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ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the role of message source and (social) media channels in determining consumer response to nonprofit advertising. After reviewing relevant literature, a summary model that focuses on attitude change, message acceptance and persuasion effect is presented. The study predicts an interaction effect between the message source (celebrity endorsement versus friend recommendation) and social media channel (Facebook versus Twitter). In order to test the hypothesis, the two variables are manipulated through a controlled online experiment and the analysis of the variance of data provides the general support. Other results and the implications for nonprofit advertising research and practice are discussed.
Introduction

As a nonprofit organization, getting people involved with your cause is difficult, especially if you are trying to reach individuals that are not particularly interested in social causes. Typically, organizations rely on advertising and PR to share their message, but sometimes getting people to believe in your cause goes beyond creative executions of advertisements. There are two factors that nonprofit organizations should carefully consider in their efforts to influence the way people respond to an advocacy message: the message source (e.g. spokespersons) and the media channel through which that message reaches the target audience.

A wide body of existing literature states that message source characteristics may increase the likelihood of people choosing to engage with a social cause. The two types of message source that are most relied upon by nonprofit organizations include celebrity endorsements and word-of-mouth. For example, the Book-Burning Campaign to save a Public Library relied on word-of-mouth to spread the word about a tax increase law, while the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has traditionally made use of celebrity advertisements to convey credibility. However, nonprofit organizations battle uncertainty about which message source will work better for them.

Celebrity endorsers are considered to be a high credible source. They can help raise awareness for the nonprofit’s cause and set an example of service that has the potential to encourage others to get involved. Celebrities are considered to be original influencers whose likes or dislikes are often adopted by a large number of
individuals. According to industry professionals, celebrity endorsers have “the power to promote whatever they support to millions of people through talk shows, weekly magazines, and ever-growing social media followings” (Laura Giangiulio, Executive VP at Metro PR, in an article for the Huffington Post). Therefore, when a celebrity expresses support for a nonprofit cause, their targeted audience would receive high-profile exposure to the nonprofit’s cause, which could in turn result in strengthened support for the cause.

In a similar way, individuals may be more inclined to buy a product after one of their friends shared a positive review about it on a social media platform. Therefore, word-of-mouth seems to be an important factor in changing social behavior. (Williams and Buttle, 2013). When it comes to being responsive to social campaigns, a friend recommendation for a specific cause can help build up the credibility of the message. Therefore, the likelihood of the target being responsive to the cause can increase.

As with message source, selecting an effective media platform is a key strategy in spreading the advocacy message. In particular, use of social media has shown to be an increasingly important method to reach a large amount of individuals . . . The rapid growth of the Internet has led to increased interest in understanding how vehicle source effects function in the online medium.

The influence social media has on message advocacy and persuasion can be understood by analyzing the way people respond to an advertising message when it comes through social media channels. In today’s society, social media plays a crucial role in creating effective advertising campaigns. There are several social media
platforms that help maintaining individuals interconnected, Facebook and Twitter being two of the most used social media platforms, counting millions of users. In recent years, advertisers have leveraged social media in order to get their message across and better connect with their target audience. Nonprofits have started to leverage the potential of social media as a means to engage in a conversation about the organization’s mission. A study conducted by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation states that “building sustained awareness about your cause through sustained conversations is also pivotal to bringing in donations” (James, 2013).

For the purpose of this study, it is essential to understand how individuals use the two social media platforms previously mentioned, and how they interact with potential stakeholders on each platform.

Industry professionals affirm that “of all social networks, Facebook is best equipped to linearly share responses to a post asking a question or sparking conversation.” (thenextweb.com). According to Lauren Dugan (2011), a social media expert and consultant, Facebook is a much more personal social media platform. That is because connecting with other people implies a certain level of familiarity, since they have to accept someone’s friend request (Dugan, 2011). A study conducted by Boston University revealed that the main reason people use Facebook is “the need to belong” (Eler, 2012). This affirmation supports previous findings that Facebook is primarily a social network where people interact with either friends or with people with whom they have a certain level of connection. This would allow us to imply that the content people share or post on Facebook is relevant to a certain extent to the people they are friends with on this social platform.
Dugan (2011) also states that Facebook is very different than Twitter: “The people you’re connected to on Twitter expect different things than those you’re connected to on Facebook (even if most of them are the same group of people)” (Dugan, 2011). Twitter is far more impersonal than Facebook, since individuals have the possibility to follow any different people without necessarily knowing them, because no permission is needed to do so. Therefore, Twitter doesn’t imply any level of connection or familiarity. It does imply that the people followed are perceived as valuable sources of information.

According to an article from Forbes, Twitter is considered to be “social media’s most relevant platform” (Forbes, 2012). The same article states that the contributions the people you follow on Twitter make and the content that is shared is perceived as “much more interesting than your friends attempts at creating the perfect construction of their lives” (Forbes, 2012). Thus it follows that individuals generally use Twitter more for relevant content than for personal connection.

Having explained within the limits of this paper how individuals may interact with different stakeholders on Facebook or Twitter, the following hypothesis can be stated:

The purpose of this research is to analyze if there is a significant difference between individuals’ response to a social cause based on the source of the message (a celebrity endorser versus a friend) and the social media platform where that message is shared (Facebook versus Twitter).

This study predicts there will be a crossover interaction, meaning that the effect of the message source will not only be different across levels of the media
platforms, but it will actually reverse. Therefore, a celebrity might have a higher persuasion effect on Twitter, whereas a friend might have a higher persuasion effect on Facebook.
Literature Review

In order to understand how people respond to nonprofit advertising, it is important to review how the source of a message, as well as the media platform where that message is shared, influences the way people process and respond to an advocacy message.

Heuristic Systematic Model

One theoretical framework used to explain the hypothesis stated in this study is the heuristic systematic model. According to existing research, systematic (or central route) processing differs from heuristic (or peripheral route) processing (Chaiken and Maheswaran, 1994). Both concepts involve the concern message recipients have in regard to evaluating the validity of a message’s general inference (Chaicken, 1980).

While a systematic view implies that people, exposed to a certain message, actively attempt to understand and assess the message’s arguments by employing a considerable cognitive effort, the heuristic view of persuasion indicates the exact opposite (Chaiken, 1980). When heuristic processing is applied to persuasion, it implies that “people have formed or changed their attitudes by invoking heuristics such as <<experts can be trusted>>, <<majority opinion is correct>>, and <<long messages are valid messages>>” (Chaiken and Maheswaran, 1994, p. 460). Therefore, rather than processing the information themselves, people employ little effort in judging message validity and rely on information that is more accessible.
such as the identity of the source and other heuristic cues (Chaichen, 1980).

Heavily influenced by traditional theory, much persuasion research has assumed that the message source affects opinion change, as well as the message reception and comprehension (McGuire, 1968). A clear distinction between systematic and heuristic processing is directly related to independent variables such as source. Chaichen (1980) argues that in heuristic processing the independent variable (e.g. source) “may directly influence the recipient's willingness to accept the message's conclusion” (p. 753).

Dual-process theories imply that systematic processing is more effort-intensive, while heuristic processing is present when there is a low motivation or capacity for effortful processing (Chaiken and Maheswaran, 1994). Moreover, several studies have shown that attitude judgments are less influenced by the persuasive arguments of a message, but considerably influenced by heuristic cues, such as the source of the message, or other people’s opinions (Chaiken and Maheswaran, 1994).

Existing research suggests that the recipients of a message often tend to agree or disagree with a message based on their reactions to noncontent cues such as communicator trustworthiness (Miller, Maruyama, Beaber, and Valone, 1976) or perceived audience opinion (Landy, 1972). These findings concluded that comprehension effects were not a factor in the persuasive impact of speech, and that the recipients have formed their opinions based on the credibility of the source (Miller, Maruyama, Beaber, and Valone, 1976). This argument is also supported by McGuire's (1969) theory about message recipients that rely on a link between the
information and the source as a cue for accepting or rejecting a message “without really absorbing the arguments used” (p. 198).

One advantage heuristic processing might have over systematic processing is that it requires minimum cognitive effort (Chaicken, 1980), since “judging message acceptability on the basis of noncontent cues is less effortful than receiving and analyzing persuasive argumentation” (p. 753). Therefore, when recipients avoid a systematic processing of the information and choose to engage in a heuristic strategy, “source characteristics may exert a greater impact on persuasion than message characteristics” (Chaicken, 1980, p. 754). The reliance of recipients on the source’s identity in deciding message acceptability calls to mind the concept of source attractiveness. This concept implies that people might tend to agree with people they like because of an association between the concepts of liking and interpersonal similarity (Stotland and Canon, 1972).

