

## CELEBRITIES ARE ENDORSING PRODUCTS, WHICH THEY DO NOT USE THEMSELVES

Gaurav vashishtha<sup>1</sup> Dr. Satyapal Yadav<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Deptt. of Commerce & Management, Narnaul (Haryana)

### ABSTRACT

Advertisers make number of claims about their product which may or may not be true. To make their claims seemingly truthful, quite often well known celebrities are used in the advertisements as spokesperson of the company. Few years back three high profile celebrities like Hrithik Roshan, Shahrukh Khan, Sachin Tendulkar were used as endorsers of a company named "Home trade". A deal worth rupees crores was signed by the endorsers to endorse this company. Later on this company fell into a scam leading to loss of crores of rupees of investors. So, shall we blame the celebrities for misleading the people with the claims which were never true? When the statement that "Celebrity claims are confusing and misleading" was put to analysis, overall it was found that the majority of respondents i.e. 51.1 percent, are in favour of the proposition. It has also been observed that a substantial number i.e. 31.3 percent of respondents have neither agreed nor disagreed to the statement.

**Key words;** seemingly, truthful, well known celebrities.

### INTRODUCTION

Advertisers make number of claims about their product which may or may not be true. To make their claims seemingly truthful, quite often well known celebrities are used in the advertisements as spokesperson of the company. Few years back three high profile celebrities like Hrithik Roshan, Shahrukh Khan, Sachin Tendulkar were used as endorsers of a company named "Home trade". A deal worth rupees crores was signed by the endorsers to endorse this company. Later on this company fell into a scam leading to loss of crores of rupees of investors. So, shall we blame the celebrities for misleading the people with the claims which were never true?

When the statement that "Celebrity claims are confusing and misleading" was put to analysis, overall it was found that the majority of respondents i.e. 51.1 percent, are in favour of the proposition. It has also been observed that a substantial number i.e. 31.3 percent of respondents have neither agreed nor disagreed to the statement. This can be attributed to the reason that most of the respondents are not aware if celebrities' claims are confusing and misleading. Only 16.5 percent of respondents have shown disagreement to the statement.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Tellis (1998) discussed financial risks as a risk associated with celebrity endorsements. Celebrity endorsements have become a part of many advertisers' promotional strategy and companies pay millions of dollars each year for the endorsements of their products by athletes.<sup>21</sup> It is important for advertisers to consider if the celebrity endorser is worth the investment. For example, the costs associated with using celebrities as endorsers are rising. Some celebrities endorse several products, sometimes even switching their endorsements to rival brands; the negative publicity generated by some celebrities has added the potential risk of negative impact which can result in decreased sales. A celebrity's behavior can be a big risk to a company.

## MATERIAL AND METHOD

It was observed from the literature review that the celebrities are endorsing products but they are not using those products themselves. When the statement that "Celebrities are endorsing products, which they do not use themselves" was put to analysis, overall it was surprising to see that a substantial number of respondents i.e. 41.9 percent, have neither agreed nor disagreed to the statement. It is so because most of the respondents do not know if celebrities are using the products which they are endorsing.

Gender-wise analysis reveals that only 47.9 percent of female respondents have agreed to the statement in comparison to significantly higher number of male respondents i.e. 57.2 percent, agreeing to the statement. Majority of female respondents i.e. 49.7 percent, have neither agreed nor disagreed to the above proposition which is significantly higher than their male counterparts. Only 38.4 percent of male respondents have expressed neither agreement nor disagreement to the statement. On having a glimpse on the table, a significant difference was visible in opinion of respondents between male and female. The value of chi square confirms the analysis.

**Table: 5.06 Distribution of respondents as regards the statement “Celebrities are endorsing products, which they do not use themselves”.****Res. Status wise cross tabulation**

Res. Status	Rural	Urban	Total
SA	28 (34.1)	115 (25.7)	143 (27.0)
A	30 (36.6)	115 (25.7)	145 (27.4)
CS	20 (24.4)	202 (45.1)	222 (41.9)
D	4 (4.9)	12 (2.7)	16 (3.0)
SD	0 (0)	4 (.9)	4 (.8)
<b>Total</b>	<b>82 (100.0)</b>	<b>448 (100.0)</b>	<b>530 (100.0)</b>
<b>Sig. Level: 0.008</b>			

**Gender wise cross tabulation:**

Gender	Male	Female
SA	114 (31.2)	29 (17.6)
A	95 (26.0)	50 (30.3)
CS	140 (38.4)	82 (49.7)
D	14 (3.8)	2 (1.2)
SD	2 (.5)	2 (1.2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>365 (100.0)</b>	<b>165 (100.0)</b>
<b>Sig. Level: 0.004</b>		

**Age-wise cross tabulation:**

Age	Up to 20	20-35	35-55	55 and above
SA	3 (34.9)	86 (28.7)	18 (17.0)	9 (23.7)
A	1 (16.3)	98 (32.7)	27 (25.5)	6 (15.8)
CS	3 (41.9)	11 (37.3)	53 (50.0)	21 (55.3)
D	6 (7.0)	2 (.7)	6 (5.7)	2 (5.3)
SD	0 (0)	2 (.7)	2 (1.9)	0 (0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>8 (100.0)</b>	<b>30 (100.0)</b>	<b>10 (100.0)</b>	<b>38 (100.0)</b>
<b>Sig. Level: 0.000</b>				

