CELEBRITY AND THE UNITED NATIONS: LEADERSHIP AND REFERENT POWER OF GLOBAL FILM AMBASSADORS

Anita M. Cal and Leo A. Mallette

Pepperdine University, USA

This study examines the United Nations' (U.N.) cultivation of celebrity ambassadors, specifically international film celebrities as activists for social and global political causes. Two questions were explored during a qualitative meta-analysis of the literature: 1) Do film stars qualify as leaders? 2) Why does the global film actor have power in the sociopolitical milieu? Through the qualitative meta-analysis of the literature utilizing the concepts of charismatic leadership, referent power theory, and the three-stage transfer model theory, this article seeks to understand why the United Nations strategically appoints film celebrities' like George Clooney and Angelina Jolie as Goodwill Ambassadors. In addition, the authors considered several environmental analysis techniques and focused on the political environment. The research of the literature revealed that global film stars are effective components in the U.N. mission of raising awareness for its global sociopolitical agenda. In the decades since Danny Kaye emerged as the first U.N. Goodwill Ambassador for UNICEF in 1953, the ambassadorial services of film stars has evolved. Celebrities have transitioned from politically neutral figureheads into more independent advocates that at times are at odds with U.N. policy. However, implications of this study conclude a more in-depth analysis is needed to determine the extent to which the celebrity U.N. Goodwill Ambassadors are effective leaders, and whether they effectively manage the causes they advocate, toward tangible transformative change.

Keywords: Celebrity, Ambassador, Meta-analysis, Referent, Charisma, Power, Film, SPELIT.

Introduction

Celebrities have become a ubiquitous global presence as a result of television, motion pictures, and social media. The phenomenon of celebrity is inextricably woven into the fabric of modern culture through the rise of the visual (Barry, 2008). Brockington (2012) points out that there is a modern spread of the celebrity and this propagation is a consequence of mass media. Including "the film industries of Hollywood and Bollywood, the proliferation of newspapers and glossy magazines, television and its channels, and the Internet" (p. 9).

As the focal point of this study the question must be addressed, what constitutes a celebrity? There are four conceptualizations of celebrity discussed in this section; however, only one is used in this study for the purpose of meta-analysis. The four conceptualizations of celebrity include: (1) the basic definition utilized in advertising; (2) the proverbial "fifteen minutes of fame" notion of celebrity; (3) the celebrity as a construct of media for political purposes; and (4) a three-definition theory of celebrity.

In advertising, the term celebrity has traditionally had the demarcation of talent or skill attached to it and is described as **"**an individual who is known to the public (i.e., actor, sports figure, entertainer, etc.)

for his or her achievements in areas other than that of the product class endorsed" (Friedman & Friedman, 1979, p. 63).   This definition of celebrity provides a solid foundation for exploring the concept of celebrity. However, in the new millennium the term celebrity has evolved.   Celebrities today include talented and skilled individuals, as well as private citizens who become famous in an instant for no specific achievement. Due to the explosion of new technologies any individual could become a celebrity in a formerly nontraditional manner. A private individual may become famous via viral video, a viral Tweet, or a nanosecond appearance on a local broadcast that catches the world's attention for any number of inconsequential reasons. This type of fame involves the lightening flash propagation of media celebrities that occurs from manufactured events or viral video. The latter paints a picture for the second definition of celebrity, the so-called "fifteen minutes of fame" (Warhol, 1986). This instant fame syndrome also happens with children: "Not only have sites like YouTube made it possible for numerous unknown adolescents to be discovered…but youngsters with no special talent" (Hagwood, 2011, para. 9). The latter examples of instantaneous fame support Boorstin's (1961) assertion that the "celebrity is a person who is well-known for his well-knownness" (p. 57).   The modern celebrity according to Boorstin and Warhol has no more levity or demarcation of talent or even worthiness required for the individual attached to the word.   Subsequently, Brockington (2012) contends that all celebrities from Donald Trump to Kim Kardashian "are a manifestation of the lack of authenticity in society. They are people and personalities fabricated by the media for economic and political ends. They numb thought, protest, and effective engagement with the reality of our surroundings" (p. 11)**.**

   It is important to note that there are sufficient illustrations throughout the last half century that refute Brockington's (2012) assertions.   Many savvy, intelligent global celebrities have stepped to the forefront of political and social firestorms and conducted effective engagement. One must take into consideration thinker activists Harry Belafonte, Marlon Brando, Charlton Heston, and Sidney Poitier.   The four movie stars risked their careers to join televised roundtables and street marches in support of the 1960s Civil Rights Movement. Richard Gere traded his U.N. "Pretty Woman" knight-in-shining armor diplomacy to raise awareness for Tibet, initiating a lifelong protest of the U.N.'s non-recognition of Tibet as a sovereign nation.   Likewise global icons Ellen DeGeneres, Samuel Jackson, and Leonardo DiCaprio have stepped to the forefront to fight various new millennial issues including bullying, police brutality, and global warming.

   Boorstin's (1962) view offers an oversimplified explanation of celebrity and Brockington's assessment (celebrities represent a lack of authenticity in society) is steeped in a narrow, pessimistic-tinged theory regarding those that are famous. Advertising's description (a celebrity is a person with talent or skill) brings us somewhat closer to what a celebrity represents. But the question remains, what exactly is a celebrity and what makes celebrities worthy of U.N. Goodwill Ambassador appointments? Also, how does one truly separate a star renown for talent or skill from a well-known person without talent or skill?