While the systematic mode implies that decisions are made through detailed information processing, the less effortful heuristic mode infers that decisions are reached by employing simple rules of thumb such as “consensus implies correctness” and “experts’ statements can be trusted” (Giner-Sorolla and Chaicken, 1997).

Chaiken and Maheswaran (1994) argue that heuristic processing influences people to “expect messages to contain more valid arguments when they stem from expert rather than non-expert sources and to expect attitude objects or attitudinal positions to be more worthy when they are liked or endorsed by many rather than few people” (p. 461). The reasoning behind their argument is that heuristic cues
impact respondents’ opinions regarding the perceived validity of the persuasive message. Furthermore, source characteristics not only influence how consumers process the message and turn it into information (Cameron, 1994), but those sources that are perceived as trustworthy have a higher level of engagement and effectiveness than the ones without these features (Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann, 1983; Meyers-Levy and Tybout, 1997).

Although both models, systematic and heuristic, “have their roots in the persuasion context of communication” (Neuwirth, Frederick, and Mayo, 2002, p. 321), the existing body of research presented above clearly illustrates the distinction between the two: heuristic processing mode is “characterized by the application of simple decision rules” (Chaiken, Giner-Sorolla, and Chen, 1996, p. 553) or heuristics such as “experts can be trusted” when making immediate verdicts. At the opposite pole, systematic processing encompasses a greater mental effort in the pursuit of “a relatively analytic and comprehensive treatment” of significant information (Chen and Chaiken, 1999, p. 74).

**Source Characteristics**

The effects of source characteristics on attitude change and persuasability have been of great interest to researchers. This study will now focus on heuristic processing and heuristic cues that impact the decision making process, such as source credibility, expertise, trustworthiness and likeability.

The effect a communicator’s character has on the persuasiveness of their appeals is considered to be significant by many researchers and practitioners. According to Hovland and Weiss (1951), source characteristics have a significant
impact on the persuasiveness of a message.

A substantial number of existing studies have examined the aspects surrounding source credibility (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978). Some of the findings focus around the following areas: the persistence of the source effect (Capon and Hulbert, 1973), and the process by which communicator attractiveness mediates persuasion (Simons, Berkowitz, and Moyer, 1970).

A common advertising technique for non-profit organizations involves the use of spokespersons. As demonstrated by previous studies, the credibility of a source is crucial to the effectiveness of the communications. Researchers found that highly credible sources are more persuasive than those of lower credibility (Harmon, and Coney, 1982), and therefore communication strategy implies the use of highly credible individuals as spokespersons for nonprofit organizations.

The belief that, under certain circumstances, highly credible sources enhance persuasion is supported in the literature. This pattern has been analyzed in several studies, and according to Greenwald (1968), cognitive response theory can help anticipate the persuasive effect of source credibility discussed before. This theory implies that “social influence depends on the favorability of thoughts or object-attribute associations available in memory at the time of judgment” (Harmon, and Coney, 1982, p. 255).

In order to understand how source credibility affects social influence, this study takes into consideration two components that define source credibility: trustworthiness and expertise. Hovland (1953) defines trustworthiness as the degree to which individuals perceive a message as valid for the source, whereas
expertise refers to the degree to which the source is considered capable of delivering correct messaging.

The body of research examining the source effects has extended across a large number of theoretical perspectives, including cognitive response theory, attribution theory, social adaptation theory, and the elaboration likelihood model (O'Hara, Netemeyer, and Burton, 1991). These approaches have established a prevailing thought among researchers that messages originating from highly expert sources produce greater attitude change than messages from less expert sources (Hovland, and Weiss, 1951); furthermore, sources perceived as being trustworthy are more persuasive than those perceived as being less trustworthy (Petty, and Cacioppo, 1986).

In regards to likeability, it has been commonly agreed that the communicator’s likeability enhances positive attitude change (Dholakia, and Sternthal, 1977), and that a likeable source is more persuasive than a nonlikeable one (Chaiken, 1980). Even though likeability affects persuasion, McGuire (1985) argues that the impact of likeability may be secondary to the impact of expertise and trustworthiness. Given that source likeability appears to be more peripheral to belief and attitude formation than either expertise and trustworthiness (O'Hara, Netemeyer, and Burton, 1991), likeability may have a smaller influence than either of the other two source characteristics.

**Attribution Theory**

As mentioned above, another theory that focuses on persuasion effects is
attribution theory. Although cognitive response theory helps to predict certain effects of source credibility on persuasion, it may be inadequate in other respects. As Sterenthal, Phillips and Dholakia mention, focusing on cognitive response theory alone presents a limited understanding of the true nature of persuasion effects:

Nevertheless, cognitive response theory is not a sufficient explanation for persuasion. While the theory identifies initial opinion as a driving force for persuasion, it is silent with regard to the determinants of initial opinion. Moreover, while the theory specifies how individuals actively process persuasive cues in influence situations, it does not specify how different cues are interpreted and ultimately selected for processing. These issues are addressed by introducing attribution principles (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 304).

The theoretical meaning of attribution refers to “the determination of a cause of behavior” (Kelley, 1973). In communication science, the term is described as a cognitive process that influences certain actions. Social psychology introduces the concept of “attribution theory”, a notion that researchers refer to when explaining people’s behavior. In order to understand how attribution works, it is essential to examine three different variables that influence it: consensus, consistency and distinctiveness.

Kelley developed the covariation model of attribution as a means to better comprehend the three main types of information that influence an attribution
decision regarding an individual’s behavior. The first, consensus, refers to the
degree to which people behave similarly when put in the same situation and with
the same stimulus. The second variable is consistency, which refers to behavioral
similarities when people are exposed to the same stimulus in different situations.
The third variable is distinctiveness, defined as the extent to which an individual
responds differently depending on the stimulus.

Kelley’s research (1973) states the existence of two different types of
attribution, internal and external. According to him, external attributions that
emphasize situational constraints tend to dominate. Humans are likely to make
internal attribution only under certain circumstances such as low consensus (other
people do not behave like this), high consistency (the same behavior is persistent in
different situations) or low distinctiveness (similar behavior in similar situations).

In this particular study, attribution theory serves as a framework to
understand how individuals interpret the cause of an outcome. In social influence
situations, attribution theory is used to explain “how message recipients’ own
behavior in response to a persuasive communication affects their subsequent
attitude toward that behavior” (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 304).

Moreover, attribution theory also helps describe how people interpret
messages from different communicators and how their own interpretation
influences their attitudes (Kaplan, 1976). According to Sternthal, Phillips and
Dholakia, “attribution principles pertaining to both the perception of one’s own
behavior and other people’s behavior are relevant in understanding the persuasive
As previously mentioned, attribution theory states that an individual’s attitudes are determined by his or her own behavior and the circumstances that influence that specific behavior. When internal or personal causes influence an individual’s behavior, she or he is also more inclined to already have formed an opinion toward the object of behavior. However, according to Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia:

“If circumstantial factors provide plausible rival explanations for a behavior, individuals tend to discount an internal cause as the reason for behavior. In this instance, people are unlikely to be certain about the cause of their behavior and therefore unlikely to consolidate strong attitudes toward it” (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 304).

Through principles of augmentation and discounting, attribution theory also suggests that a low credibility source determines a greater persuasion than a highly credible source when persuasive cues include both the communicator and the message recipient’s’ behavior. Therefore, uncertainty exists regarding the motivation for agreement, depending upon the way a highly credible source exposes the advocacy message.

People tend to disregard internal reasons as the main cause of their own behavior and instead tend to attribute behavior to a high credible source. If the source is less credible, individuals tend to attribute their behavior to internal causes. Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia state that “performance of a behavior
Despite its advocacy by a low credibility source results in people becoming certain that their behavior is due to internal factors and therefore they consolidate a strong attitude toward that behavior” (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 305).

By explaining the joint effects of source credibility and message variables, attribution theory clarifies how individuals reckon what determines other people’s behavior. According to attribution principles, if a source’s message is unexpected, the audience is more likely to believe that the message is a truthful depiction of reality. Persuasion is enhanced by unexpected situations, according to research which has demonstrated that “When the advocacy is expected from a source, message recipients are likely to be uncertain about the validity of the communication” (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 305). For individuals it might be confusing to distinguish when a message represents the source’s opinion or reality, therefore it can be concluded that the audience’s attitude toward the source’s credibility influences persuasion. The following findings are stated by Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia:

By virtue of their trustworthiness and expertise, highly credible sources are likely to induce the belief that the message is valid. A less credible source is likely to cause people to discount the validity of the message and attribute the appeal to the source’s bias (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 305).