**Education-wise cross tabulation:**

Education	Up to Matriculation	Graduate	Post Graduate	Professional
SA	16 (36.4)	37 (21.1)	41 (22.7)	49 (37.7)
A	4 (9.1)	46 (26.3)	50 (27.6)	45 (34.6)
CS	20 (45.5)	80 (45.7)	85 (47.5)	36 (27.7)
D	4 (9.1)	10 (5.7)	2 (1.1)	0 (0)
SD	0 (0)	2 (1.1)	2 (1.1)	0 (0)
Total	44 (100.0)	170 (100.0)	181 (100.0)	130 (100.0)
Sig. Level: 0.000				

**Income-wise cross tabulation:**

Income	Up to 10000PM	10000-20000 PM	20000-30000 PM	40000 and above	Not Employed
SA	6 (7.9)	29 (24.4)	43 (35.8)	6 (15.0)	59 (33.7)
A	21 (27.6)	42 (35.3)	34 (28.3)	9 (22.5)	39 (22.3)
CS	47 (61.8)	44 (37.0)	41 (34.2)	21 (52.5)	69 (39.4)
D	2 (2.6)	4 (3.4)	2 (1.7)	2 (5.0)	6 (3.4)
SD	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (5.0)	2 (1.1)
Total	76 (100.0)	119 (100.0)	120 (100.0)	40 (100.0)	175 (100.0)
Sig. Level: 0.000					

Analysis of the opinions of total respondents across different age groups shows that a significantly higher number i.e. 61.4 percent, of respondents of “20-35” age group has agreement to the statement in contrast to that of the respondents of other groups. It has also been seen that majority i.e. 55.3 percent of respondents of “55 and above” are neither in favour nor against the above proposition. The value of chi square at 0.05 levels is significant and confirms to our analysis.

Further analysis of table 5.06 across different educational level groups reveals that a significantly higher number i.e. 72.3 percent of respondents of “Professional”, are in favour of the statement in comparison to other groups. It was surprising to see that the degree of agreement for the statement is going up as move up in education level. Only 27.7 percent of “Professional” group have neither agreed nor disagreed to the statement which is significantly lower than other groups. There is a visible difference of opinions across different education level groups. The value of chi square also suggests the same.

In income-wise cross tabulation, it was found that the number of respondents of “20000-30000” agreeing to the statement is very high. 64.1 percent of respondents of this group are in favour of the statement which is significantly higher than the other categories. It has also been seen that a significantly higher number i.e. 61.8 percent of respondents of “Up to 10000” income group have neither agreed nor disagreed to the above proposition. This can be attributed to the fact that majority of respondents are not aware if celebrities are using the products which they are endorsing. There is a significant difference of opinion across different income groups. The value of chi square confirms to our analysis.

When the statement was put to residential status wise analysis, it was observed that there is visible difference of opinion between rural and urban respondents. 70.7 percent of rural respondents have agreed to the statement against 61.4 percent of urban respondents. This significant difference has been confirmed by the value of chi square at 0.05 levels.

## CONCLUSION

On having a glimpse of the table 5.07 gender-wise, it was noticed that there is a significant difference of opinion between males and females. A significantly higher number i.e. 55.7 percent of male respondents are in favour of the statement as against only 40.6 percent of female respondents in favour. It has also been seen that 26.1 percent of female respondents are disagreeing with the statement which is significantly higher than their male counterparts. This significant difference has been duly confirmed by the value of chi square at 0.05 levels.

The age-wise cross tabulation of the statement reveals that only 5.3 percent of respondents of “55 and above” have disagreement to the proposition which is significantly less in contrast to other age categories. It has also been observed that 41.9 percent of respondents of “Up to 20” group are in favour of the proposition.

**REFERENCES**

1. Belch, G.E., & Belch M.A. (2001). *Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective 5th edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
2. <http://forbes.com/forbes/121696/5814244a.htm> [2002, April 1]
3. *Endorsement Defined* (2000) – <http://www.StickyMarketing.com>
4. Dr Anna Murdoch (2006), “Creativity in Advertising”, Website: <http://www.e-sgh.pl/cia/celebrityendorsement.pdf>
5. Boorstin, Daniel 1963 *The Image*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
6. Evans, R.B.(1988), “Production and Creativity in advertising”, Pitman Publishing, London, U K.
7. Horton, Donald and R. Richard Wohl (1956), “Mass Communication and Para-Social Interaction: Observation on Intimacy at a Distance”, *Psychiatry*, 19(3): 215-29.
8. Calcoat, M.F. and Philips, B.J. (1996), “Observation: Elves make good cookies”, *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, pp. 73-79.
9. O’ Mahony, Sheila and Tony Meenaghan (1997-98) ), “The Impact of Celebrity Endorsements on Consumers”, *Irish Marketing Review*, 10:2, pp. 15-24.
10. Ohanion, R. (1991), “The Impact of Celebrity Spokesperson’s Perceived Image on Consumers’ Intention to purchase. *Journal of Advertising Research*”, 31:1, pp. 46-52.
11. Louie, T.A., & Obermiller, C. (2002), “Consumer Response to a Firm’s Endorser (Dis) association Decisions”, *Journal of Advertising*, 31.
12. Riezebos, R., Kist, B., Koostra. G. (2003), *Brand Management. A theoretical and practical approach*. Prentice Hall.
13. Till, B.D. (1996), “Negative publicity and the endorsed brand: the moderating effect of association strength and timing of negative publicity”. *Proceedings of Conference of American Academy of Advertising*, pp.192-201.
14. Tellis, G.J. (1998), *Advertising and Sales Promotion Strategy*, Reading: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
15. Agrawal, J., & Kamakura, W.A. (1995). *The Economic Worth of Celebrity Endorsers: An Event Study Analysis*. *Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 59, pp. 56-62.
16. Hsu, C-K., & McDonald, D. (2002), “An examination on multiple celebrity endorsers in advertising”, *The Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 11:1, pp. 19-29.