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The Elaboration Likelihood Model in the New Millennium: An exploratory study

Abstract

Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), developed in 1981 by Petty and Cacioppo, explained alternative ways in which source, message and contextual variables impact attitude change. Since that time, advertising has changed fundamentally and it is important to re-examine the fit of this model in the lives of today’s consumers. Results suggest that given ad stimuli conditions as replicated from the 1983 study, attitude toward the product will not differ. One significant effect does emerge however. Among perceptions of people in the ad, an association exists with brand attitude, construed as similar to “endorser” observations or “peripheral cue” in the original study.
The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) was developed in 1981 by Petty and Cacioppo to explain the conflicting theories in persuasive communications by suggesting a number of ways in which source, message and other contextual variables impact attitude change (Petty, Kasmer, Haugtvedt and Cacioppo 1987). Prior to that, the literature in the field had been described by Fishbein and Ajzen (1981 in Petty and Wegener 1999, p.41) as “an accumulation of largely contradictory and inconsistent findings with few (if any) generalizable principles of effective communication”.

Since the almost 30 years since its inception, the ELM, a socio-psychological theory, has been widely applied to different consumer behaviour as well as evolving advertising contexts. ELM has helped explain persuasive communication in internet communication (Hershberger 2003), web site trust (Lee and Huh 2007), and the effects of consumer skepticism on online consumers (Sher and Lee 2009). Bloemer, Brijs and Kasper (2009) applied the ELM to the new disciplinary area of country of origin effects.

While the application of the ELM in research has been prolific, the empirical testing of the model is a path less travelled (Andrews and Shimp 1990). In addition, many empirical replications were conducted in the decade after its inception (Petty, Capioppo and Schuman 1983, Stiff 1985, Petty and Cacioppo 1986, Andrews and Shimp 1990). Since that time, however, advertising has changed fundamentally (Krugman 2000; Malthouse, Calder and Tomhane 2007; Schultz and Pilotta 2004) in part due to the digital revolution and its inherent impact on the way consumers use and attend to media. It seems important then as the ELM enters its third decade to examine the fit of this well-respected model of persuasive communication in the lives of today’s consumers.
This is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, ELM is a fundamental advertising theory, which has a home in all leading advertising texts and advertising programs at universities worldwide. Secondly, ELM is frequently cited by advertising researchers. Thirdly, there has been much discussion about how advertising has changed, but little reflection of this in light of some of its most fundamental theory. Finally, this research is important as the first of three global studies to be completed. The subsequent two are currently being conducted in the US and the UK, by leading marketing communication researchers. This study provides some initial insight, or perhaps a sneak preview, into this important work.

**Overview of the ELM**

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) was developed across a number of experimental studies by Richard Petty and John Cacioppo (1981, 1983, 1986). It developed from the authors’ work on persuasion theory and attempted to describe two paths to persuasion and attitude change (Petty, Kasmer, Haugtvedt and Cacioppo 1987). The central path requires a great deal of elaboration on the information and arguments presented. The alternative peripheral path uses simple associations, inferences and heuristics to trigger attitude change. These attitudes are less persistent and predictive of behaviour than those formed by the central route (Petty et al. 1987).

ELM theory introduces a finite number of ways in which any internal or external variable can impact judgement. It specifies when variables take on these roles and outlines the resulting consequences. Variables may act as persuasive arguments, which introduce information central to the issue or peripheral cues to encourage attitude change without a true consideration of the issue. A third way that variables can impact attitude change is by effecting the extent or direction
of argument elaboration which Petty et al. (1987, p.234) describe as “the extent to which the person is motivated and/or able to evaluate the central merits of the issue-relevant information presented”. When consumers are motivated and have the ability to think about the information, then the elaboration likelihood is high and the central path to persuasion the probable outcome. When elaboration likelihood is low, then the peripheral path is generally followed.

The model is based on a number of key postulates (Petty and Wegener 1999). These formal ELM postulates were first presented by Petty and Cacioppo (1986) in order to address confusion and misunderstandings as researchers explored and applied the model. These are shown in Table 1.