Although the usefulness of attribution theory is supported by a multitude of
studies, there are still gaps in the research presented thus far. Among the issues that this theory doesn’t address are other interactive credibility effects, such as initial opinion or issue involvement, and the issue of credibility in two-sided communication. Findings implied the limitations of attribution theory regarding persuasiveness. The mechanism through which information is actively processed is not explained through attribution, despite the fact that “it describes the inferential work individuals do in interpreting and selecting persuasive cues” (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978, p. 306).

**Cognitive Response Theory**

Cognitive response theory supports the importance of initial opinion as a determinant of influence. The validity of the cognitive response formulation is demonstrated by the effects source credibility has on attitudinal outlooks. The message recipient is both favorably and negatively predisposed to a certain attitude toward an advocacy message. The cognitive response theory accounts for source credibility, supporting previous findings that a highly credible source has more influence than a lower credible source (Sternthal, Phillips and Dholakia, 1978).

The interactive effects of source credibility and media credibility are concentrated around persuasion, attitude change and opinion forming. Media channels serve as a forum in which advertising practitioners try to pursue and influence the audience. According to Wanta and Hu (1994), the success of persuasive efforts depends on an individual’s perceptions of media credibility. Researchers defined the concept of media credibility as a complex and
multidimensional construct (Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz, 1970).

Current studies focus on two main aspects of media credibility: source credibility (Hovland, Janis, and Kelley, 1953) and medium credibility (Golan, 2010). According to Golan (2010), “Source credibility research typically focuses on the characteristics of the message source (such as the speaker, or the organization), whereas research on medium credibility focuses on the medium through which the message is delivered (for example, Facebook compared to Twitter)” (Golan, 2010, p. 3).

**Vehicle Source Effects**

Of particular interest in this review are the joint effects of source credibility and the media channels through which the message reaches the audience. This study aims to demonstrate a significant difference in the way individuals perceived a message depending on the source from which it comes, and on the media channel through which it reached them. In particular, this analysis looks at advocacy messages in advertising.

Both scholars and practitioners have shown interest in intermedia effects as an important factor that influences advertising theory and practice (Rodgers, 2005). According to Assmus, an intermedia effect, or a “vehicle source effect”, is defined as a “measurement of the increment to advertising response contributed by one vehicle rather than another” (Assmus, 1978, p. 4). The implications of intermedia effects are discussed under the theoretical framework of cognitive processes for advertising messages.
A growing number of advertising experts have come to the conclusion that “the quality of an advertising medium may enhance or inhibit the advertising message” (Assmus, 1978, p. 4). Assmus calls the “increment to the advertising response contributed by one advertising medium rather than another <<the vehicle source effects>>” (Assmus, 1978, p. 4). Despite attempts to measure the size of the effect, there seems to be consensus that the degree to which it influenced the way a message is perceived has to be estimated either directly, or by assessing various related factors (Assmus, 1978).

The goal of this study is to determine whether a different effect occurs if a person is exposed to the same advertising message through one media channel versus another (Rodgers, 2005). This exposure would be achieved by manipulating the social media channels, while keeping the advertisement and the message constant across the media channels.

**Social Media for Nonprofits**

This thesis aims to increase understanding of how nonprofit organizations use social media to construct advertising messaging that would lead to a higher engagement with the audience. The study will examine the features and dynamics of social media based advocacy in order to identify how organizations use social media channels, Facebook and Twitter in particular, to enhance their persuasive efforts.

In recent years, the Internet has generated new opportunities for advocacy organizations to engage stakeholders and influence public policy (Saxton, Guo, and Brown, 2007). Social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter have a decentralized structure that incorporates interactivity and networking options to enhance the
ability of nonprofit organizations to communicate strategically with their stakeholders (Waters and Jamal, 2011). Nonprofit organizations can leverage the tools offered by social media in order to expand their advocacy messages by reaching to networks where their target audience is present and mobilize them to take action within those networks.

Current literature covers topics involving the use of social media by advocacy organizations, but it only investigates the preponderance of social media, and whether organizations explore it or not. Few studies investigated how social media is being utilized. According to Guo and Saxton, “There is a striking need for research on how organizations are using the core dynamic feature of social media sites—the frequent brief messages, or <<status updates>>, the organization sends to its network of followers” (Guo and Saxton, 2012, p. 58). In order to understand how advocacy organizations are using social media to influence opinions and persuade the audience to take audience, it is essential to discuss both advocacy strategies from nonprofit literature, as well as social media advocacy techniques from the communications or public relations literature.

Advocacy represents a nonprofit function through which nonprofit organizations contribute to human rights by representing the interest of citizens and supporting public policy changes. Analysis of prior studies yielded to the following findings:

“The advocacy function is crucial not only to organizations that engage primarily in external representational activities, but also service providers and other charitable organizations. For most nonprofits, advocacy activities
represent an additional path for helping achieve the organizational mission and improving the lives of their constituents” (Guo and Saxton, 2012, p. 59).

Social media is very similar to the offline medium when it comes to the tactics that nonprofits employ in order to get an advocacy message across. Research conducted by Berry (1977) stated that there is a significant dissimilarity between advocacy strategies and tactics: strategies represent general approaches taken to persuade public opinion, whereas tactics indicate a specific action that is needed to execute a particular strategy.

According to Berry (1977), there are four major advocacy strategies: litigation, information, constituency influence and pressure, and embarrassment and confrontation. These strategies have been devised by other scholars into different categories: inside and outside strategies (Gais and Walker, 1991), insider and outsider strategies (Gormley and Cymrot, 2006), and insider and indirect (Mosley, 2011). The distinction between theses strategies only stands in the terminology choice, as they all distinguish between the work that is being done outside the system (public education campaigns, protests) and the work conducted inside the system (lobbying).

The existing literature also indicated the tactics nonprofits can choose in order to implement the strategies they decided upon. For example, Guo and Saxton (2012) identified eleven different advocacy tactics. For the purposes of this study, however, I shall only address four: media advocacy, direct lobbying, public education, and expert testimony. While not precisely stated in prior research, it is somewhat logical that some of these tactics fall under the internal strategy, while
other pertain to the indirect strategy. While reference to advocacy tactics that nonprofits use in an offline medium to persuade their target audience does exist within the literature, this study moves forward to analyze how these tactics can be employed in a social media environment.

Social media sites such as Facebook, Twitter or YouTube have facilitated the way organizations can build relationships with stakeholders and engage with the target audience by initiating the usage of assembling platforms. The potential social media platforms have to help building a persuasive advocacy message is best described by Guo and Saxton through the following statement:

Social media are claimed to help organizations engage present and potential stakeholders by sharing, cooperating, and mobilizing joint actions in near-real time. Social media’s interactive, decentralized environment offers a low-cost way for organizations to mobilize supporters, foster dialogic interactions with large audiences, and attract attention to issues that might otherwise be ignored by traditional media (Guo and Saxton, 2012, p. 60).

Several scholars have begun to explore the way nonprofit organizations make use of social media. Bortree and Seltzer (2009) have analyzed different Facebook profiles of environmental groups, while Greenberg and MacAulay conducted a deeper investigation on environmental groups by looking at their websites along with other social media tools, such as Facebook, Twitter and blogs. Their findings suggested that even though nonprofit organization have started to
utilize social media to strengthen their persuasive strategies and better engage with their target audience, advocacy groups don’t explore all the opportunities social media platforms offer.

**Celebrity Endorsers and Word-of-Mouth**

As previously discussed, source credibility is an important factor in the process of persuasion through an advertising message. This study focuses on advocacy messages perceived as coming from distinct sources with a different level of credibility: celebrity endorsement and word-of-mouth.

The topic of celebrity endorsement in advertising has been widely researched throughout the years (Erdogan, Baker, and Tagg, 2001). The use of celebrity endorsers in advertisements was very popular in the 60’s and 70’s. To date it is still a highly utilized technique, as Giant Magazine (2006) confirms that more than ten of the top 50 ads featured a celebrity endorser. Existing research addresses two different aspects regarding the advertising effectiveness of celebrity endorsers: suitability factors of different source types for products (Maddux and Rogers, 1980; Till and Busler, 2000), and the persuasive impact of ad subject involvement (Homer and Kahle, 1990). A specific aspect that is missing is the lack of distinction between for-profit and nonprofit organizations.

Nonprofit advertising represents an area in the field that has increasingly expanded, reaching an annual amount of $7.6 billion annual spent by nonprofit organizations with revenues exceeding $10 million on advertising and promotion (Watson, 2006). Given the lack of information about this fast growing field, there is
some urgency to analyze the impact of celebrity endorsers and involvement in a nonprofit context and thus to contribute to the body of research in the area.