   Rojek (2001) offers the fourth and most nuanced definition of celebrity that addresses the complexities of the word by separating the term into three types:

- Ascribed celebrity
- Attributed celebrity
- Achieved celebrity

   Ascribed celebrity status is derived through bloodlines such as the Kennedy's or the British royal family. Attributed celebrity is bestowed upon individuals considered "noteworthy or exceptional by cultural intermediaries" (p. 17) like reality star Kim Kardashian or celebrity blogger Perez Hilton. Achieved celebrity stems from the public's perception of the individual's accomplishments in competitive arenas, and includes athletes, authors, artists, and movie stars (p. 17).   For example, Wimbledon tennis champion Venus Williams, NFL Super Bowl champion Peyton Manning, Oscar winners Meryl Streep and Sandra Bullock, are distinguished from those media celebrities famous for being famous like Nicole Richie.   Instead the famous individuals with special abilities or expertise qualify as achieved celebrities because they are "recognized as individuals who possess rare talents or skills" (p. 17).

For the purposes of this analysis it is Rojek's (2001) definition of the achieved celebrity that is under examination-the noteworthy individual with perceived greatness in attainments. Specifically, the global movie star is examined within the context of his or her service as a global Goodwill Ambassador for the U.N. Furthermore, the authors' distinguish unofficial movie star activists from movie star diplomats appointed by the United Nations. This analysis adopts Cooper's (2008) explicit criteria that contends celebrity diplomats are individuals who "must not only possess ample communication skills, a sense of mission, and some global reach. They must enter into the official diplomatic world and operate through the matrix of complex relationships with state officials" (p. 7). Therefore, by Cooper's definition the global movie star Goodwill Ambassador appointed by and groomed by the U.N. is a celebrity diplomat.

There have been analyses of celebrities and their relationship with the U.N. within the past decade (e.g. Cooper, 2008; Yoo & Jin, 2013); those studies focus on the impact of perception on followers, as well as the tenuous, yet mutually beneficial dependence the U.N. and celebrities share. However, only a handful of examinations between the U.N. and celebrity ambassadors have been analyzed through the lens of leadership theory and advertising theory. The following sections will examine the historical relationship between global film celebrities and the U.N., the global film star as diplomatic leader, and the theoretical explanations behind their power.

Literature Review

Since Danny Kaye served as the first Goodwill Ambassador in 1953, the pursuit of celebrities by the United Nations has been a dynamic, at times discomfited liaison. Cooper (2008) contends the relationship between the two is manipulated by the U.N. which "has throughout its history flirted with celebrities when it wanted them to be the legitimizing faces of the institution" (p. 16). By the late 1950s, a nascent U.N. recognized that celebrities could provide focus "…for their causes, thereby transcending other agencies of social authority, to become integral in the sphere of political communication" (Wheeler, 2013, p. 47).

Kaye was the model diplomat, a conformist who avoided conflicts (Cooper, 2008). He visited disaster zones around the world on behalf of the United Nations and raised the agency's profile among other Hollywood elites through glamorous galas. He brought actresses Judy Garland and Carol Burnett to the White House to meet President John F. Kennedy. In addition, he dutifully publicized the agency's fight to relieve the plight of children, and led donors in raising millions of dollars for the cause (Cooper, 2008).

In 2003, on the fiftieth anniversary of Kaye's appointment as a celebrity ambassador, U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan described the birth of the organization's relationship with film celebrities after a chance meeting with Kaye on a transatlantic flight:

> On the day Danny Kaye became a UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, a new kind of star was born: The kind that shines its light on the hardship and injustices suffered by the children of this world. The kind that confronts us and melts away our indifference. The kind that forces us to admit that we can and must do something to help. (Annan, 2003, p. 1).

After Kaye's enormous diplomatic success, the U.N. under Annan began to enfold celebrities in the organization to such an extent that an anonymous insider declared that the agency had become "a celebrity hotel…and anyone in Hollywood who wants to show there's nothing trivial about them checks in with Kofi [Annan]" (Cooper, 2008, p. 28). From the beginning, global film star ambassadors demonstrated the ability "to frame issues in a manner that attracts visibility and new channels of communication at the mass as well as the elite circles" (Cooper, 2008, p. 16). Elite circles include foreign governments, Cooper notes, which may reject an offer to meet with U.N. representatives, but accept the opportunity to socialize with a global movie star.

For more than half a century, the U.N. has boldly declared that the very publicness of the celebrity, and particularly the superstar film celebrity with global recognition, is essential to

executing their sociopolitical vision (UNICEF, 2014, p. 1). For it is without question that the global film celebrity has the star power to grab the world's attention, concentrate it on a particular cause, and influence millions of people to get involved. On the official UNICEF website, the U.N. charitable arm for combatting the hunger and abuse of children, the organization declares that "UNICEF Ambassadors have proven that being a public figure can be a powerful tool in mobilizing the support necessary to improve the lives of children and ensure their basic human rights" (UNICEF, 2014, p. 1). On many levels, movie stars, because of their fan base and high profiles, are a more effective than elected leaders. Barron (1998) noted nearly two decades ago that talking head politicians were ineffective and the use of celebrities was an irreversible trend necessitated by survival in a world full of static that the U.N. clearly understands:

> In the television-oriented 1990's, policy wonks are using celebrities to get their messages across. Maybe it is inevitable that groups like the Population Fund, which provides contraception and counseling, would turn to entertainers and athletes to reach a wider audience than do the policy makers who inhabit Sunday-morning interview shows. (para. 4).

According to Yoo and Jin (2013), the U.N.'s utilization of film stars as ambassadors "could be taken to indicate that organizations are seeking similar effect to that obtained by using celebrities in advertising" (p. 620). Indeed, a significant part of the diplomatic film star's responsibilities involves the promotion of U.N. humanitarian platforms in order to produce "general awareness of the organization's activities via advertising and other public relations and to urge people to donate funds or participate in volunteer activities" (Yoo & Jin, 2013, p. 621). It is a function akin to the promotional duties movie actors perform during press junkets. Also, it is a function "…similar to that of the celebrity endorser in advertising" (Yoo & Jin, 2013, p. 621).

