any of the celebrity endorsers (Mehta, 1994). One of the potential reasons for this finding is the forced nature of the survey, respondents were asked to look at the advertisement and answer questions accordingly. This is not reflective of the contextual nature of marketing, and therefore respondents were forced to examine an advertisement they might otherwise ignore. Additionally, given the unfamiliarity of Crawford Allen for the majority of respondents, additional cognitive processing would have been necessary, thus resulting in higher levels of recall (Mehta, 1994). Nonetheless, this is an important finding given the different ways in which celebrity endorsement can be used to achieve conservation-marketing goals. For example, H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge is becoming increasingly known for his involvement in wildlife conservation. He has formed United for Wildlife, a collection of seven key conservation organisations who have joined together to combat the illegal trade in wildlife. Consequently, given the recent press exposure United for Wildlife has received, particularly in the United Kingdom, it would be reasonable to expect that he would elicit high levels of full recall for respondents in the survey. Interestingly however, he did not, but did generate significantly high levels for incomplete recall, meaning respondents were only able to recall that H.R.H. The Duke of Cambridge was associated with wildlife conservation in general. They were not able to remember the exact nature of the issue he was endorsing. This finding would indicate that celebrity endorser and issue congruence (the Match-Up Hypothesis) is potentially more complicated than previously thought. If a celebrity’s support for an issue is well known, that support can eclipse the specific issue being communicated, resulting in an ineffective advertisement.
5.3 Explanations for Celebrity Endorsement Effect on WTE

Whilst Atkin & Block (1983), Petty et al. (1983) and this study found a significant difference between celebrity and non-celebrity endorser, Mehta (1994) and Roozen & Claeys (2010) found there to be no such significant difference. The reasons for this ambiguity could be related to the samples used, with undergraduate students featuring heavily in samples for celebrity effectiveness research, or to the age of the research, with a substantial proportion of the literature dating from the 1980s and 1990s (Amos, Holmes & Strutton, 2008; Roozen & Claeys, 2010). There have been considerable changes in society, and advertising and research techniques, since then and new research would be beneficial to fully understand the current effect of celebrity endorsers. Furthermore, this study’s survey data contradict the focus group findings, suggesting people are unaware of the effect celebrity endorsement has on them, this was also found by Brockington & Henson (2014). Therefore future work should investigate real-world celebrity endorsement effectiveness.

In accordance with the principles of the Source Credibility Model, this study found personalities considered as unknowledgeable about the issue by respondents were significantly less likely to engage with the communication. As Till & Busler (2000) found, there should be a high level of congruence between perceived level of celebrity endorser expertise and product or topic. This study reinforces the importance of selecting celebrities in accordance with the Source Credibility Model, and serves as an important finding for conservation marketing practitioners looking to partner their organisation or issue with a celebrity endorser or spokesperson. Interestingly whilst Chris Packham is considered highly knowledgeable about the issue, he has never actually officially spoken about the illegal wildlife trade. His perceived
expertise is derived from his role as a nature documentary presenter and campaigner on various wildlife and conservation related issues. This reinforces Hovland et al. (1953) and Ohanian (1991) findings. Crawford Allen, who is the most informed about the issue, given his role as Director of Traffic USA, is considered the most knowledgeable, however this expertise alone is not enough to induce positive engagement actions.

5.4 Recommendations for Practitioners

As the public become increasingly more selective with regards the advertisements and marketing communications they interact with (Pieters & Wedel, 2004), it is imperative the conservation community focuses on using new marketing techniques and high quality, immersive and responsive content with a strong visual element (CMA, 2013).

In addition the following recommendations can be made for conservation practitioners looking to use celebrity endorsers in campaigns.

1. Build and increase brand awareness and equity to build trust, encourage public engagement and secure meaningful celebrity endorsement partnerships.
2. Develop a celebrity endorsement strategy and develop and increase marketing output evaluation.
3. Use celebrity endorsers who are considered knowledgeable and currently engaged with the issue. Using celebrity endorsers with no connection is confusing for the audience, and can lead to negative brand associations.
4. Avoid those celebrities that are associated with multiple causes or organisations. Not only does this reduce the time they have available, but can also risk distracting the audience, who struggle
to associate the celebrity with a particular issue or cause or believe they really care.