Further, the effectiveness of advertisements that feature celebrities is analyzed in terms of persuasion and attitude change. Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann discuss attitude change on advertisements (1983). According to their findings, attitude change can happen through two different routes, a central route and a peripheral one. While the central route refers to “a person’s diligent consideration of issue relevant information”, the peripheral one considers that the object or issue in the ad can be associated with positive or negative cues, even though the audience may not cognitively process the information in the ad. This study considers celebrity and the association of a nonprofit organization with that celebrity to be the peripheral cues that influence the way the audience perceives the ad message.

The interaction between celebrity endorsers and subjects was analyzed by Kahle and Homer (1985) through their theory of attitude change based on social adaptation. This theory suggests that there is a pairing between celebrity and object or issue, and that its impact is determined by the “adaptive significance of information”, without necessarily focusing on the way the source or image association are being processed. The findings presented by Kahle and Homer imply that “Information based on importance may be processed, but its influence may be based on usefulness for adaptation” (Kahle and Homer, 1985).

According to a study presented by Till and Bussler (2000), it is essential to establish a connection between the object and the endorser, best know as “Associative Learning Theory”. This theory explains this connection in terms of
“belongingness, relatedness, fit and similarity”, stressing the relationship between the product advertised and the spokesperson that would ultimately influence the effectiveness of celebrity advertising. Their findings also establish that expertise and trustworthiness of the spokesperson has an influence on brand attitude, but not necessarily on the purchase decision. However, these findings are not extended to the nonprofit environment.

Another aspect of the impact source credibility has on message persuasion is discussed in this study from the perspective of word-of-mouth communication. WOM has been widely researched by many academics and it is commonly described as an informal means of communication between two people, one being a noncommercial communicator and the other one the receiver of the advertising or advocacy message (Sen and Lerman, 2007). According to scholars, WOM has a significant influence on nonprofits due to its indirect influence on organizational reputation (Williams and Buttle, 2013). Although the small existing research on WOM in a nonprofit context is emerging, there is not a sufficient body of research to establish if and how nonprofit organizations consciously manage WOM.

Summary of Literature Review

The theories discussed in this study have several implications. Analyzing source credibility effects in terms of cognitive response and attribution offers a framework for understanding how credibility arbitrates social influence. These findings help anticipate the credibility in the situations previously discussed and beyond. The use of source credibility effects to determine the impact of cognitive
response and attribution on persuasion provides insights about individuals’ response to a certain type of message. Specifically, this thesis makes use of these theories to provide a complementary explanation of how the audience perceives nonprofit advertising depending on who is the spokesperson of the advocacy message. In addition, this study analyzes the influence a particular source has on persuasion depending on the media channel the spokesperson employs to share the advocacy message.
Methodology

The purpose of this research was to determine if there is a significant difference between an individual’s response to a social cause depending on the source of the message (a celebrity endorser versus a friend) and the social media platform where that message is shared (Facebook versus Twitter). The study predicted a crossover interaction, meaning that the effect of the message source would not only be different across all levels of the media platforms, but that it would actually reverse. Therefore, a celebrity would have a higher persuasion effect on Twitter, whereas a friend would have a higher persuasion effect on Facebook.

This mixed design predicted that the source variable was going to be manipulated within subjects, while the media platform variable was going to be manipulated between subjects.

By manipulating the media platform variable between subjects, each participant was assigned to one level of the independent variable. This means that participants were randomly assigned to exposure to the advocacy message through either Facebook or Twitter. The random assignment to each social media platform was intended to eliminate any respondent’s bias towards one medium or another.

The source variable was manipulated within subjects in order to reduce the variance within treatments by having each participant in both conditions. Therefore, each individual was exposed to the advocacy message coming from two different spokespersons: celebrity and friend. Within-subjects factors had a greater statistical power than between-subjects factors, and a reduction in error variance associated
with the differences between individuals. The reduction in error variance is due to
the fact that the same participant is in two different conditions, whereas for
between-subject factors there are two groups that may still differ in terms of
individual difference factors despite the random assignment.

Exposing participants to more than one level of the source variable allowed
to better identify whether an effect existed or not. Another reason to use within-
subjects factors to manipulate the source was because it allowed for each subject to
serve as his or her own control, since the same individual was exposed to both
conditions. In addition, since we are talking about the same individual, personal
differences apparently did not affect their scores in the two conditions.

There were several concerns that needed to be addressed regarding within-
subjects factors. The first limitation of within-subjects experiments was internal
validity. By exposing the participants to all levels of the independent variable (e.g.
both celebrity and friend messaging), the chances that they discover the hypothesis
and respond differently increased. In order to address this issue, subjects were
exposed to two distinct messages. That means that participants were exposed to one
message coming from a celebrity, and then to another message coming from a
friend.

The second limitation of using a within-subjects experiment was order effect.
That means that the difference between the answers of two questions may have
been due to the order in which they were responded rather than the questions
themselves. This issue was addressed by making “order” a between subjects factor.
Therefore, half of the participants saw the advocacy message coming from a celebrity, while the other half first saw the advocacy message coming from a friend.

Another issue for the within-subjects designs, and perhaps the most important, is carryover effects, which analyzes the extent to which the first message impacts responses to the next one. That means that participation in one condition could have affected performance in other condition by creating a cofounding extraneous variable.

With this in mind, the initial 2 (media platform) x 2 (message source) mixed design became a 2 (message source: celebrity endorser versus friend) x 2 (media platform: Facebook versus Twitter) x 2 (message replication) x 2 (message order) mixed design, where platform and order are between-subjects and source and replication are within-subjects.

**Research Design**

In order to test the hypothesis previously stated, this study used an online random controlled experiment. The experiment consisted of a 2x2 mixed design that tested the main effects and interaction between message source and media platform in a nonprofit environment.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables manipulated for testing were *message source* and *media platform*. The respondents were randomly assigned to two distinct social
media platforms, Facebook and Twitter. The message sources were celebrity and friend.

**Testing Instrument**

An online survey (Appendix 1) was created using the survey website Qualtrics. The survey had 27 questions and it took an average of 10 minutes to complete. The panel of respondents was supplied by Qualtrics; Qualtrics recruits panelists online, which are further narrowed through quality control systems before being included in the actual panel. Randomly selected panelists were then contacted through email and asked to participate in this study.

The panelists that agreed to respond to the invitation to participate in the study were prescreened in order to determine eligibility. Respondents had to be at least 18 years old, and to have a Facebook and a Twitter account. The total of completed surveys for study was 510. Participants that successfully completed the survey were compensated $1.50 through a third-party vendor used by Qualtrics.

**Participants and Procedure**

The survey was built upon committee approval. Following IRB approval, the survey was shared with Qualtrics. After data quality measures such as forced responses were added, Qualtrics did a soft launch of the survey on October 8, 2014, in order to gather 10% of the responses to assure data quality. The survey was paused while the collected data was reviewed. The survey fully launched on October
9, 2014. By October 13, 2014, all 510 responses were collected and the survey was closed. The data was downloaded as an SPSS file for analysis.

Participants of the study were males and females, age 18 and older, residing in the United States. To make the survey questions both realistic and yet avoid any biased attitudes, a fictional nonprofit was conceived. The survey presented Children of Freedom, a fictitious nonprofit organization concerned with the rights of children’s right to education in Africa.

The participants in the research were able to participate in the study by accessing the online website www.missouri.qualtrics.com. Once accessing this webpage, participants were first presented with a consent form allowed them to opt in or out of the experiment. The consent form contained a short explanation of the overall purpose of the experiment, as well as a general description of the data collection process.

After agreeing to participate in the research, respondents were prescreened to determine their eligibility for the study.

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to collect information about their presence on social media and the purposes of their usage of specific social media platforms.

In the second section of the questionnaire the participants were presented with a series of advocacy messages that were specifically created for this test. Half of the respondents were shown the advocacy message on Twitter, and the other half on Facebook. While the fictional nonprofit was the original source of the message, the message was shared by two distinct stakeholders. The participants were
presented with messages coming from either a friend or a celebrity. In order to address the limitations of the within-subjects design, there were two distinct messages, and the order of the source of the message was reversed.

The last section of the questionnaire contained anonymous demographic information (age, gender, level of education, household income).

**Demographics**

For the entire sample of 510, participants ranged in age from 18 to 79. The average age was 43.28, and the median age was 42. Of respondents, 34.1% were male and 65.9% were female. The median education level was some college, with 21.2% having only completed a high school degree, 31.1% a college degree, and 29.2% being four year college graduates.

Among the 453 respondents that chose to disclose their household income, the median household income was $40,000 to $49,999, with 53.0% of respondents having a household income of $40,000 to $49,000 or higher.

