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Abstract
Throughout the late nineteenth century, makers actively solicited testimonials from fashionable actresses for merchandise go from cosmetics and corsets to pianos and medicament. By the turn of the century, however, the utilization of testimonials as a general advertising observe had fallen into disfavour, and while they for no reason completely disappeared, celebrity testimonials were perceptibly absent from the pages of most women’s magazines for nearly a decade. For this reason, the next revitalisation of actresses’ testimonials in cosmetics advertising of the 1910s raises important questions about the utilization and desirability of actresses as endorsers, and offers new insight into the cosmetics industry’s efforts to change preconceptions about the utilization of cosmetics as a social observe. By 1910, actresses had gained an additional respectable position within society and were well known as fashion leaders, often appearing in the pages of Vogue and Harper’s Bazaar wearing their latest stage garments. For emerging cosmetic specialists such as Forrest D. Pullen and Helena Rubenstein, furthermore as for establishing beauty product makers like the Pond’s Extract Company association with modern actresses was an effective way to promote their line of merchandise and, additional important, the cosmetics business as a full.
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Testimonial Advertising in the Nineteenth Century

Historians have copied the roots of testimonial advertising to the eighteenth century. However it absolutely was in the late nineteenth century, when the craze for aggregation celebrity photographs was at its height, that testimonial advertising first attracted widespread public interest. Capitalizing upon the public’s familiarity with illustrious names and faces, advertisers paid celebrities (noted medical professional, military officers, preachers, and performing artists) to testify to the quality and good of their merchandise. During an amount of rapid urbanization when it absolutely was turning into more and more troublesome to “know” people based on case history and name, advertisers used celebrity testimonials to create a private attractiveness to shoppers and invite them to affix, through consumption, a community of acquainting faces. In 1882 A. & F. Pears Ltd. paid British artist Lily Lillie Langtry 132 pounds for the statement, “Since utilizing Pears’ Soap for the hands and complexion I actually have discarded all others.”6 on the road in the US., Langtry, the former mistress of Edward vii and considered by several to be “the world’s most beautiful girl,” captured the hearts of the American people along with her charm, talent, and intensive wardrobe. Where she appeared, crowds clamored to catch a glimpse of “the Jersey Lily,” snapping up her photographs and any other merchandise, as well as Pears’ Soap, related to her name. Pears’ investment in Lillie Langtry more than bought it. For two decades the corporate prominently displayed her statement in its newspaper, magazine, and trade card advertisements, sometimes in a shorter, altered version (“I prefer Pears’ Soap to any other”). In consequent years, Pears solicited testimonials from different illustrious beauties, as well as the American artist Mary Anderson and opera singer Adelina Patti. Following Pears’ lead, American beauty culturist Harriet Hubbard Ayer approached Lillie Langtry to endorse her lines. Recamier Preparations, providing the artist a furnished lodging in exchange for her statement. Ayer additionally enlisted the services of widespread American actresses. Vocaliser, Lillian Russell, Cora Brown Potter, and Fanny Davenport, and therefore the internationally renowned French artist Sarah Bernard, everyone who received payment in money or kind. Ads featuring the actresses’ written testimonials appeared in the New York Times throughout the Eighteen Eighties and soon prompted different cosmetics firms to wage their own testimonial campaigns. Despite the testimonial’s quality, however, it is troublesome
to gauge the success of those efforts. Whereas bourgeois ladies were getting down to experiment with cosmetics by the Eighteen Eighties and 1890s, few were willing to admit that they did, scared of being labeled “fast” or “cheap.” A lingering association between actresses and prostitutes, each professional ladies “painted” for a living, may indeed, have deterred bourgeois ladies from shopping for the wonder merchandise supported by such socially marginal ladies. For their part, actresses were more than happy to be fits advertisers’ requests to endorse their merchandise. Additionally to the financial rewards offered, testimonial advertising provided a straightforward, yet extremely effective, way to stay in the limelight. Actresses willingly traded on their facial expressions, their fame, or both, in exchange for the free publicity that came with every endorsement. By the early 1890s, actresses associated different widespread performers supported an ever-widening range of merchandise that included everything from chocolates and cigars to cleaner and medication. Adelina Patti, one of the primary stars to endorse Pears’ Soap, earned the nickname “Testimonial Patti” for her frequent advertising appearances. Throughout her career she supported corsets, pianos, tooth brush, and numerous different products; the program for her 1904 “farewell performance” in Salt Lake town, for example, includes testimonials for Crème Simon, a chilly cream, the Greek deity instrumentalist, piano maker and Sons, and Hill’s Pure spice tree Oil. Performers’ indiscriminate endorsement of something and everything ultimately undermined the value of the testimonial by raising queries in consumers’ minds about the honesty of their claims. Advertisers had no way to stop actresses from endorsing different merchandise, as well as those of their competitors, and instead of identifying their product, the testimonial merely cheapened it. By the late 1890s, a series of scandals regarding the employment of faux or “tainted” testimonials by medication firms any tainted the testimonial’s name. Though 2 major firms, Mariani wine and Sozodont, a cleaner, continued to use celebrity testimonials, testimonial advertising was for the most part discredited and actresses near disappeared from advertising for near a decade.