5. Build a partnership with a celebrity, to ensure they become a powerful spokesperson for the organisation over time, as repeated exposure reinforces and strengthens the association for the audience. Furthermore, ensure the celebrity endorser is speaking about the issue outside of the campaign to build credibility and demonstrate real commitment.

5.5 Future Work

Given the lack of existing research into conservation marketing, and particularly celebrity endorsement, this study serves to introduce new concepts and techniques to the conservation community. Consequently there are multiple avenues to be explored. Of particular interest are:

- Evaluating the effectiveness of celebrity endorsement in real-world conservation marketing, particularly in terms of tracking changes in donation activity and behaviour.
- Ensuring the analysis is representative of the demographic groups conservation marketing is targeting in terms of raising funds and awareness, and effecting behaviour change.
- Evaluating which celebrity endorser attributes are most important for conservation marketing specifically.

5.6 Conclusion

It is critically important to the conservation community to increase existing levels of funding, effect meaningful behaviour change and raise awareness, if conservation interventions are going to be effective and ultimately reduce biodiversity loss. Whilst there are effective and powerful advertisements reaching the target audiences, there are equally ineffectual ones. With no evaluation or testing of these
communications, it is difficult for the conservation community to ensure the scarce resources available are used in the most efficient and effective way. Furthermore with no evidence to support the techniques being used, further research is required to fully understand the ways in which the conservation community is communicating with donors, and the public. This study serves to introduce new techniques and principles from other disciplines to the conservation community, and provide exciting new channels of research and inquiry.
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Appendix 1

Focus Group Script

**Introduction:**
Thank you so much for agreeing to be part of this discussion. My name is Lizzie Duthie, and as part of my Masters in Conservation Science at Imperial College, I am investigating the impact celebrities have in conservation marketing. This discussion will help me to learn more about your opinions on conservation marketing and the role celebrities do or don’t play.

I need to let you know that this discussion is being tape-recorded, and notes are being taken by [name]. We are recording the discussion so I can ensure I have a faithful transcript of the session, however your comments are confidential, and no one but myself will listen to the recording. Any comments written up, as part of the research, will remain anonymous.

I am just going to go over the ground rules briefly. I want to hear everything you say, so I’ll ask you to speak one at a time, and loud enough for the recorder. I’m going to ask you a few questions, to which there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers – anything you want to say is ok, and I want to hear what you like and don’t like – everything you say is useful, and please feel free to speak up whether you agree or disagree. I would also like everyone to participate and so I may call on you if I haven’t heard from you in a while.

1.) Let’s begin with a quick exercise. Please can you make a mental note of the advert that most appeals to you, and then we will go round in a circle and everyone can take a turn to briefly introduce themselves and explain why they chose that advert.

2.) Were there any adverts that you found unclear or didn’t understand?

3.) Does the advert you chose actually make you want to donate/sign up/learn more? If not, why not?

4.) Can you think of any changes that could be made to the advert to make it more likely to make you take action?

6.) **Celebrities:** I am particularly interested in the role celebrities can play in conservation marketing, and so I wanted to spend a little time understanding some of the connections between celebrities and conservation.

So can you please write down the names of five celebrities you would expect to front a conservation campaign (of any kind or type). We will then go round in a circle and explain briefly our reasons for choosing them.

7.) So what qualities in particular do you think are necessary for these celebrities to have?

8.) And what sort of qualities would make a celebrity seem like a bad choice?

9.) What would be the single most important factor for you accepting and believing a celebrities involvement and endorsement of a campaign or issue?

10.) And what would be the single most off-putting factor that would make you

11.) What do you think motivates a celebrity to choose to represent a conservation issue or present a campaign?

12.) Do you think knowing the reason behind the celebrities involvement would make you more or less likely to believe them?

13.) That’s brilliant, thank you.

**Summarise what has been said in this section so far and then ask:** How well does that capture what has been said?

14.) Is there anything you would like to add to this discussion that you feel has not already been addressed?