**Criticisms and Support of the ELM**

Perhaps the greatest criticism of the ELM came from Stiff (1985) who suggested that the model had a number of limitations and offered Kahneman’s (1973) Elastic Capacity Model as an alternative perspective of the persuasion process. The original authors (Petty et al. 1987) countered Stiff’s criticisms, by making three clear points. Firstly, many other variables in addition to involvement can effect elaboration and the route to persuasion. Secondly, these variables can act in multiple roles in different circumstances, for example, the number of message arguments can trigger an inference and act as a peripheral cue. And finally, ELM does not preclude multi-channel information processing.

Other criticisms of the model have included a failure to capture all possible peripheral influences and an inability to identify and control every cue. As Andrews and Shimp (1990) point out, this is problematic in all research. Another enduring problem in research design also applies to this
research design. The use of students as subjects. Here, it is felt that this may have inflated antecedent-ad correlation because of sample homogeneity (Andrews and Shimp 1990).

There has also been empirical support for the model and further experimentation of the role of central and peripheral antecedents as a determinant of attitude towards the advertisement. In 1983, Lutz, MacKenzie and Belch demonstrated a dual mediation explanation, with both a direct path and an indirect causal link produced by peripheral processing. Other research has also identified central and peripheral antecedents in attitude towards the ad and demonstrated this dual mediation model (Homer 1990). Dual mediation model (DMM) is grounded in the advertising effects literature (Homer 1990) and is grounded in the construct of elaboration likelihood (Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann 1983).

Andrews (1985 in Andrew and Shimp 1990) tested the ELM and reported that significantly greater total thoughts, as well as greater favourable message-oriented thought and attitude change were generated for high, as opposed to low, involvement participants. He also found that significantly greater communicator-oriented minus message-oriented thoughts were created under low involvement conditions.

Andrews and Shimp (1990) reported support for ELM predictions in terms of cognitive response activity and central and peripheral paths to attitude change. The central path was influenced by message cognitions, while the peripheral was influenced by both message cognitions and source perceptions. Significantly greater attitude change occurred when high involvement subjects were exposed to strong message arguments. Low involvement subjects changed attitude most when exposed to favourable sources and also when exposed to strong message arguments. This shows that even low involvement subjects processed the message to some degree.
In 1995, Lord, Lee and Sauer provided evidence of a “combined influence hypothesis” where both central message arguments and peripheral cues exerted a consistent influence in the formation of attitude towards the ad. This was demonstrated across different levels of motivation and opportunity to process. They concluded with some important comments, “In a departure from the highly involving types of tasks employed in earlier studies, this study obtained this ‘combined influence’ in natural processing sets where attention was focused primarily on surrounding program content rather than on the ads themselves” (Lord et al. 1995, p. 83). At the formation stage, attitude towards the ad is directly influenced by the consumer’s response to and evaluation of the message arguments, as well as the peripheral cues in the ad or program context. At the outcome stage, attitude towards the ad exerts a consistently significant direct impact on purchase intent, and an indirect influence through attitude towards the brand.

More recently, Coulter (2005) explored the qualitative side of the ELM. He noted that the ELM operated on the quantitative principle, that attitude change is a function of the amount of information processing (high or low). However, he proposed that the quality or nature of that thinking in response to the persuasive message may also vary across the central and peripheral paths.

In summary, the ELM, as a general framework for organizing and understanding the basic processes responsible for attitude change, makes an important contribution to our understanding of how advertising works. Like any model, it has received both support and criticism, yet continues to be an enduring theory in all advertising texts and research activity. However, like any thirty year old, it is time for a checkup.
Research Question and Methodology

This literature review has demonstrated the value and contribution of the ELM to advertising theory and research in the last 30 years. This study aims to replicate the original 1983 study in order to validate its application in the new advertising environment. Specifically, this research asks the question:

*Does the ELM still explain how today’s consumers process advertising and change attitude through the central and peripheral routes to persuasion?*

The original experiment used a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design, manipulating the independent variables of message processing involvement, argument strength and source characteristics. This has been replicated as closely as possible and described in detail in the following sections.

Sample

The sample also resembled the original experiment. Petty et al (1983) used a sample of 160 male and female undergraduates in US university, who participated in order to earn credit. In this replication, we used a sample of 217 male and female undergraduates from an Australian university. They volunteered to participate and were given no credit for doing so. The subjects were randomly assigned into the test cells.