The U.N. strategy for appointing movie star diplomats does indicate a strategy to incorporate many theories founded in celebrity endorsements and advertising. In studying the impact of endorsements, advertisers believe the utilization of celebrities positively influences effectiveness, recognition of the brand, and the recall of the brand (Spry et al., 2011). Whether it is to raise public outrage over genocide in Darfur, fight malnutrition in war-torn Somalia, or donate money to earthquake refugees in Haiti, the use of glamorous film celebrity diplomats creates recognition for U.N. causes for citizens around the world. The practical implication is that the film star ambassador's effect on public opinion for the U.N. is similar to celebrity brand ambassador's effect on attitude change in advertising. Yoo and Jin (2013) demonstrated that U.N. Goodwill Ambassadors had the same influence on the public's behavior as celebrities in advertising and found that:

> ...the celebrity endorsement models and match-up hypothesis...can be applied similarly to the relationship between a goodwill ambassador (sic) and his or her commissioning organization...the effects of celebrity engagement are not limited to products or brands, but can also be extended to organizations and groups. (Yoo & Jin, 2013, p. 633).

In analyzing the U.N.'s agenda for the recruitment of global film celebrities for social and political causes the question arises whether international movie stars are truly leaders or marionettes manipulated by their U.N. benefactors? The answer is multifaceted. Movie stars like Audrey Hepburn and Swedish movie star Liv Ullman followed the tow-the-line diplomacy of Kaye. In 1978, Ullman became the first celebrity diplomat to possess clearly articulated views about the impoverished people of the world that went beyond the scope of U.N. controlled scripts (Wheeler, 2011).

Ullman was part of the evolution of the Goodwill Ambassador as thinker-activist, displaying a superior political cognizance more so than her predecessors (Wheeler, 2013). Though more thoughtful in conveying her political views, Ullman adhered to the parameters set by the U.N. regarding approved policies. Ullman and like-minded movie star diplomats "conformed as good international citizens a they

saw their role as propagating a cause or an issue," (Wheeler, 2012). The evolution of the celebrity Goodwill Ambassador from puppet to problem emerged within a decade of Danny Kaye's appointment. Starting as early as the mid-1960s, Marlon Brando had become a public relations nightmare for the U.N. Mesmerizing as a Goodwill Ambassador, Brando proved to be a skilled spokesman and fundraiser. The movie star helped spotlight famine in India and helped raise millions of dollars for children suffering from malnutrition. But the *On the Waterfront* star proved uncontrollable and used his role as a Goodwill Ambassador to gain status as a political cowboy who often went off script (Wheeler, 2011). The U.N. began to experience similar conflicts through the new millennium. Movie star diplomats like Richard Gere disagreed with non-recognition of Tibet and called for a boycott of the 2008 Beijing Olympics. Susan Sarandon (anti-war) and Mia Farrow, opposed non-action regarding genocide in Sudan. Politically minded movie stars used their influence, access, and acquired diplomatic savvy to frame issues that vociferously opposed U.N.-promoted policies (Cooper, 2008, p. 8). It was a sign of the times, according to Wheeler (2012): "In this transformative era of celebrity diplomacy stars have felt they should use their fame to expose injustices" (p. 4).

After decades of turbulence between the U.N. and some of its most famous movie star ambassadors, current film stars seemed to have returned to apolitical, Danny Kaye-like conformity. *Harry Potter* star Emma Thompson, and *Titanic* icon Leonardo DiCaprio have been gracious ambassadors serving within the parameters of U.N. guidelines since their appointments as Goodwill Ambassador and Ambassador of Peace, respectively, in 2014. The present trend of movie star ambassadors dutifully serving in their diplomatic appointments appears to be a result of formal U.N. guidelines that were established in 2006. According to Cooper (2008), after years of "ill-judged choices played into a sentiment that the U.N. was getting out of control in its efforts to catch the celebrity wave…As a result of these negative experiences the U.N. ambassador program was tightened up" (p. 30).

The U.N.'s new procedures require prospective celebrity ambassadors to meet several guidelines. Potential Goodwill Ambassadors are required to possess integrity, superior communication skills, dignity and a willingness to promote the values of the U.N. (United Nations, 2006, p. 5).

Also, the new policy requires ambassadors to undergo a courting period; the U.N. invites potentials to diplomatic events and observes candidates for a year before offering any appointments. In addition, the U.N. clearly states that once a celebrity is selected, he or she will be terminated if the designee "engages in any activity incompatible with his/her status or with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, or if the termination is in the interest of the Organization (United Nations, 2006, p. 5).

The adoption of strict selection procedures abated much of the public relation problems with controversial Goodwill Ambassadors. However, Cooper (2008) points out the future relationship between the U.N. and high profile celebrity diplomats will always remain murky: "…emergent tensions will be between the divergent roles that celebrities are prepared to play. Will they continue to perform under the name-and the direction-of the UN" (p. 37). Recent examples of the latter involve Angelina Jolie, who served dutifully as a Goodwill Ambassador for the UNHCR without incident for nearly a decade. Then, in 2009 she criticized the Barack Obama administration in Newsweek regarding the U.S.'s lack of intervention in Darfur (Jolie, 2009). Again in 2015, Jolie addressed the U.N. and chastised its members for failing to intervene and help refugees in Syria, suggesting the relationship between the U.N. and celebrity ambassadors will always be tenuous at best. Although Jolie violated U.N. Goodwill Ambassador guidelines, to date, her diplomatic status has not been terminated.

The Celebrity Film Star Ambassador and Leadership

Are movie stars appointed as Goodwill Ambassadors leaders? In order to answer whether movie stars are leaders requires first, understanding the definition of leadership and second, examining the relationship between referent power and how it operates in conjunction with leadership.

According to Robbins and Judge (2013), leadership is "the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a vision or set of goals" (p. 368).   Likewise, Lunenburg (2013) defines leadership as the ability to "influence others and modify behavior via legitimate and referent power" (p. 5).   Based on these definitions, the international movie star is indeed a leader, possessing the ability to influence the masses. These "fans-turned-followers" perceive the movie star in a positive light, as well as respect the celebrity (Lunenburg, 2013). The latter, referred to as reverence, gives the movie star referent power that increases their influence.