New Advertising Strategies

The testimonial scandal cast a fade over the advertising business, that (somewhat ironically) found itself the subject of theatrical satires and parodies. In an attempt to revive dignity to the profession and refute lingering charges of knavery, advertising agents abandoned their quackery ways of persuasion and began to reinvent themselves as skilled business people. Now not mere brokers of advertising area, agencies such as the N. W. Ayer Company and the
J. Bruno Walter Thompson Company promoted a scientific, rational approach to advertising, and worked on behalf of the major makers to remodel a various nation of consumers into a mass market. Responding to fears of overproduction and augmented competition between makers of comparable (or in some cases, identical) product, these agencies developed disapproval strategies to differentiate their clients’ product and secure customer loyalty. Funny names, catchy jingles, and cute or fascinating trade characters were a number of the primary techniques advertising agents devised to ascertain complete identity and create a positive and memorable impression with consumers. In some ways, trade characters secure to try to everything that the testimonial did without raising worrying questions about the truthfulness of their statements or its supply. As advertising agent Charles W. Hurd argued during a 1913 Printers’ Ink article, “The Campbell children, the two grape juice youngsters, Phoebe Snow, the Gold dust Twins, the Dutch Boy Painter and the host of all of them attest to the worth of the merchandise.” just like the testimonial,“they do not merely establish the merchandise however they found satisfaction with it, that should be regarded as a highly important matter. What is more, trade characters belonged to the corporation they pictured, and therefore couldn’t be accustomed promote any product other than those for which they had been created. In addition to trade characters, companies also used illustrations of attractive, smiling ladies to attractiveness to consumers. These ladies were kind of like trade characters therein they also “identified satisfaction” with the merchandise, however were intended to counsel a truer, rather than fictional, user. After 1904 trade characters and jingles gave way to the additional refined “salesmanship-on-paper” strategy, that offered rational minded consumers a listing of reasons “why” they ought to buy a product. Advertisers for common commodities such as cleansing agent and change of state gum (products that in themselves lacked any distinctive features) continued to use these illustrations of highly idealized ladies to individualize their product. By 1909, however, advertisers were starting to question the relative merits of “pretty footage.” Following the publication of Frank H. Holland’s article, “The attractiveness in Advertising,” agents usually agreed that “pretty pictures” were now used therefore often that they did not convey distinction upon the product they advertised. Even as the ever present testimonial had ceased to be effective, “pretty pictures” were failing to meet their intended purpose. “Putting ladies in advertising have always seemed as arbitrary as the perpetual tendency of a certain friend of mine to place a border of flowers around his ad,” wrote B. D. Walthouser, “I’m glad someone has the courage to go out and condemn the completely disrespectful flaunting of people on the
advertising pages.”. In 1910, William Colgate of the Gagnier agency in Toronto suggested that, in addition to their extensive use, “pretty pictures” did not attract consumers as a result they were not real. “The public is setting out to grow tired of ‘pretty picture’ illustrations,” he reasoned, “consonant with the demand for truth and human involvement in advertising copy.”

Colgate, a lucid supporter of the “truth in advertising” movement, claimed that footage of “tall, willowy, lissome creatures” alienated, rather than attracted, consumers from the product they promoted as a result of they lacked “real human interest and sincerity.” Instead, he urged advertisers to attempt for bigger realism and “truth” in their advertising copy and illustrations. For advertisers aiming to create a secure, personal appeal to consumers, photography offered one amongst the most effective, and most evident, solutions. “This methodology, should envisage, would impart a more positive impression and carry a way more convincing charisma,” Colgate resolute, noting the Stein-Bloch Company’s innovative use of “living models” in their latest covering catalogue. Four months earlier L. B. Jones, advertising manager for the Eastman Kodak Company, had conferred an identical argument in support of photography. “The very fact that the photograph covers a reputation for veracity is an assist to the honest publicist,” Jones had explained. “It helps him within the telling of a frank story; brings him in close bit with the probable client.”