That wraps up our discussion today. Thank you all so much for participating! Your ideas and comments are extremely helpful and will be used to help conservation marketing in the future.
### Appendix 2

Promotional images used in focus groups (and image sources).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Image Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>International <a href="https://www.crowdrise.com/conservation">https://www.crowdrise.com/conservation</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sea Shepherd</td>
<td><a href="https://my.seashepherd.org/netcommunity/sslpage.aspx?id=184">https://my.seashepherd.org/netcommunity/sslpage.aspx?id=184</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td><a href="http://wwf.worldwildlife.org/site/MessageViewer?em_id=45521.0&amp;dlv_id=67151">http://wwf.worldwildlife.org/site/MessageViewer?em_id=45521.0&amp;dlv_id=67151</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td><a href="http://adsoftheworld.com/media/ambient/wwf_brazil_turtle">http://adsoftheworld.com/media/ambient/wwf_brazil_turtle</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wwf.org.uk/how_you_can_help/donate_now/tigerlands_habitat_appeal/">http://www.wwf.org.uk/how_you_can_help/donate_now/tigerlands_habitat_appeal/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td><a href="http://wwf.worldwildlife.org/site/MessageViewer?em_id=36821.0&amp;dlv_id=0">http://wwf.worldwildlife.org/site/MessageViewer?em_id=36821.0&amp;dlv_id=0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ZSL</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/officialzsl?group_id=0&amp;filter=3">https://www.facebook.com/officialzsl?group_id=0&amp;filter=3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td><a href="http://wwf.panda.org/?216811/Actress-Emma-Stone-helps-fight-wildlife-crime">http://wwf.panda.org/?216811/Actress-Emma-Stone-helps-fight-wildlife-crime</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>World Land Trust</td>
<td><a href="http://www.savetheants.com/donate/">http://www.savetheants.com/donate/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td><a href="http://wwf.worldwildlife.org/site/Ecard?ecard_id=4601">http://wwf.worldwildlife.org/site/Ecard?ecard_id=4601</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WildAid</td>
<td><a href="http://lockyep.blogspot.co.uk/2013/01/animals-doing-my-part-for-sharks.html">http://lockyep.blogspot.co.uk/2013/01/animals-doing-my-part-for-sharks.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Qualtrics survey logic:
Thank you for agreeing to take part in this short survey - it should only take about 5 minutes to complete.

You are about to see a promotional image for a campaign to stop wildlife poaching. Please take a moment to look at it carefully.

Q1: If you saw this image online, would you click on the link to find out more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: Why is that?
Please indicate where on the spectrum your opinion lies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like him</th>
<th>I don't like him</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this issue</td>
<td>I am not interested in this issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe he is knowledgeable about it</td>
<td>I don't believe he knows enough about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His statement caught my attention</td>
<td>His statement has no impact on me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in why he is supporting it</td>
<td>I don't care that he is supporting it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often click on promotional images like this</td>
<td>I never click on promotional images like this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I instantly recognised him</td>
<td>I don't know who he is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3: Are there any other reasons for your decision?

Q4: Do you know who he is?

Yes
No
Unsure

Q5: Please tell us who you think he is and what he is known for:

David Beckham is a former professional footballer who has played internationally and for the England national team. His charitable work includes UNICEF, Elton John AIDS Foundation and Malaria No More UK in addition to his role as Lead Ambassador for United for Wildlife.

Chris Packham is a naturalist, author, nature photographer and television presenter. He is best known for presenting programmes such as The Really Wild Show and Springwatch.

Crawford Allen is the Senior Director of TRAFFIC, the world’s largest international wildlife trade monitoring organisation. TRAFFIC is run jointly by WWF and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Crawford’s role involves combating the illegal trade in wildlife.

His Royal Highness The Duke of Cambridge founded United for Wildlife to bring together the world’s seven leading wildlife organisations to create a global movement for change and raise awareness about the illegal trade in wildlife.

Q5: Knowing this information, does his appearance in this campaign make more sense?

Yes
No
Unsure
Q6: Were you aware of his support for this issue prior to seeing this promotional image?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q7: Does it increase your belief in his commitment to this issue?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q7: What level of commitment do you think he has to this issue?