Movie star fans then, by definition, can be argued to be admirers and consumers of the celebrity who support the celebrity's career.   In turn, the fan supports the celebrity's causes thereby making the movie star a leader and giving the movie star referent power. Angelina Jolie is the U.N.'s most prominent Goodwill Ambassador. According to Barron (2009), Jolie was "purposely selected because people would be more likely to listen to her because of who she is-a movie star" (p. 224). When global film ambassadors like Jolie speak, the world not only listens, Cooper (2008) points out, but masses of people are induced to action.

The substantial influence global film celebrities such as Angelina Jolie, Emma Watson, and George Clooney possess is evident. However, a celebrity's international profile and ability to influence on a global scale does not necessarily mean he or she is a good leader. Effective leadership requires several characteristics and skills, including an ability to convince people to trust, a quality that involves a perception of credibility that is necessary to influence people to achieve a desired goal.

Celebrity diplomats face two hurdles when it comes to garnering trust with their fans and the public-at-large. First, celebrity ambassadors are regarded with skepticism due to the public's suspicions that the movie star may be more invested in self-promotion than the cause (Cooper, 2008). Though admired for their career achievements, wealth, and beauty, Brockington (2009) noted that the movie star diplomat "often arouses resentment and uncertainty when mixed with the serious business of life" (p. 1). Second, celebrity diplomats must be perceived as authentically linked to their causes. To influence fans to take up the U.N. cause, the celebrity ambassador must be paired in areas of humanitarian work the public perceives as being in the realm of their expertise. In other words, consumers who believe a celebrity is credible are persuaded to trust the star's declarations about a brand. The celebrity produces a positive consumer response toward the brand if the celebrity is perceived to have pertinent knowledge, abilities, or skills related to the brand (Ohanian, 1990). Similarly, if the celebrity ambassador's cause is not perceived by the public to be congruent with the celebrity's image, then the ability to influence those fans toward desired attitude change could be problematic. Yoo and Jin (2013) found that when a celebrity Goodwill Ambassador was perceived to have very little in common with the charitable work, the "ambassador activity was found to have negative effects on all three credibility categories of attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertise, which means the audience members find such activities unnatural or unsuitable in light of the celebrity's image" (p. 14).

Whether movie stars are qualified to serve in diplomatic roles is one issue, but in terms of leadership characteristics and traits, the global film star qualifies. Communication and interpersonal skills are important leadership skills. Since movie stars are trained to convince the world they are fictitious characters on the big screen, they develop effective verbal and nonverbal abilities in order to become that character. As a result, most highly successful actors have the ability to influence the people around them to do what they want them to do. As a result, the global film diplomat is adept at communication in their role for the U.N. a role that requires excellent oral skills.

Three-Stage Meaning Transfer Model

Why do the fans of movie stars have such a connection with individuals they have never met? Rojek (2001) points out that movie stars and the characters they play are virtually indistinguishable to the public because the "media saturation means we now live in the age of the pseudo-event, with the result that the

line between fact and fiction, reality and illusion has been erased" (p. 18). Thus, in terms of the public's perception the movie star that saves the world in a movie, is also capable of leading the battle for peace in a war torn country.

In the world of marketing, McCracken (1989) called the process in which the transference of a movie star's projected image is linked to his real life in the public's perception, a "three-stage meaning transfer model." First, the celebrity's trustworthiness and the talent or skill that produced the fame is transferred to his or her public image (p. 168). Second, the celebrity transfers the positive perception that resulted in his or her fame to the brand. Third, the combined meaning is transferred to the consumers.

In the case of the global film Goodwill Ambassador, the celebrity transfers the projected meaning to the diplomatic position and ultimately the cause (McCracken, 1989, p. 168). Similarly, Cooper (2008) points out that the public transfer's credibility to movie stars outside of their achieved fields in advertising. Thus, Cooper asks, "can they not expand their status and sell ideas and a sense of commitment on an issue-specific basis" (p. 10).

One example of a film celebrity ambassador who has certainly benefitted from the three-stage meaning transfer model in the arena of perceived trustworthiness is Angelina Jolie. Cooper (2008) points out, Jolie's movie roles and her real life bear a striking resemblance: she is elegant in her movies and elegant in real life. In addition, the super heroines she portrays populate foreign lands that resemble her real life diplomatic missions. For Jolie, "starring in adventure films in exotic locations provided added credibility to her front-line activity both as a UN goodwill ambassador and her more recent ventures into freelance diplomatic activity" (p. 116). To date, Angelie Jolie is the most prominent and powerful, U.N. Ambassador, giving voice to genocide in Darfur, raising the awareness of Libyan war refugees, and criticizing the U.N. regarding the lack of action against Syria for war atrocities.

Jolie provides the perfect example of the obscured line between the fictional persona of the film celebrity and the star's off-screen persona. This muddling is further highlighted in U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan's 50th anniversary speech honoring Danny Kaye. It is difficult to distinguish Annan's real life references and those that are fictional:

> Then, the top hat and tails of Danny Kaye's time gave way to the tousled mops of the Fab Four. The tale of Walter Mitty was replaced by the legend of Sergeant Pepper. We learned to sing "here comes the sun," as the new era brought us someone I particularly want to pay tribute to tonight. George Harrison was the first to understand and use the power of rock music to motivate people to embrace causes bigger than themselves. (UNICEF, 2003).

Indeed, the boundary between the hero of fiction and real life became so distorted that by the time the 1980s rolled around it was not a stretch for a former actor to become the leader of the free world. The cultural, social and political landscape had converged. When former actor Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, some scholars contend his rise marked a troubling trend of celebrity worship (West & Orman, 2002). Reagan's ascension also coincided with the new beginning of celebrity exploitation by politicians that undermine the democratic process. West and Orman cautioned:

> If we don't take back the celebrity politician system, citizens might well face a political contest between a basketball player versus a football player, or a comedian versus rock star, or a movie star versus a television situation comedy star. (p. 119).