Photography was without doubt nothing new to the advertising business in 1910, above all for advocates of the “reason why” approach. As Elspeth H. Brown visualizes, “The faithful reproduction of detail offered by a halftone provided the visual analogue for ‘reason-why’ copy.” Ads featuring images of everything from canned goods to carriages allowed rational-minded consumers to assess the standard of the product they desired well beforehand of buying them. By 1910, however, as a consequence of new research into client science, most advertisers had exchanged their construct of the “rational client” therewith of the “emotional consumer,” and were abandoning “reason why” copy for the “soft sell” approach. With this theoretical shift, Brown explains, “Photography’s price as the most well-liked medium of efficient rationality became a distinct liability.” Advertisers discarded photography for its realistic sterility and opted instead for fanciful, idealized illustrations to stimulate client desire and convey a singular aura upon their product. Considering the advertising industry’s general disregard for photography in 1910, why did some advertising agents still argue for photography based on its “convincing, compelling, commercialism power way beyond that of any painting?” The solution to this question is found in Stephen Fox’s observation that “Reason-why didn’t sink to suggestion [soft copy] within the explosive dramatic fashion that reason-why had brushed
off jingles and trade characters.” Instead, Fox argues, the two approaches “coexisted during a sniping stalemate.” Given “reason why’s” durability, then, it is now not dramatic to discover that some advertisers, significantly those that upheld “truth in advertising,” favored photography over illustration. Even as reason-why copy continued to serve the needs of sure advertisers, photography was well matched to specific product and campaigns. Though it couldn't nevertheless contend with illustration based on emotional attractiveness, photography might, through the use of “real” models, supply advertisers a powerful way to establish an immediate, personal reference to consumers. Whereas “pretty pictures” failing as a result of they lacked “human interest,” advertisers believed that images of real men and girls would encourage consumers to spot with both the exploiters and the product. “It is my belief that the real covers a much bigger attractiveness to an outsized majority of the general public than the work of the associate creative person, that cannot carry the same personal component, might ever have,” explained Edward A. Olds, of the Packer’s Tar Soap Company. “The effect of the use of real people, whether or not in images or other medium that keeps the human characteristics of the model, is sure to hold a certain amount of temperament to the reader.” Alan C. Reilly of the Remington typewriter Company agreed that advertisements with pictures of real people “stand out distinguished from the herd of illustrations by their own individuality.” With the advertisers’ heightened interest in “living models” and their desire to relate to consumers on an individual level, the reappearance of the testimonial was inevitable. Ironically, the very strategy rejected by the advertising business for over a decade for its inability to convey distinction upon advertising product and its failure to win consumers’ trust was now being hailed as some way to accomplish these goals. Despite the public’s continued skepticism, what made the testimonial such an effective advertising strategy was its ability to make an immediate attraction to consumers through its connection with people they might (supposedly) trust. Even as images of living models helped to change associate otherwise impersonal product, the testimonial format established intimate contact with consumers during a way that illustrations couldn't. In 1911, Printers’ Ink ran a five-part series on the testimonial within which it conferred case studies of bombing campaigns and printed important rules for advertisers interested in beginning one amongst their own. Whereas acknowledging that many distinguished ad agents continued to condemn testimonials, “lock, stock, and barrel,” the journal ended that it didn't see any reason why testimonials couldn't be accustomed establish client loyalty if advertisers chose revered and
knowledgeable sources, and took steps to ensure that their product lived up to the claims being made.

Conclusion

It is important to note that Pond’s and alternative cosmetics companies continued to use actresses in their advertising throughout the Twenties. Film actresses, specially, appeared in numerous ads throughout the decade, with some actresses testifying to totally different merchandise. In 1927, these abuses, paying homage to the testimonial craze in the Nineties, led to the introduction of legislation on the use of testimonials. Despite tighter restrictions, however, the celebrity testimonial trend continued, virtually unabated, throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty first.

Reference