**Social Media Behavior**

In terms of their social media behavior, 59% of respondents were very active on Facebook, whereas only 23.7% were very active on Twitter. The median for Facebook usage was 7 (very active), and the median for Twitter usage was 5 (somewhat active). When it comes to following a celebrity they admire, 60% of respondents said that they use Facebook, and 40% said that they use Twitter. 93.1%
of respondents said that they prefer to use Facebook to follow a friend, whereas only 6.9% use Twitter to follow a friend.

**Attitude Toward Nonprofits**

Regarding their attitude toward nonprofit organizations, 69.4% of respondents said they support social causes. When asked if they are aware of any social causes, even if they are not actively involved with them, the percentage increased to 85.3%.

**Dependent variables**

The dependent variables were computed for each of the two sources manipulated as independent variables, celebrity and friend.

*Interest in the cause*: measured using three items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree) 'I am curious about [cause]', 'I would like to know more about [cause]' and 'I am intrigued by [cause]'

Celebrity interest in the cause was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity curious, celebrity know more, celebrity intrigued). The reliability test indicated a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.962, which was above 0.7, and therefore reliable.

Friend interest in the cause was computed by calculating the means of (friend curious, friend know more, friend intrigued). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.971.
**Attitude toward the message:** measured using three items on a 7-point likert scale: dislike/like, bad/good and negative/positive impression, and one separate item on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree): engaging.

Celebrity attitude towards the message was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity like message, celebrity good message, celebrity positive message, celebrity engaging). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.861.

Friend attitude towards the message was computed by calculating the means of (friend like message, friend good message, friend positive message, friend engaging). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.905.

**Message credibility:** measured using four items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree): accurate, believable, important, unbiased.

Celebrity message credibility was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity accurate, celebrity believable, celebrity important, celebrity unbiased). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.867.

Friend message credibility was computed by calculating the means of (friend accurate, friend believable, friend important, friend unbiased). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.903.

**Attitude toward the organization:** measured using three items on a 7-point likert scale: dislike/like, bad/good and negative/positive impression.
Celebrity attitude towards the organization was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity like organization, celebrity good organization, celebrity positive organization). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.925.

Friend attitude towards the organization was computed by calculating the means of (friend like organization, friend good organization, friend positive organization). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.928.

Message acceptance: measured using four items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree): trustworthy, efficient, convincing, acceptable.

Celebrity message acceptance was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity trustworthy, celebrity efficient, celebrity convincing, celebrity acceptable). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.941.

Friend message acceptance was computed by calculating the means of (friend trustworthy, friend efficient, friend convincing, friend acceptable). Cronbach's alpha was 0.956.

Intention to volunteer: measured using three items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree): ‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization, ‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’, ‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’.

Celebrity intention to volunteer was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity consider volunteer, celebrity want volunteer, celebrity will volunteer). Cronbach's alpha was 0.860.
Friend intention to volunteer was computed by calculating the means of (friend consider volunteer, friend want volunteer, friend will volunteer). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.902.

Intention to donate money: measured using two items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree): ‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’, ‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’.

Celebrity intention to donate was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity consider donate, celebrity will donate). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.954.

Friend intention to donate was computed by calculating the means of (friend consider donate, friend will donate). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.962.

Intention to “spread the word” about the cause: measured using three items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = disagree, 7 = strongly agree): ‘I want to recommend [cause]’, ‘I want to talk about [cause]’, and ‘I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’.

Celebrity intention to “spread the word” was computed by calculating the means of (celebrity want recommend, celebrity want talk, celebrity will share). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.951.

Friend intention to “spread the word” was computed by calculating the means of (friend want recommend, friend want talk, friend will share). Cronbach’s alpha was 0.953.
Results

Research Question 1: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people's interest in the cause?

A 2X2 repeated measures ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on interest in the cause. The main effect for source was significant (F(1, 508)=4.37, p<0.05), but the main effect for platform was not significant (F(1,508)=0.182, p>0.05). No significant interaction between the source and the platform was found (F(1,508)=0.063, p>0.05).

For research question 1, the significance level below 0.05 (p=0.04) confirmed the existence of a relationship between the message source and the interest in the cause. Celebrity had a greater effect on people's interest in the cause than friend (Celebrity: m=5.01, sd= 1.66; Friend: m=4.92, sd=1.73). However, the significance level of the media platform above 0.05 (p=0.67) indicated that the social media channel where the message is shared had no effect on people’s interest in a social cause. With the significance level greater than 0.05 (p=0.80), the test also showed that there is no interaction between the source and the platform.
Table 1:

*Descriptive Statistics: Interest in the cause*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity cause interest</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.01*</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend cause interest</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.92*</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:

*Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Interest in the cause*

Measure: Repeated Measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source * platform</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (source)</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Interest in the cause

Measure: Repeated Measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24971.89</td>
<td>4672.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s attitude towards the message?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on attitude towards the message. The main effect for source was significant (F(1,508)=4.231, p<0.05), but the main effect for platform was not significant (F(1,508)=0.239, p>0.05). No significant interaction between the source and the platform was found (F(1,508)=0.298, p>0.05).

The results of research question 2 analyzing people’s attitude towards the message also confirmed that the source was significant (p=0.04), confirming the existence of a relationship between the two. Celebrity had a greater effect on people's attitude toward the message than friend (Celebrity: m=5.40, sd=1.27; Friend: m=5.33, sd=1.38). The media platform had a significance level above 0.05 (p=0.63), therefore it has no effect on people’s attitude toward the message. The significance level above 0.05 (p=0.59) indicated that the message source and media platform did not influence one another in regard to an individual’s attitude toward an advocacy message.
Table 4:

*Descriptive Statistics: Attitude toward the message*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity message</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>5.40*</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend message</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>5.33*</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5:

*Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Attitude toward the message*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source *</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Attitude toward the message

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29194.43</td>
<td>9109.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s perception of message credibility?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on message credibility. The main effect for source was significant ($F(1,508)=14.611, p<0.01$), but the main effect for platform was not significant ($F(1,508)=0.777, p>0.05$). No significant interaction between the source and the platform was found ($F(1,508)=0.527, p>0.05$).

For research question 3, the within subjects test indicated a significance level below 0.01 ($p=0.00$) for source. The effect source has on message credibility confirms the existence of a relationship between the two. Celebrity had a greater effect on people’s perception of the message credibility than friend (Celebrity: $m=5.21, sd=1.23$; Friend: $m=5.10, sd=1.34$). The $p$ values above 0.05, $p=0.38$ for platform and $p=0.47$ for the interaction between the source and the platform indicated that neither the media platform, nor the effects between the source and the media platform, are not significant when it comes to individuals’ perception of the message credibility.
Table 7:

*Descriptive Statistics: Message credibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Celebrity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facebook</strong></td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5.21*</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facebook</strong></td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5.10*</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8:

*Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Message credibility*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Lower-bound</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>source</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>source * platform</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error</strong></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9:

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Message credibility*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26941.57</td>
<td>8650.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s attitude towards the organization?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on attitude towards the organization. No significant main effects or interactions were found. The main effect for source (F(1,508)=0.829, p>0.05), the main effect for platform (F(1,508)=0.065, p>0.05), and the interaction between source and platform (F(1,508)=0.034) were not significant.

The repeated measures used to analyze research question 4 demonstrated that there is no effect for either the message source or the media platform in regard to people’s attitude toward the organization. Therefore no relationship was found for either the platform, or the source. Both had a significance level above 0.05, p=0.36 for source, and p=0.80 for platform. Additionally, a significance level above 0.05 (p=0.85) showed that there is no interaction between the two, and therefore it was concluded that media platform and message source do not influence one another.
Table 10:

*Descriptive Statistics: Attitude toward the organization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity organization attitude Twitter</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity organization attitude Facebook</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity organization attitude Total</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend organization attitude Twitter</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend organization attitude Facebook</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend organization attitude Total</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11:

*Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Attitude toward the organization*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Lower-bound</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source * platform</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (source)</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Attitude toward the organization

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29486.67</td>
<td>8265.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 5: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s acceptance of the message?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on acceptance of the message. The main effect for source was significant (F(1,508)=6.372, p<0.05), but the main effect for platform was not significant (F(1,508)=1.302, p>0.05). No significant interaction between the source and the platform was found (F(1,508)=1.848, p>0.05).