Charismatic Leadership

When examining movie stars through the microscope of leadership theory, there's one principle that seems to affirm the global film celebrity's leadership qualifications in the sociopolitical milieu: charismatic leadership. Charismatic leadership is a form of authority that global celebrities by their very existence tend to confirm. Charismatic leadership traits include extroversion, confidence, and achievement-centered motivation (Robbins & Judge, 2013).

Sociologist, Max Weber, defined charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality, by virtue of which he or she is set apart from ordinary people and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (Robbins & Judge, 2013, p. 379).

The movie star is highly skilled at image control and impression management, which are key charismatic traits. Movie stars are motivated to protect the perception that they are more valuable than the rest of the public. Thus, film celebrities become experts at projecting the image they want the public to perceive, both professionally and in public. The U.N. comprehends the movie star's charisma and ability to project an image that appeals to the masses. In 2000, U.N. Secretary-General Annan indicated the magnetic character traits of global film stars were valuable in the world of diplomacy. Film stars, Annan contends, possess "the personality to capture the imagination of people and policy makers alike" (Cooper, 2008, p. 28). Marshall (1997) contends contemporary culture fosters the perception that global film celebrities are more special than their fans. Modern culture confers "on certain individuals we call celebrities or stars the public stage and renown. The recognition and public fame are part of the act of celebrating their importance and significance" (Marshall, 1997, p. xlviii).

It is important to note, however, that the ability of a global movie star to attract followers through magnetism, charm, or captivation, does not necessarily mean they are good leaders. In fact, Robbins and Judge (2013) caution that celebrity charisma does not equate to effective leadership and charismatic leaderships has potential drawbacks. Thus, the United Nations should tread carefully with the charismatic film celebrity as "…research has shown that individuals who are narcissistic are also higher in some behaviors associated with charismatic leadership. It isn't that charismatic leadership is not effective; overall, it is. But a charismatic leader isn't always the answer" (p. 382). Conversely, Evje (2012) warns there are three dangers to charismatic leadership (2012). First, charismatic leaders become addicted to the public attention they receive from their own charisma. Second, an overly-charismatic leader "draws focus from the rest of the organization by demanding (subtly or dramatically) attention for him-or herself." Third, "charisma grows for its own sake and forgets its purpose" (p. 1).

From the readiness of celebrities to take on the responsibility of diplomacy, the question arises, are movie stars reliable activists or self-promoters seeking to build further their brand? The answers are not simplistic ones. Celebrities have raised hundreds of millions of dollars for humanitarian causes since Kaye became the first Goodwill Ambassador. From Hepburn to DiCaprio, movie stars overall have been reliable diplomats. Tsalik (2011) contends that the global film diplomats have played their roles well:

> Undoubtedly, Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace have lent weight to the public campaign waged by the U.N. in a commercially driven global news media. They have provided a definable focus for public engagement and have utilized their star power to affect pressure on international policymakers (p. 59).

The next section will explain the environmental analysis applied to the review of the literature.

Environmental Analysis using SPELIT

There is a need to analyze environments in many aspects of life, including those of celebrity ambassadors. The SPELIT method, developed in the early 2000s, is designed to meet the need of analyzing organizations and their environments from different perspectives. SPELIT is the acronym for the social, political, economic, legal, intercultural and technical environments (Schmieder-Ramirez & Mallette, 2007, 2015). The methodology aligns with many change theorists, such as Christensen, Kaufman, Holcomb, and Cummings & Worley. These theorists stipulate benchmarking or diagnosing the current condition as a first step in the change process.

Change theorists, described in this section, include an evaluation of the environment as part of their philosophies. Christensen (1997) discusses a three-stage method for defining a detailed strategy to guide a company. The first of his three stages is identifying the driving forces. Christensen states: "Identify at a

fundamental level the root causes of the issues the company needs to address. These are the *driving forces*—the economic, demographic, technological, or competitive factors in the company's environment that either constitute threats or create opportunities" (p. 5).

Conversely, Kaufman (2000) has a four-step model of assessment, and the second step is "measuring current results (What is)". The first of Holcomb's (2001) five guiding questions is the environmental analysis question "where are we now?" (p. xi). Holcomb's five questions are targeted to collaboration and school change, but these questions apply to almost any transition process including the evolving roles of global film ambassadors. The SPELIT analysis methodology is an effective tool to answer these questions.

The U.N. as a reframer of its Goodwill Ambassador program for celebrities needed a starting point to do any reframing of the views of an organization. Bolman and Deal (2003) identify four frames of reference: 1) structural, 2) human resource, 3) political, and 4) symbolic. Each of these frames is a point of view and can be useful for evaluating the environment of an organization. These four frames incorporate into several categories of the SPELIT analysis methodology. Kotter's (2012) first step, of his 8-step change model, is to create urgency. Creating urgency involves understanding your market and the competitive environment concerning opportunities and threats. Bridges (2003) has a three-step process to describe the process of transitions. His first step is "ending" (p. 4) which addresses the pre-existing environment and that it must end. A key step in the "general model of planned change" (Cummings & Worley, 2005, p. 28) is the diagnosis. The authors discuss diagnosing organizations, groups within organizations, and individuals prior to designing interventions. To this list, we would add diagnosing the environment outside of the organization as suggested in the 5C model by and Bygrave and Zacharakis (2004).

All the above theories include a step for analysis or diagnosis of the current organization that define the way things are now. The SPELIT analysis methodology is a tool that is used to analyze systematically the environment of a large organization such as the U.N. or the European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS). Other analyses may include individuals, a situation such as graduate school or an impending merger, the physical community such as a charter school association or church. Many theorists systematically evaluate the environment of an organization if for no other reason than to have a baseline to determine if a change occurred after an intervention (Schmieder-Ramirez & Mallette, 2007, 2015).