- Strong
- Moderate
- Neutral
- Slight
- None

Q8: Do you think that other people would be influenced by his support of the issue?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q9: Why do you believe he is appearing in this campaign? Please tick all that apply

- He is involved in an organisation or charity that is working on this
- He hopes to improve his public profile
- A friend asked him to get involved
- He is being paid to appear
- He is knowledgeable about it
- He cares about it
- He wants to support it publicly
- Other (please specify)

Q10: Can you remember his name? If so, please write it here:

Q11: Can you remember what the campaign is about? If so, please write it here:

You are about to see some other people who might appear in the promotional campaign. Please take a moment to look at each one.

Click "Next" to display the images

STOP WILDLIFE POACHING NOW

"We are going to need to be held responsible for future generations." - Crawford Allen

Click here to find out how you can help

STOP WILDLIFE POACHING NOW

"It's much as we love them these magnificent animals continued existence is not guaranteed." - David Beckham

Click here to find out how you can help

STOP WILDLIFE POACHING NOW

"Our children should not live in a world without elephants, tigers, lions and things." - Chris Packham

Click here to find out how you can help

STOP WILDLIFE POACHING NOW

"It is shocking to think that we could lose these animals from the wild in our lifetime." - Duke of Cambridge

Click here to find out how you can help

Q12: For the four images, please indicate which of the following statements you think applies to each person. Please tick all that apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crawford Allen</th>
<th>David Beckham</th>
<th>Chris Packham</th>
<th>Duke of Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>His photograph caught my eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe he is using this issue to improve or raise his own profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe he might be being paid to promote this issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe he is knowledgeable about this issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His statement made me want to find out more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe he cares about this issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I already knew about this issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q13: Which one would be most likely to make you click on the link in the red box?

Crawford Allen

Stop Wildlife Poaching Now

“We are going to need to be held responsible for future generations.”

Crawford Allen, Director

The Duke of Cambridge

Stop Wildlife Poaching Now

“Our children should not live in a world without elephants, tigers, lions and rhinos.”

The Duke of Cambridge

David Beckham

Stop Wildlife Poaching Now

“It’s shocking to think that we could lose these animals from the wild in our lifetime.”

David Beckham

Chris Packham

Stop Wildlife Poaching Now

“As much as we love them these magnificent animals continued existence is not guaranteed.”

Chris Packham

Q14: Why do you prefer this one?
Please tick all that apply

- I like him more than the others
- I already knew about his support for this issue
- I believe he is the most knowledgeable about this issue
- I was unaware the others supported this issue
- His photo caught my eye

Q15: Please tell us your gender:

Male
Female
Prefer not to say

Q16: Please tell us your age:

Q17: Which of the following best describes where you currently live?

Q18: Have you completed a university degree?

Yes
No
Prefer not to say

Q19: Are you currently:

- Employed
- Self-employed
- Out of work and looking for work
- A homemaker
- A student
- Retired
- Unable to work
- Other

Q19a: Please describe your employer:

Thank you so much.
The survey is nearly complete, all we need now is a little information about you. This information is completely anonymous and can not be used to identify you in any way.
Q20: In the last year have you made any donations to, paid a membership fee towards, or volunteered for any of the following types of organisations?

- Animal - including conservation, welfare and zoos and aquariums
- Arts & Culture - including museums, art galleries, performing arts and public broadcasting
- Education - including scholarships and support
- Environmental - including parks and botanical gardens
- Health - including disease and disorder, and research, treatment and support
- Human Services - including children's, social, homeless and crisis services
- International - including development, disaster relief and human rights
- Religious
- Prefer not to say

Q21: Which of these organisations do you support, either through donations, membership or as a volunteer? Please tick all that apply.

- BES - British Ecological Society
- Conservation International
- Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust
- Fauna & Flora International
- Greenpeace
- The Nature Conservancy
- RSPS - Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- WCS - Wildlife Conservation Society
- The Wildlife Trusts
- WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature
- WWT - Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust
- ZSL - London Zoo / Whipsnade Zoo
- Other, please specify:
- Prefer not to say

Finally, if you would like to make any additional comments about anything you have been asked in this survey, please use the space below:

[Additional comments field]
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