For question 5, the within subject test showed that the source was significant for people's acceptance of the message, having a significance level equal to 0.01 (p=0.01) that confirms the existence of a relationship between the source and message acceptance. Celebrity had a greater effect on people's acceptance of the message than Friend (Celebrity: m=5.30, sd=1.30; Friend: m=5.22, sd=1.40). A significance level above 0.05 (p=0.25) indicated that the media platform had no effect on the message acceptance. The message source and media platform do not impact one another, having a significance level above 0.05 (p=0.17).
Table 13:

Descriptive Statistics: Message acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.30*</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.22*</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14:

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Message acceptance

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source *</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(source)
Table 15:

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Message acceptance*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27996.16</td>
<td>8093.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 6: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s intention to volunteer?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on intention to volunteer. No significant main effects or interactions were found. The main effect for source (F(1,508)=0.107, p>0.05), the main effect for platform (F(1,508)=0.007, p>0.05), and the interaction between source and platform (F(1,508)=0.051, p>0.05) were not significant.

The results for research question 6 indicated that no relationship was found between the source and people’s intention to volunteer, with a significance level above 0.05 (p=0.74). A significance level of 0.93 showed that no relationship was found between the platform and the volunteer intention. The lack of interaction between the source and the platform (p=0.82) indicated that they do not influence one another.
Table 16:

*Descriptive Statistics: Intention to volunteer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17:

*Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Intention to volunteer*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source * platform</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (source)</td>
<td></td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18:

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Intention to volunteer*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14615.67</td>
<td>2481.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 7: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s intention to donate?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on intention to donate. No significant main effects or interactions were found. The main effect for source (F(1,508)=1.983, p>0.05), the main effect for platform (F(1,508)=0.000, p>0.05), and the interaction between source and platform were not significant (F(1,508)=0.026, p>0.05).

For research question 7, the test of within subjects indicated a significance level above 0.05 for message source (p=0.16), meaning that no relationship was found between the source and people’s intention to donate. In a similar way, no relationship was found between the media platform and people’s intention to donate, the significance level also being above 0.05 (p=1.00). The lack of interaction between the source and the platform (p=0.87) indicated that they don't influence one another.
Table 19:

*Descriptive Statistics: Intention to donate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity donate intention</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Friend donate intention | 3.96 | 2.03           | 274         |
| Facebook       | 3.96 | 1.92           | 236         |
| Total          | 3.96 | 1.98           | 510         |

Table 20:

*Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Intention to donate*

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (source)</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Intention to donate

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16129.85</td>
<td>2226.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 8: How does the source of an advocacy message and the social media platform where that message is shared affect people’s intention to “spread the word” about the cause?

A 2X2 mixed-design ANOVA was calculated to examine the effects of the platform (Facebook, Twitter) and source (celebrity, friend) on intention to “spread the word” about the cause. The main effect for source was significant (F(1,508)=7.4, p<0.05), but the main effect for platform was not significant (F(1,508)=0.854, p>0.05). No significant interaction between the source and the platform was found (F(1,508)=0.395, p>0.05).

The results for research question 8 indicated that a relationship exists between the message source and people’s intention to “spread the word” about the cause, the significance level being equal to 0.01. Celebrity had a greater effect on people’s intention to “spread the word” about the cause than Friend (Celebrity: m=4.58, sd=1.82; Friend: m=4.47, sd=1.84). No relationship was found between the media platform and people’s intention to “spread the word” about the cause, which as indicated by a significance level above 0.05 (p=0.36). The lack of interaction between the source and the platform (p=0.53) indicated that they do not influence one another.
Table 22:

Descriptive Statistics: Intention to spread the word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity spread the word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.58*</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend spread the word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23:

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects: Intention to spread the word

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Intention to spread the word

Measure: Repeated measures ANOVA

Transformed Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21662.93</td>
<td>3392.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

This study confirmed findings in existing literature that the source of a message influences the way people respond to that message.

In this particular study, the original source of the message was the nonprofit organization. However, a premise of this research was that the message would reach the audience through a spokesperson for the organization. The nonprofit organization was fictional, to eliminate biased attitudes based upon prior knowledge of the organization. Central to the issue of nonprofit advertising effectiveness is the audience’s image of the message source. As a result, nonprofit organizations employ several persuasive appeals to induce responses to social issues, including the use of highly credible spokespersons.

The results of the current research indicated that the source of the message had a significant influence on the way people perceived and responded to the advocacy message. The significant effect for source was present for several of the items analyzed: “interest in the cause” (p=0.04), “attitude toward the message” (p=0.04), “message credibility” (p=0.00), “message acceptance” (p=0.01) and “intention to <<spread the word>>” (p=0.01). However, the source had no significant effect on “attitude toward the organization” (p=0.36), “intention to volunteer” (p=0.74), “intention to donate” (p=0.16).

These findings confirmed previous theories concerned with the difference between changing attitudes, or influencing opinions, and determining a change of behavior. According to previous research regarding the effectiveness of advertising
messages, the expertise and trustworthiness of a source has an influence on brand attitude, but not necessarily on the purchase decision (Till and Bussler, 2000).

However, until now the existing literature applied solely to for-profit organizations and did not include testing these theories within a nonprofit environment. The current study demonstrated that Till and Bussler’s statements can also be applied to the nonprofit environment. The results of this study demonstrated that the source of an advertising message can help form opinions and determine attitudes, but not necessarily determine change of behavior (e.g. volunteer or donate).

These results also support the fact that source characteristics influence the way people perceive a message and form opinions and attitudes. As mentioned in the literature discussed in the introduction, there are several characteristics that convey a source’s credibility and can further have an impact on persuasiveness and attitude change: trustworthiness, likeability and expertise (Hovland and Weiss, 1951; Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Dholakia and Sternthal; 1977).

The survey responses indicated that a celebrity is a more persuasive spokesperson than a friend. For the five items where the source was significant, the celebrity had a higher effect on the way people respond to an advocacy message than a friend. For interest in the cause, the mean for celebrity was 5.01, while for friend the mean was 4.92. For the attitude toward the message, the celebrity had a mean of 5.40, and friend had a mean of 5.33. The results for message credibility indicated a mean of 5.21 for celebrity, and 5.10 for friend. Regarding message acceptance, the celebrity had a mean of 5.30, while the friend had a mean of 5.22.
When it comes to the intention to “spread the word” about the cause, the results showed a mean of 4.58 for celebrity and a mean of 4.47 for friend.

Even though the difference in the means is not very high, the influence in the statistical significance of the source was due to the large sample number. Also, the statistical test for source was run within-subjects, which also contributes to the statistical significance.

The fact that the celebrity had a higher influence on the way people respond to a message could confirm previous findings (Goner, Sorolla and Chaicken, 1997) about a communicator’s expertise being a significant factor in attitude change and persuasiveness. While trustworthiness and likeability are characteristics that can be applied to both sources, the outcome indicated that celebrities may be perceived as “more expert” than friends. However, it can be argued that the most important characteristic that defines a source that can influence opinions or change attitudes is likeability. Both sources analyzed in this research were highly likeable: while a friend is, by definition, someone you like, the survey announced the respondents that the advocacy message was coming from a celebrity “they admire”, therefore a celebrity they “liked”.

The results did not confirm previous findings regarding “word-of-mouth”, which refers to information received through people you know or friends. Existing literature indicated that “word-of-mouth” has a significant influence on nonprofits due to its indirect influence on the organization’s reputations (Williams and Buttle, 2013). The respondents of this study were less influenced by a friend’s recommendation for a social cause than they were when the same message came
from a celebrity. However, this doesn’t indicate in any way that word-of-mouth or friend’s recommendation are not important.

The result also contradicts the “Associative Learning Theory”, which implies that people can be influenced to have a certain opinion if the source creates a connection that can lead to a feeling of belongingness, relatedness, fit and similarity (Till and Bussler, 2000). A friend should be able to establish such a connection, since those feelings that describe that connection can be associated with friendship.

However, it can be argued that the same theory was confirmed for the celebrity spokesperson. People’s desire to find connections or similarities between them and celebrities they admire determined greater effectiveness of the message promoting the social cause.

Aside from analyzing the impact message source has on the way people respond to nonprofit advertising, this study also analyzed the effects of the media platform has on advocacy messaging. Previous studies suggest that people respond differently to a message when it reaches them through one media platform versus another (Rodgers, 2005). These findings refer to traditional media and the comparison is made between media such as print, radio, or broadcast, but there is a lack of literature covering social media channels and how people respond to each. Therefore, the vehicle source effects theory was applied to the current research in order to investigate if a similar statement can be made about social media channels.