The next section describes the SPELIT analysis methodology environments.

The SPELIT Environments

Each of the six major environments that created the SPELIT acronym described in the next six paragraphs and additional environments can be added as described in the last paragraph.

Social Environment. Sociology is the study of how people behave in various group interactions, such as work, home, family, church, charitable organizations, sports team, driving, etc. (Macionis, 2005). The SPELIT social environment addresses the social character of an organization. It would include Bolman and Deal's (2003) structural and human resources frames of reference.

Political Environment. Politics is the process of making decisions within groups closely tied to the concepts of power and influence. A political environment is associated with any group of people. The SPELIT political environment can address organizational structure and sources of power (position, expert, power, charismatic, etc.). This environment would include Bolman and Deal's (2003) political frame-of-reference and competitors and collaborators from Bygrave and Zacharaki's (2004) model.

Economics Environment. Economics focuses on with production and consumption of resources. The SPELIT economics environment addresses resources of an organization such as facilities, trucks, people, goodwill, charitable acts, or money. This environment would include *customers* from Bygrave and Zacharaki's (2004) model.

Legal Environment. The legal environment includes official laws or accepted rules. The four types of legal systems are the civil law, common law, customary law, and religious law. The SPELIT legal environment addresses the laws, customs, and ethics of the organization. This environment would include *customers* and *company* from Bygrave and Zacharakis' (2004) model.

Intercultural Environment. Being interculturally sensitive "is to be aware of the points of view of others and to recognize differences in cultures" (Schmieder-Ramirez, Fortson, & Madjidi, 2004, p. 7). The SPELIT intercultural environment addresses culture and differences between cultures that would be a driver for an organization. This environment would include Bolman & Deal's (2003) human *resources,* and it would include *symbolic* frames-of-reference and *context* from Bygrave and Zacharakis' (2004) model.

Technological Environment. Technology is the use of tools that society has developed to become more efficient, and technology is driving how the majority of businesses operate. The SPELIT technological environment includes the obvious computer and cell phone. This environment could also include the physical infrastructure such as the internet, highways, facilities, and food distribution channels.

Other Environments. The ability to delete existing or to add new environments is one of the remarkable advantages of the SPELIT analysis methodology. SPELIT can adapt to unique organizations by adding or deleting environments. These unique environments could include the educational, ethical, historical, physical, religious, temporal (schedule), and security environments (Schmieder-Ramirez & Mallette, 2007). Any of these environments could be very important in specific organizational analysis. There are variations of the SPELIT analysis methodology that use parts of the original earlier SPEL and SPELT models or expand to other environments. These variants include acronyms such as PEST, SLEPT, STEEPLE, PESTLE, PESTELEM, and POST (12Manage, 2015). Furthermore, some environments can be deleted if they are not applicable.

The remainder of this article will discuss the referent power of the political environment and findings in the meta-analysis of the literature review.

Global Film Ambassadors and the Theory of Referent Power

Power "is the ability to influence others" (Lunenburg, 2013, p. 1). Alleyne (2009) argues the rise of the celebrity and the influence they possess in the media age "translates into power. Being famous creates an aura that enhances influence" (Alleyne, 2009, p. 1). Likewise, Brockington (2012) suggests an individual categorized as a global film star inherently has influence. The public personality "or celebrity conveys the meaning that his or her actions are significant and can produce change" (p. 244). The theoretical basis for the type of power film ambassadors possess surrounds the concept of referent power. Referent power is the "identification with a person who has desirable resources or personal traits....Referent power develops out of admiration of another and desire to be like that person" (Robbins & Judge, 415).

It is referent power that elucidates the type of influence the global film celebrity possesses. The global film celebrity has an international fan base that admires, respects and has positive perceptions toward the star. As a result of the positive perceptions fans have toward the movie star, the movie star has a great amount of personal power or influence over these admirers. Partzsch (2014) contends that the media legitimizes the movie star's role in the political process, which heightens political perceptions of the celebrity as well as the public's reverence for the star. The images put the film star's on a pedestal. The film star is portrayed as acting "in favor of the common good, as representatives empowered by a certain number of people to act and as political actors raising important issues" (Partzsch, 2014, p. 1). Thus, the film ambassador, although untrained in diplomacy, possesses a personal power through reverence from both the political elite and their fans.

Through charisma and referent power, the movie star has effectively altered the script of diplomatic leadership. Moreover, Cooper contends "…the best celebrity diplomats have figured out far more

successfully than their professional counterparts how a sophisticated form of public diplomacy can be operated. Direct appeals to a massive public audience are at the core of this approach" (p. 127). In response, the U.N. has established a proliferation of agencies (e.g. UNODC, UNIFEM, UNDP, UNHCR, FAO, etc.) to address global issues with film celebrities at the helm. Each agency employs a celebrity engagement office for ambassadors. For more than half a century, the U.N. has been at the forefront, recognizing that global stars with their charisma and referent power have the ability to reach people and grab attention without gatekeepers. Barry (2014) points out that movie stars influence "not only what we buy, but our body image, our career aspirations and even our politics" (p. 251).

The results of meta-analysis yielded several implications. First, the celebrity film ambassador possesses the requisite characteristics that influence the behavior of the masses toward a desired outcome, which is a hallmark of leadership. Second, the global movie star possesses superior communication skills, tends to have magnetic traits that quality as charismatic leadership. Third, the movie star diplomat possesses referent power over millions of adoring fans.

