There’s no question that the ads are a big part of the Super Bowl experience—for many, more important than the game itself. And with a $5 million price tag for a 30-second ad for Super Bowl 50, the ads certainly don’t come cheap. While they may change from year-to-year, celebrity and animal ads are two tried-and-true tactics used by marketers every year to generate buzz.

Charles R. Taylor, PhD, and the John A. Murphy Professor of Marketing at the Villanova School of Business and a nationally known expert on advertising and marketing, decided to examine the effectiveness of Super Bowl advertising and supervised 55 undergraduate business students in an exhaustive content analysis of animal v. celebrity Super Bowl ads over the past five years. The students (aged 18-22) also conducted a longitudinal examination of the best and worst celebrity and animal ads of all time through content analysis, aggregation of critics ratings and their own in-depth analysis.
Celebrity v. Animal Ads Over The Past Five Years

The students observed a slight increase in the number of ads using celebrities over the past five years concurrent with a slight decrease in the number of ads using animals.

Overall, the students found that celebrity endorsers are used in more than twice as many ads in comparison to animals.
Use of Celebrities

The students observed that celebrity endorsements are the dominant approach used in Super Bowl advertising in the last five years, but that the results of ads featuring celebrities are all over the map, and average somewhat lower likeability and effectiveness ratings than other ads. They emphasized, however, that some celebrity ads can be highly effective. As one student group put it:

“Time and time again, through our research we found many disclaimers against the utilization of celebrities in Super Bowl ads. Celebrities are polarizing in that they often appeal to only one demographic segment and worse—could possibly offend another. This is particularly important to keep in mind as the audience of Super Bowl viewers is a representation of the general population. This is not to say that if done properly, including the right celebrities in the right storyline with the right message may increase ad likeability, social media buzz and overall effectiveness of Super Bowl ads. In practice, however, this is often not the case.”

CONCLUSION
Celebrity ads can work but just inserting any celebrity into an ad is a recipe for below average performance. It is essential that they fit with the brand and message.
Gender of Celebrity Endorsers

Some students speculated that the high use of male endorsers is because the demographic for NFL football skews male—though this is not as much the case for the Super Bowl compared to the rest of the football season.

A few student groups observed that ads featuring male celebrities were more effective than ads featuring females based on rankings data, but only slightly so.

Another group noted that most commercials using female celebrities used them to reinforce a sexual appeal, including:

| Victoria’s Secret | Go Daddy* | Skechers |

CONCLUSION
Male celebrities account for 75% of celebrity endorsements in the Super Bowl. This is the case in spite of relatively even demographics. Analysis shows only slightly higher average effectiveness of ads with male celebrities, perhaps being suggestive of more opportunity to use female celebrities effectively.

Athletes v. Show Business

The students found that ads featuring show business celebrity endorsers were, on average, more effective than ads with athlete endorsers over the past five years.

CONCLUSION
Show business celebrity endorsers, on average, outperformed athlete endorsers over the past five years.
**Frequency of Dogs v. Cats v. Other Animals**

Dogs were used more frequently than cats. Dog ads outperformed those for cats and other animals, but this varied by year. As one group put it:

“...commercials featuring dogs performed better than those featuring other animals. However, there were certain years, 2012 and 2013, specifically, where almost all ads featuring animals fared badly relative to other ads.”

**CONCLUSION**

Dogs are used more often than cats, and often with high levels of success. While acknowledging the sample size is small, the students think dogs are the champs as animals used in Super Bowl ads.

---

**Serious v. Humorous Celebrity Ads**

In terms of effectiveness ratings—not just likeability, but broader effectiveness measures—the students found that the serious ads performed better on average, but cautioned that this was based on a relatively low overall number of serious ads.

**CONCLUSION**

A humorous approach is used more often than a serious one but that doesn’t mean they’re more effective.
Serious v. Humorous Approach in Animal Ads

CONCLUSION
Humor is used considerably more often than a serious approach in animal ads, but the Budweiser ads demonstrate that serious ads can be effective.

ADS THAT FEATURE ANIMALS:

- **25% Serious Approach**
- **75% Humorous Approach**

Serious ads were rated higher on average but this was largely due to the runaway success of some of the recent Budweiser ads. As one group put it:

“The fact that 80% of the serious ads were produced by Budweiser proves the company has a gift for creating captivating advertisements because of the 80%, 75% of the ads were ranked number one in 2013, 2014, and 2015. Therefore, serious ads have scored higher because they stir up conversation and allow the audience to relate to the emotion that is compelled through the ad.”
Best Celebrity Ads of All Time

1. **2010 | Snickers**  
   Betty White/Abe Vigoda  
   You’re not you when you’re hungry

2. **1993 | McDonalds**  
   The Showdown  
   Jordan, Bird

3. **1992 | Pepsi**  
   Vending Machine  
   Cindy Crawford

4. **1992 | Nike**  
   Hare Jordan  
   Bugs Bunny
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>Performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>Mean Joe Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Diet Pepsi</td>
<td>Ray Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Honda</td>
<td>Matthew’s Day Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Chrysler</td>
<td>Born of Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Chrysler</td>
<td>Halftime in America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Clash of Clans</td>
<td>Liam Neeson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honorable Mentions

2014 | Bud Light
Up for Whatever
Arnold, Cheadle, Minka K.