This study researched how people respond to a message when it reaches them through one social media channel versus another, but the results failed to demonstrate that the media platform had an influence on the way people responded
to the message. The survey findings indicated that the social media channel had no effect on any of the eight items that were analyzed. No statistical significance was found for: “interest in the cause” (p=0.67), “attitude toward the message” (p=0.63), “message credibility” (p=0.38), “attitude toward the organization” (p=0.80), “message acceptance” (p=0.25), “intention to volunteer” (p=0.93), “intention to donate” (p=1.00), and “intention to <<spread the word>>” (p=0.36).

However, it should be mentioned that the two media that were analyzed were both social media platforms, thus it might be argued that they do not represent entirely distinct mediums. Researchers affirm that both Facebook and Twitter can be used to help nonprofit organizations to communicate with their audience (Waters and Jamal, 2011). Even so, there is no literature covering how these organizations are specifically employing social media tools.

The study predicted there would be a crossover interaction between the source of the message and the social media platform, meaning that they would influence one another as follows: the celebrity would have a higher effect on Twitter, whereas the friend would have a higher effect on Facebook. The results of the study failed to demonstrate this prediction, thus the source and the platform do not influence one another in of the tests. No interaction between the source and the platform was found for neither of the following items: “interest in the cause” (p=0.80), “attitude toward the message” (p=0.59), “message credibility” (p=0.47), “attitude toward the organization” (p=0.85), “message acceptance” (p=0.17), “intention to volunteer” (p=0.82), “intention to donate” (p=0.87), and “intention to <<spread the word>>” (p=0.53).
Limitation and Future Study

There are several limitations of this study. The first concern refers to the social media platforms. Demographics indicated that respondents were more active on Facebook than they were on Twitter. Additionally, more than 90% percent of respondents preferred Facebook to follow a friend, and 60% also chose Facebook to follow a celebrity. This usage pattern may have influenced the results and therefore led to the conclusion that the media platform doesn’t influence the way people respond to a message. Future studies should address this issue by controlling the sample of respondents through social media usage.

The second weakness this study presents is previous attitude toward nonprofit organizations. Almost 70% percent of respondents indicated that they supported social causes. The study didn’t include separate analysis for the people that already supported social cause and the ones that didn’t.

Other limitations include the use of a non-probability online panel that affected the generalization of the results to a larger population. Even though the participants volunteered for the panel, they were also remunerated for their participation in the study, which may have affected their responses.
Conclusion

The current study examined the effects of message source and media platform on people’s response to nonprofit advertising. The research conducted included two different sources, celebrity and friend, and two social media platforms, Facebook and Twitter. The study looked at different aspects regarding people’s response to advocacy messages, such as: interest in the cause, attitude towards the message or organization, message credibility, intention to volunteer, donate or share that message with others.

This research confirmed that the choice of spokespersons can have a significant impact on the way the audience perceives an advocacy message. Supporting previous findings, this study has shown that the source of a message may influence people’s response to a message and their attitude towards the social cause that message promotes. Source characteristics such as likeability play a crucial role in the audience’s process of attitude formation.

The study also indicated that the media platform where an advocacy message doesn’t influence people’s interest in a social cause, nor their intention to donate or volunteer. However, given the study’s limitations, these results can be debated in future studies.

This research adds to the limited research on the way people respond to nonprofit advertising depending on the source of the message and the media platform where that message is shared. No previous studies explored the interaction between message source and social media platform for advocacy messaging.
This study can also help nonprofit organizations to better convey their strategies of persuasions. With usually limited budgets, it is crucial for these institutions to have a better understanding of how they can make use of spokespersons, as well as media. Keeping in mind the study's limitations, it is important for organizations to be present on social media platforms that allow them to connect with their audience. Even though no current studies discuss precisely how nonprofits can leverage social media, today's changing media landscape makes it essential for organizations to keep up with new and innovative ways to communicate with their audiences and share their messages more effectively.
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Appendix A: Online Questionnaires:

Survey 1 (Twitter, Celeb Ad 1, Friend Ad 2) Questions:

Prescreening Questions
1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No

1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all )  1   2   3   4   5   6   7   (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a friend?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
5. Are you aware of any social causes, even though you are not actively involved in it/them?
Yes
No

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Twitter shares the following message:

"I support Children of Freedom. Find out more about it and get involved too!"

_All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education_

6. After seeing the above advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements (on a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 = “strongly disagree” and 7 = “strongly agree”):

I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message
I strongly dislike the message 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly like,
I think the message is extremely bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
The message left me with an extremely negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I strongly disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would you best describe the advocacy message?
Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization
I strongly dislike the organization 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly like,
I think the organization is extremely bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
I have an extremely negative impression of the organization 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I strongly disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would you best describe the advocacy message?
Trustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I am considering volunteering to help the organization
'I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that'
'I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause'
'I don’t want to be involved with this organization'

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I am considering donating money to support the cause'
'I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money'
'I will make a financial contribution to support the cause'
'I will not donate any money for this cause'

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]'
'I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'

Assume one of your friends that you follow on Twitter shares the following message:

"Children of Freedom support a great cause, it’s definitely worth getting involved!"
Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom supports children’s rights to education in African countries

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am curious about [cause]</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to know more about [cause]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am intrigued by [cause]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning more about [cause] would be useless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message.

| dislike | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| bad | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| positive impression | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree", how would the advocacy message best be described?

| Engaging | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Dramatic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Exaggerated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Accurate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Believable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Important | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like, good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- ‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization’
- ‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
- ‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
- I don’t want to be involved with this organization’

20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- ‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
- ‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
- ‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
'I will not donate any money for this cause'

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]'
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'

**Demographic Questions:**

1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master's Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
   Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
   Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars
   Rather not say
   Under $10,000
   $10,000 - $19,999
Survey 2 (Twitter, Celeb Ad 2, Friend Ad 1)

Prescreening Questions

1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
Yes
No

1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know or be simply be aware of what they've been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No

5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily involved with the cause?
   Yes
   No

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Twitter shares the following message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom support children’s right to education in African countries”
6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization
10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message:

- Trustworthy: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Efficient: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Convincing: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Acceptable: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- I am considering volunteering to help the organization.
- I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that.
- I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause.
- I don’t want to be involved with this organization.

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- I am considering donating money to support the cause.
- I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money.
- I will make a financial contribution to support the cause.
- I will not donate any money for this cause.

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]' 
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'

Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Twitter shares the following advocacy message.
“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
positive impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?
Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message
Trustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Efficient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Convincing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Acceptable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization
‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
I don’t want to be involved with this organization’
20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]’
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’

**Demographic Questions:**

1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master’s Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
   Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars

Rather not say

Under $10,000
$10,000 - $19,999
$20,000 - $29,999
$30,000 - $39,999
$40,000 - $49,999
$50,000 - $74,999
$75,000 - $99,999
$100,000 - $150,000
Over $150,000
Survey 3 (Twitter, Friend Ad 1, Celeb Ad 2)

Prescreening Questions
1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No

1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know or be simply be aware of what they've been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No
5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily involved with the cause?
Yes
No

Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Twitter shares the following advocacy message.
“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression
8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

Trustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Efficient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Convincing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Acceptable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization’
‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
I don’t want to be involved with this organization’

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
   ‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
   ‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
   ‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
   ‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
   'I want to recommend [cause]'
   'I want to talk about [cause]'
   I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Twitter shares the following message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom support children’s right to education in African countries”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
   I am curious about [cause]  1   2   3   4   5   6   7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression
18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustworthy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- I am considering volunteering to help the organization
- I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that
- I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause
- I don’t want to be involved with this organization

20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- I am considering donating money to support the cause
- I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money
- I will make a financial contribution to support the cause
- I will not donate any money for this cause

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- I want to recommend [cause]
- I want to talk about [cause]
- I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)
Demographic Questions:

1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master's Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
   Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
   Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars
   Rather not say
   Under $10,000
   $10,000 - $19,999
   $20,000 - $29,999
   $30,000 - $39,999
   $40,000 - $49,999
   $50,000 - $74,999
   $75,000 - $99,999
   $100,000 - $150,000
   Over $150,000
Survey 4 (Twitter, Friend Ad 2, Celeb Ad 1)

Prescreening Questions
1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No
1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know
   or be simply be aware of what they’ve been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No

5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily
   involved with the cause?
   Yes
   No

   Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Twitter shares the following
   advocacy message.
   “Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom
   support children’s right to education in African countries”

6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”,
   please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend
   of yours.
I am curious about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I would like to know more about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I am intrigued by [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  like,
bad  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  good
negative impression  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  positive impression

8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?
Engaging  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Dramatic  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Exaggerated  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Accurate  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Believable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Unbiased  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  like,
bad  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  good
negative impression 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  positive impression

10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message:

Trustworthy 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Efficient   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Convincing 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Acceptable 1  2  3  4  5  6  7