But are global movie star ambassadors effective? Examining celebrity effectiveness in furthering the U.N.'s sociopolitical narrative toward transformational change produced a number of implications. First, Tsaliki (2011) found "the impact of celebrity activism may be more limited and problematic than we would like to think" (p. 12). One problem involves newspaper coverage. The proliferation of media and new technologies has made the once bankable movie star diplomat almost a footnote in mass static. Even the most well-known "highest-profile figures can fail to get the causes they advocate prominently reported" (Brockington, 2011, p. 2). A second problem is dedication. It is widely agreed the global film star can bring awareness to U.N. sponsored social, environmental, or political issues. But reviews are mixed about whether celebrity efforts are sincere, for the long-term, and transformational in their efforts. Wheeler (2013) contends celebrities provide a global spotlight "for their causes, thereby transcending other agencies of social authority, to become integral in the sphere of political communication" (p. 47). Dedicated volunteer activists serving on the front lines agree with Wheeler's views to an extent. However, these same volunteer workers point to movie stars' lack of commitment and interference: "the messenger becoming more important than the message" (Stanford & Forsyth, 2011). The primary criticism from humanitarian advocates on the ground level is that movie star diplomats tend to enter a crisis with attention, press conferences, and resources then disappear. Film stars like Sean Penn, who has made nearly a half-decade long commitment to transformative change in earthquake-ravaged Haiti, are an exception. Reiss-Wilchins (2013), cautions that merely engaging high-profile film ambassadors to shine a light on issues, is not the solution to solving social and political issues. "There is no substitute for strategic and long-term organizational planning" (p. 1).

A third problem is the lack of political sophistication the movie star ambassadors have surrounding issues. Film celebrities can be simplistic in their views, proffering moralistic-oriented solutions to complex problems (Brockington, 2009). One must also consider the wealthy celebrity's out of touch values and social insensitivity. For instance, Sophia Loren caused public outcry when she appeared at a UNHCR ceremony for starving Somali refugees in a Rolls Royce (Naughton, 1992). Wheeler (2011) noted that "concerns have been raised that Goodwill Ambassadors have trivialised [sic] the UN's [sic] mission" (Wheeler, 2011, p. 7). However, our meta-analysis of the literature review indicates that the U.N.'s policies and procedure guidelines adopted more than half a decade ago have helped narrow the field of potential ambassadors, thus eliminating many of the issues Wheeler and Naughton found.

A fourth issue the U.N. faces in the use of global celebrities involves the fragility of fame. The global film celebrity's power generates from his or her success in movies. If the star's movies begin to fail or the star falls out of favor with the public, then so does the star's referent power and ability to aid the U.N.'s objectives.

The authors' findings also indicate a mutually beneficial synergy that exists between the global movie diplomat and the U.N. that isn't entirely altruistic on either side. On the one hand, selection to an ambassadorship by the Secretary-General strengthens the celebrity's sociopolitical status, public profile, and image. In turn, the movie star solidifies the agency's platforms through global awareness, fundraising, and action for their causes. But Cooper (2008) cautions that once stars get "plugged into transnational

policy making, the political elite use celebrities to boost their own credibility" (Cooper, 2008, p. 3). On the other hand, Brockington (2012) argues the Hollywood movie star uses his or her diplomatic position to increase their status to perceived serious-minded intellectual and thinker-activist:

"On one level, the proxy of the celebrity relates to his or her close proximity to the institutions of power and his or her dependence on those institutions for elevation to the public sphere. The politician arises out of the institutions of political parties, whereas the entertainer is dependent on the institutions of the culture industries" (pp. 243-244).

Furthermore, the marriage between the U.N. and movie stars is a tenuous one; a union filled with a hypocrisy Kapoor (2013) argues that is detrimental to the very democracy and freedom it touts. In his research on global celebrity activism, Kapoor contends that the very existence of famous diplomats is dangerous because it "legitimates, and indeed promotes, neoliberal capitalism and global inequality" (p. 16). Kapoor also cautions that the union of politicians and global celebrities on behalf of worldwide issues such as poverty, clean drinking water, disease, etc., was never a movement of benevolence:

"...it is most often self-serving, helping to promote institutional aggrandizement and the celebrity 'brand'; it advances consumerism and corporate capitalism, and rationalizes the very global inequality it seeks to redress; it is fundamentally depoliticizing, despite its pretensions to 'activism;' and it constitutes to a 'post democratic' political landscape, which appears outwardly open and consensual, but is in fact managed by unaccountable elites" (p. 16).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this analysis demonstrates that the movie star celebrity does possess charismatic leadership and referent power. Thus, the global film star is a credible emissary in the role of U.N. Goodwill Ambassador that induces perceptions of trustworthiness in the public. Our findings indicate, global stars tend to possess extroverted traits, possess superior communication skills and possess referent power over their fans. However, there is academic debate regarding the effectiveness of the celebrification of diplomacy. Future qualitative and quantitative analysis are needed to determine the tangible long term impact celebrity U.N. Goodwill Ambassadors have in influencing transformative change in the causes they undertake.

References

1. Alleyne, M. (2005). The United Nations' celebrity diplomacy. *Sais Review*. *25*(1*). Winter-Spring. 175-185. doi: 10.1353/sais.2005.0001

2. Alpion, G. (2006). Media and celebrity culture--subjectivist, structuralist and post-structuralist approaches to Mother Teresa's celebrity status. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 20*(4), 541-557. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com

3. Barron, J. (1998). Hey, like they're on a mission for the UN. *New York Times.* Retrieved from

   http://www.nytimes.com

4. Barron, L. (2009). An actress compelled to act: Angelina Jolie's Notes from My Travels as celebrity activist/travel narrative. *Postcolonial Studies*, *12*(2), 211-228. doi:10.1080/13688790902887189

5. Barry, E. (2008). Celebrity, cultural production and public life. *International Journal of Cultural Studies.* doi: 10.1177/1367877908092583

6. Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

7. Boorstin, D.J. (1992). *The Image: a guide to pseudo-events in America*. New York, NY: Vintage Books. Retrieved from www.ebrary.com

8. Bridges, W. (2003). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.

9.   Brockington, D. (2009). Getting development into the news. The role of celebrity in development. *Development@Manchester*, 3. Retrieved from http://www.danbrockington.com

10.   Brockington, D. (2009). *Celebrity and the environment: fame, wealth, and power in conservation.* London, UK: ZedBooks.