2015 | Snickers
Brady Bunch

Key Findings

LONG LASTING IMPACT
This list suggests ultra-successful, all-time classic celebrity ads have a more long-lasting impact in terms of their memorability.

EARLY “CLASSIC” ADS RANK HIGH
In comparison to the students list of best animal ads, fewer of the highest ranked ads are from very recent years with more “classics” ranked. Moreover, the top two ads were runaway leaders, and the top five on the list were consistently scored high by the groups.

ICONIC BRANDS RESONATE
All of the top six ads on this list are for truly iconic American brands that are a part of American pop culture: Snickers, McDonald’s, Nike, Coke and Pepsi/Diet Pepsi. This represents an opportunity for these brands when they use celebrities.

NOSTALGIA STANDS OUT
Honda’s “Matthew’s Day Off” featuring Matthew Broderick scored very well using a popular U.S. celebrity and an appeal to nostalgia.

THEMED MATCHES WORK WELL
Chrysler’s placement on the list with its 2011 and 2012 ads is impressive and indicative of a good match of the celebrity to the theme of the ad. Eminem is from Detroit and edgy, hence “Imported from Detroit” connected with a young audience.
Worst Celebrity Ads of All Time

1  **2013 | GoDaddy**
Smart meets sexy with Bar Rafaeli

2  **2011 | Groupon**
Timothy Hutton
Save the money

3  **1997 | Dirt Devil**
Fred Astaire

Key Findings

- The top two ads on this list won out by a wide margin, likely for different reasons.

- The GoDaddy ad depicted a supermodel kissing a “geeky” character for a long period of seconds, a tactic that while attention-getting, was not appealing to the audience.

- The Groupon ad was viewed as being insensitive to the poor, consistent with the theme of a need to show some level of social responsibility even when running an ad intended to be irreverent.

- Somehow, the pairing of Fred Astaire and a vacuum cleaner did not work well.
Best Animal Ads of All Time

1. **2013 | Budweiser**
   - **Brotherhood**
   - [Video](#)

2. **2014 | Budweiser**
   - **Puppy love**
   - [Video](#)

3. **2008 | Budweiser**
   - **Dalmatian trains Clydesdale to make beer wagon team**
   - [Video](#)

4. **TIE**
   - **1994 | Pepsi**
   - **A chimp experiment gone awry**
   - [Video](#)

5. **2015 | Budweiser**
   - **Lost dog**
   - [Video](#)

   [TIE]
6 1998 | Pepsi
Flying geese

8 2004 | Bud Light
Owners demonstrate how their dogs fetch Bud Light

1995 | Budweiser
Frogs

9 2004 | Budweiser
Crabs worship Bud ice chest

10 2003 | Budweiser
Replay
Clydesdales turn to zebra referee

1997 | Pepsi
Bear dance
Honorable Mentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Advertiser</th>
<th>Ad Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>E-trade</td>
<td>Monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Doritos</td>
<td>Dog bribes cat owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bud Light</td>
<td>Here we go</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings

**Budweiser & Pepsi Are Tops**

All of the tops ads were either for Budweiser or for Pepsi. Of the top ten ads (11 listed due to ties), eight were for Budweiser or Bud Light, and the other three were all for Pepsi.

**Animals Are Extremely Effective**

The students believed that these companies are extremely effective in the creative use of animals to connect with consumers on the Super Bowl. One wonders why Pepsi has not consistently used animals in its advertising over the years.

**Classic Ads Resonate**

Because the students doing the ratings were born in the mid-1990s, the numbers appear to reflect some recent bias. However, the students do pick up some of the classics and the results are reflective of Budweiser running exceptionally effective ads using animals over the past three Super Bowls. This finding demonstrates the iconic status of the Budweiser Clydesdales combined with the use of highly effective creative strategy.
Worst Animal Ads of All Time

1. **2008 | Sales Genie**
   - Panda

2. **2015 | GoDaddy**
   - Puppy mill

3. **1998 | Outpost.com**
   - Gerbil canon

4. **2008 | Gatorade**
   - Dog

5. **2008 | SoBe**
   - Lizard lake

TIED
Key Findings

**EDGY ADS INEFFECTIVE**

One commonality is that these ads are generally offbeat or edgy in some way. For example, Sales Genie’s “Panda” was accused of invoking stereotypes of Asians, while Gatorade’s “Dog” showed a canine drinking Gatorade using the tagline “Man’s Best Friend.” Advertisers should have really known that these specific uses of animals would not be effective.

**“PUPPY MILL” AD MAKES LIST**

GoDaddy’s “Puppy Mill” made the list even though it did not actually appear on the Super Bowl—rather it was a highly publicized rejected ad.
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