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

'I am considering volunteering to help the organization'
'I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
'I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
'I don’t want to be involved with this organization’

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

'I am considering donating money to support the cause'
'I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
'I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
'I will not donate any money for this cause’

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]'
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Twitter shares the following message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

- dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
- bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
- negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

- Trustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Efficient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Convincing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Acceptable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- ‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization’
- ‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
- ‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
- I don’t want to be involved with this organization’
20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]'
'I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'

Demographic Questions:
1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master’s Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars
   Rather not say
   Under $10,000
   $10,000 - $19,999
   $20,000 - $29,999
   $30,000 - $39,999
   $40,000 - $49,999
   $50,000 - $74,999
   $75,000 - $99,999
   $100,000 - $150,000
   Over $150,000
Survey 5 (Facebook, Celeb Ad 1, Friend Ad 2)

Prescreening Questions
1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No

1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know or be simply be aware of what they've been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No
5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily involved with the cause?
Yes
No

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Facebook shares the following message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
I am curious about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I would like to know more about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I am intrigued by [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  like,
bad  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  good
negative impression  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  positive impression
8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Dramatic 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Exaggerated 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Accurate  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Believable 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Important 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Unbiased  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  like,  
bad     1  2  3  4  5  6  7  good  
negative impression  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  positive impression  

10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

Trustworthy  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Efficient  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Convincing 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Acceptable 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization
‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
'I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
I don’t want to be involved with this organization'

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
‘I want to recommend [cause]’
‘I want to talk about [cause]’
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’

Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Facebook shares the following advocacy message.
“Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom support children’s right to education in African countries”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
I am curious about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I would like to know more about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I am intrigued by [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression
18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustworthy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- I am considering volunteering to help the organization
- I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that
- I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause
- I don’t want to be involved with this organization

20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- I am considering donating money to support the cause
- I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money
- I will make a financial contribution to support the cause
- I will not donate any money for this cause

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- I want to recommend [cause]
- I want to talk about [cause]
- I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)

**Demographic Questions:**
1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master's Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
   Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
   Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars
   Rather not say
   Under $10,000
   $10,000 - $19,999
   $20,000 - $29,999
   $30,000 - $39,999
   $40,000 - $49,999
   $50,000 - $74,999
   $75,000 - $99,999
   $100,000 - $150,000
   Over $150,000
Survey 6 (Facebook, Celeb Ad 2, Friend Ad 1)

Prescreening Questions
1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No
1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know
   or be simply be aware of what they've been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No

5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily
   involved with the cause?
   Yes
   No

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Facebook shares the following
message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom
support children's right to education in African countries”
6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization
10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message:
- Trustworthy: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Efficient: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Convincing: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Acceptable: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
   - ‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization’
   - ‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
   - ‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
   - ‘I don’t want to be involved with this organization’

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
   - ‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
   - ‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
   - ‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
   - ‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
'I want to recommend [cause]'  
'I want to talk about [cause]'  
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'

Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Facebook shares the following advocacy message.  
“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

I am curious about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I would like to know more about [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
I am intrigued by [cause]  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike  1  2  3  4  5  6  7   like,
bad  1  2  3  4  5  6  7   good
negative impression  1  2  3  4  5  6  7   positive impression

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?

Engaging  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Dramatic  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Exaggerated  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Accurate  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Believable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Unbiased  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 

17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  like, 
bad 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  good 
negative impression 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  positive impression

18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message
Trustworthy  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Efficient  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Convincing  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 
Acceptable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization’
‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
I don’t want to be involved with this organization’
20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- ‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
- ‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
- ‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
- ‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

- ‘I want to recommend [cause]’
- ‘I want to talk about [cause]’
- ‘I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’

**Demographic Questions:**

1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   - Grammar School
   - High School or equivalent
   - Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   - Some College
   - College Graduate (4 year)
   - Master’s Degree (MS)
   - Doctoral Degree (PhD)
   - Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars

Rather not say

Under $10,000

$10,000 - $19,999
$20,000 - $29,999
$30,000 - $39,999
$40,000 - $49,999
$50,000 - $74,999
$75,000 - $99,999
$100,000 - $150,000

Over $150,000
Survey 7 (Facebook, Friend Ad 1, Celeb Ad 2)

Prescreening Questions

1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No

1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know or be simply be aware of what they’ve been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No
5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily involved with the cause?
Yes
No

Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Facebook shares the following advocacy message.
“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression
8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", how would the advocacy message best be described?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaggerated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

' I am considering volunteering to help the organization'
'I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that'
'I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause'
I don’t want to be involved with this organization'

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
'I am considering donating money to support the cause'
'I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money'
'I will make a financial contribution to support the cause'
'I will not donate any money for this cause'

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
'I want to recommend [cause]'  
'I want to talk about [cause]'  
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'  

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Facebook shares the following message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom support children's right to education in African countries”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?
Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression
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18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", please rate the following words that describe the message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I am considering volunteering to help the organization'
'I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that'
'I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause'
'I don’t want to be involved with this organization'

20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I am considering donating money to support the cause'
'I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money'
'I will make a financial contribution to support the cause'
'I will not donate any money for this cause'

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means "I disagree" and 7 means "I strongly agree", please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I want to recommend [cause]'
'I want to talk about [cause]'
'I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’
Demographic Questions:

1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master's Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
   Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
   Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars
   Rather not say
   Under $10,000
   $10,000 - $19,999
   $20,000 - $29,999
   $30,000 - $39,999
   $40,000 - $49,999
   $50,000 - $74,999
   $75,000 - $99,999
   $100,000 - $150,000
   Over $150,000
Survey 8 (Facebook, Friend Ad 2, Celeb Ad 1)

Prescreening Questions
1. Are you age 18 or older?
   Yes
   No

2. Do you have a Facebook account?
   Yes
   No

3. Do you have a Twitter account?
   Yes
   No
1. On an average day, how active are you on social media (Facebook, Twitter)?
   (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very active)

2. Which social media channel do you prefer to use to follow a celebrity you admire?
   Facebook
   Twitter

3. Which social media do you prefer to use to keep in touch with someone you know or be simply be aware of what they’ve been up to?
   Facebook
   Twitter

4. Do you support any nonprofit organizations or social causes?
   Yes
   No

5. Are you familiar with any social campaigns, even though you are not necessarily involved with the cause?
   Yes
   No

   Assume one of your good friends that you follow on Facebook shares the following advocacy message.
   “Going to school should not be an unattainable privilege. Children of Freedom support children’s right to education in African countries”

6. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.
I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

8. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?
Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Dramatic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Exaggerated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Accurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unbiased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  positive impression

10. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

Trustworthy 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Efficient 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Convincing 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Acceptable 1  2  3  4  5  6  7

11. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization
‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
I don’t want to be involved with this organization’

12. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

13. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message shared by a good friend of yours.

‘I want to recommend [cause]’
‘I want to talk about [cause]’
I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)’

Assume that a celebrity you admire and follow on Facebook shares the following message to promote a social cause and offer support to a nonprofit organization.

“All children should have the right to go to school. Support Children of Freedom to help children in Africa get access to education”

14. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.
I am curious about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I would like to know more about [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am intrigued by [cause] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Learning more about [cause] would be useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the message

dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

16. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, how would the advocacy message best be described?
Engaging 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaggerated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. On a 1 to 7 scale, please choose what best describes your attitude toward the organization

- dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like,
- bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
- negative impression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive impression

18. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate the following words that describe the message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

- ‘I am considering volunteering to help the organization’
- ‘I want to volunteer but I am not sure I have enough time for that’
- ‘I will volunteer and get actively involved with the cause’
- I don’t want to be involved with this organization’
20. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

‘I am considering donating money to support the cause’
‘I want to support the cause but I am not sure I am willing to spend money’
‘I will make a financial contribution to support the cause’
‘I will not donate any money for this cause’

21. On a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 means “I disagree” and 7 means “I strongly agree”, please rate how you feel after seeing the advocacy message endorsed by a celebrity you admire.

'I want to recommend [cause]' 
'I want to talk about [cause]' 
'I will share [cause] on my personal social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter)'

Demographic Questions:

1. What is your age today?

2. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

3. Please indicate the highest level of education completed.
   Grammar School
   High School or equivalent
   Vocational/Technical School (2 year)
   Some College
   College Graduate (4 year)
   Master’s Degree (MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)
Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)
Other

4. Please indicate your current household income in U.S. dollars
   Rather not say
   Under $10,000
   $10,000 - $19,999
   $20,000 - $29,999
   $30,000 - $39,999
   $40,000 - $49,999
   $50,000 - $74,999
   $75,000 - $99,999
   $100,000 - $150,000
   Over $150,000