Procedure

As in the 1983 experiment, two booklets were prepared, one containing stimulus material and the other the independent variables. In the first booklet, the cover page explained the purpose as being the evaluation of magazine and newspaper ads, using the same wording as the 1983 original and containing the same involvement device. The booklet continued with 10 real ads,
some familiar and some unfamiliar to the participants. Each ad was preceded by an introductory statement. The sixth ad in the booklet was the test ad, a bogus ad for a disposable razor, the Edge. The test product in this experiment was the same one used in the original experiment, the Edge disposable razor. Students were instructed to read through booklet one at their own pace and then raise their hand. Booklet one was then removed and replaced with booklet two, which contained the questionnaire.

**Independent Variables**

*Involvement*  Involvement was measured in two places in booklet one. The first place was on the cover page, where participants were offered a free gift for participation. This gift was either a choice of disposable razor (high involvement with test ad for Edge razors) or toothpaste (low involvement). The second place where the involvement variable was tested was in the introductory copy before the test ad. High involvement subjects were told that the Edge razor would soon be test-marketed in their city. Low involvement subjects were told it would be test marketed thousands of miles away. This again is consistent with the original experiment.

*Argument quality*  The original experiment contained different treatments using weak and strong arguments. This was also part of this experimental design. However, the original arguments such as “floats in water with a minimum of rust” or “designed with the bathroom in mind” were considered not relevant to today’s target market. The arguments themselves had to be modernized. Therefore, copy points were collected from the websites of the leading disposable razor manufacturers, including Schick, Wilkinson-Sword and Bic and evaluated by an expert panel. The types of argument were matched where possible. For example, the original experiment promised, “New advanced honing method creates unsurpassed sharpness”. This was
replaced by “Unique titanium coating means the blades are lighter, stronger and sharper for longer”.

On this basis, a strong product claim ad was constructed employing the following five statements:

- Designed with the performance of a premium razor plus the convenience, hygiene and value of a disposable.
- Unique titanium coating means the blades are lighter, stronger and sharper for longer.
- Movable blades adjust to the pressure applied to help avoid nicks and cuts.
- Ergonomic shape with a ribbed rubber handle for precision in handling and control.
- In direct comparison tests, the Edge blade gave twice as many close shaves as its nearest competitor.
- Slim head with twin blades ensures a close precision shave in difficult areas, giving you the edge in comfort and smoothness.

In the weak creative claim for Edge razors, emphasis was directed toward style and moderate functionality:

- Designed by a team of experts.
- More style, less irritation.
- Available in 2 designs – the Edge and Edge Plus.
- Protective cap for the blade offers easy storage.
- In direct comparison tests, the Edge blade gave no more nicks or cuts than other razors.
- Each package contains 4 assorted shavers.
Overall, product claims sought to reflect a blend of original differences between arguments and relevance to advances in the contemporary market.

**Peripheral Cues**  Like the original experiment, this one also used famous (again sports stars) versus non-famous endorsers. In the “famous endorser conditions”, player in the champion local football team were featured. The original headline of “Professional athletes agree: Until you try the new Edge disposable razors you’ll never know what a really close shave is” was substituted by the more contemporary “Lions players have the Edge! Until you try the Edge, you’ll never know what a really close shave is”. The non-famous endorsers were unknown male and female models. The layout from the original experiment was retained and updated a little in terms of typeface and space.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables used in the original experiment were also included in this experiment, including unaided recall of product categories and brand names in that category. This was followed by a list of product categories and participants were asked to select the correct brand name. Participants were then asked to respond to some questions about a real ad in the booklet, followed by questions about the test ad for the Edge razor. These included rating purchase intention on a 4 point scale, overall impression of the product on three 9 point scales and some qualitative answers.

**Results**
Scale measures were employed to replicate dependent measures in the original study. Subjects were first asked to rate overall purchase intention along a four point scale anchored with “I definitely would not buy it” (1) to “I would definitely buy it” (4).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

ANOVA testing in each independent variable yielded no significant differences (at 0.05) upon purchase intent among any of the conditional variables: involvement, argument or endorsement.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Overall, no significant differences appear to exist among the conditions manipulated by all three (with two influences of involvement) independent variables.