11.   Brockington, D. (2011). Analysis: Charities need to rethink celebrity. *Third Sector.* Retrieved from http://www.thirdsector.co.uk

12.   Bygrave, W., & Zacharakis, A. (2004). *The portable MBA in entrepreneurship* (3). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

13.   Chan, K., Ng, L.Y., Luk, E.K. (2013). Impact of celebrity endorsement in advertising on brand image among Chinese adolescents. *Young Consumers*, *(14)*2 pp. 167 – 179. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17473611311325564

14.   Chan, S. (2013). Jamie Foxx: Will Smith, Jay Z should be next civil rights leaders. *The Hollywood Reporter.* Retrieved from www.hollywoodreporter.com

15.   Christensen, C. M. (1997). Making strategy: Learning by doing. *Harvard Business Review, 75*(6), 141-156. Retrieved from http://www.hbr.org

16.   Cooper, A.F. (2008). *Celebrity Diplomacy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, pp. 1-150.

17.   Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2005). *Organization development & change* (8th ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western.

18.   Evje, B. (2012). 3 dangers of charismatic leadership. *Inc.* Retrieved from http://www.inc.com

19.   French, J. & Raven, B.H. (1959). *The bases of social power. Studies in social power*, pp. 150-167. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

20.   Friedman, H.H., & Friedman, L. (1979). Endorse effectiveness by product type. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *19*(5), 63-71. Retrieved from http:www.journalofadvertisingresearch.com

21.   Hawgood, A. (2011). No stardom until after homework. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

22.   Holcomb, E. L. (2001). *Asking the right questions: Techniques for collaboration and school change* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

23.   Jolie, A. (2009). Angelina Jolie argues for action in Darfur. *Newsweek.* Retrieved from

      http://www.newsweek.com

24.   Kamins, M.A., Brand, M.J., Hoeke, S.A., & Moe, J.C. (1989). Two-sided versus one-sided celebrity endorsements: The impact on advertising effectiveness and credibility. *Journal of Advertising*, 18(2), 4_10.

25.   Kapoor, I. (2013). *Celebrity humanitarianism. The ideology of global charity* New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 1-148.

26.   Kaufman, J. (2000). *Mega planning: Practical tools for organizational success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

27.   Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change.* New York, NY: Harvard Business Review Press.

28.   Macionis, J. J. (2005). *Sociology* (10th ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

29.   Lunenburg, F.C. (2012). Power and leadership: an influence process. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration. 15*(1), pp. 1-9. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforum.com

30.   Marshall, D.P. (1997). *Celebrity and power: Fame and contemporary culture.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved from: http://www.ebrary.com

31.   McCracken, G. (1989). Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement Process. *Journal of Consumer Research. 16(3*), pp. 310-321.

32.   McCutcheon, L.E., Lange, R. and Houran, J. (2002). Conceptualization and measurement of celebrity worship. *British Journal of Psychology*, *93*(1), pp. 67-87.

33.   Partzsch, L. (2014). The power of celebrities in global politics. *Celebrity Studies*.   dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 19392397.2014.955120

34.   Reiss-Wilchins, G. (2013). The right celebrity can play a vital role in producing social change. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com.

35.   Rhoden, W.C. (1992). Basketball; Hodges criticizes Jordan for his silence on issues. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

36. Schmieder-Ramirez, J., Fortson, J. L., & Madjidi, F. (2004). Assessment of intercultural sensitivity of organizational leadership doctoral students utilizing the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). *Scholar and Educator: The Journal of the Society of Educators and Scholars, 26*(1), 7-15.

37. Schmieder-Ramirez, J., & Mallette, L. A. (2007). *The SPELIT Power Matrix: Untangling the organizational environment with the SPELIT leadership tool.* North Charleston, SC: BookSurge Publishing.

38. Schmieder-Ramirez, J., & Mallette, L. (2015). New developments in analysis techniques for organizational transitions. *Education Applications & Developments*, Retrieved from http://www.insciencepress.org.

39. Siegfried, K. (2013). *How good are goodwill ambassadors.* IRIN. Retrieved from http://www.irinnews.org

40. Stanford, P. & Forsyth, J. (2011). Are celebrities a help or hindrance to charities? *The Guardian.* Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com

41. Tsaliki, L., Frangonikolopoulos, C. A., & Huliaras, A. (2011). *Transnational Celebrity Activism in Global Politics: Changing the World?* Bristol, UK: Intellect. 12Manage (2015, February 3). *What is PEST analysis? Description*. Retrieved from http://www.12manage.com

42. UNICEF (2003) *Secretary-general praises celebrity advocates as "new kind of star," shining light on hardship, injustice, in remarks at UNICEF gala.* Retrieved from http://www.unis.unvienna.org

43. U. N. (2014). *Guidelines for the Designation of Messengers of Peace and Goodwill Ambassadors.* Retrieved from http://www.un.org.ua/files/guidelines_gwa.pdf

44. U.N. (2014).

45. West, D., & Orman, J. (2002). Celebrity Politics. Princeton, NJ: Prentice Hall.

46. Wheeler, M. (2011). Celebrity diplomacy: United nations' goodwill ambassadors and messengers of peace. *Celebrity Studies. 2*(1), pp. 6-18. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu

47. Wheeler, M. (2012). Celebrity diplomacy: a source of political legitimacy in an era of late modernity? Retrieved from: http://www.idmarch.org

48. Wheeler, M. (2013). *Celebrity Politics*. Hoboken, NY: Wiley. Retrieved from: http://www.ebrary.com

49. Yoo, J., & Jin, Y. (2013). Effects of celebrity-organization congruence on audience attitudes, preferences, and credibility ratings for goodwill ambassadors. *Asian Journal of Communication, 23(*6), pp. 620-636.