Next, subjects were asked to rate their impressions about the Edge razor on three nine-point scale items:

- How good (4) to bad (-4) is your impression of the razor?
- How satisfactory (4) to unsatisfactory (-4) do you think you would find this razor?
- How favourable (4) to unfavourable (-4) do you think it would be shaving with this razor?

Among all three scale measures, no significant differences were observed among any independent variable conditions:

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE
Across all three scale measures, no significant differences among independent variable conditions were observed. In short, manipulating conditions of involvement, endorsement and argument influenced no significant differences among subjects’ attitudes toward the product.

Attitude toward the Ad. Further in the survey instrument, subjects were asked to rate the extent in which they “liked the people in the ad.” An 11-point scale was anchored with “liked very little” (1) and “liked very much” (11). No significant difference was observed in respondents’ preferences for the sporting celebrities or anonymous people. Both groups were equally ‘average’ in respondents’ ratings (mean ratings for celebrities = 5.1 and mean ratings for people = 5.2).

However, strongly significant differences were observed in purchase intent and product impression scale ratings based on subjects’ ratings of ad subject “likeability.”

A comparison of means illustrates the positive relationship between ad subject likeability and product attitudes scale measures:

In short, a strongly significant influence upon purchase intent and brand attitude was evident in subjects’ likeability ratings of both sporting celebrities and average people. The more subjects “liked” the people illustrated in the ad, the better they rated the product.

Discussion
This research sought to replicate the original ELM study (Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann 1983) and validate observations in central and peripheral processing of advertising information. Overall, the results of this study reflect different findings when compared to observations generated in the original study. Preliminary analyses of these findings suggest the given ad stimuli conditions as replicated in this study, attitude toward the product will not differ.

One significant effect does emerge however. Among perceptions of the people portrayed in the ad, an association exists with brand attitude. This could be construed as similar to the “endorser” observations in the original study, hypothesized as a “peripheral cue.” In essence, it appears ‘soft sells.’

Somewhat similar to the findings by Petty et al. (1983), the impact of ad subject “likeability” was a significant factor influencing brand attitude (as measured by purchase intent and product impression). However, it was not necessarily the presence of celebrity endorsement that stimulated a difference. The impact of this variable was not significant on purchase intent or brand attitude.

Rather, subjects’ partiality perceptions of either the sporting celebrities or average citizens were the driving factor in determining brand attitudes. The more subjects reported liking the people in the pictures, the more favorable their purchase intentions and brand attitudes were likely to be.

While many of these findings contrast observations in the original ELM study, further exploration is required.

Although the original experiment was replicated as closely as possible, one major factor could not be recreated – the advertising environment has changed dramatically in over thirty years. The
context of creative claims, advertising media, and product competition have all changed significantly when compared to the environment of the original study.

One could argue, for example, the validity of a “high involvement” condition for disposable razors. In today’s world, do consumers perceive that much difference among advertising claims of competing brands? Does the advertising elicit sufficient cognitive processing to justify interpretation of a “high involvement” condition? It may be that student subjects in today’s environment generally process all print advertising about disposable razors via low involvement.

Another somewhat related aspect is the general content and context of creative strategy. A generation or two ago, a substantial emphasis of advertising strategy focused on product claims and rational arguments. Today, frequent lack of product differentiation coupled with a cluttered media environment has accompanied growing calls for creative license. Consumers have generally been “conditioned” to interpret and appreciate creative executions which employ more lateral associations ... the growing incidence of metaphorical executions in advertising. This creative direction is often more illustrative than literal.

The strong associations observed among ad subject likeability and brand attitude measures may reflect a demonstrable trend in advertising toward visual cues and ‘soft associations’ ... in effect, “people like me.”

An implication of this observation is a possible shift in what Petty et al. (1983) defined as differences in central and peripheral processing. Perhaps in today’s commoditized and cluttered advertising environment, peripheral processing is often a primary route of cognitive processing. Greater interpretation of information and meaning through visual association may reflect a growing trend in consumer cognitive processing of advertising.
Implications

Preliminary analyses from this update on the original ELM study sought to replicate findings observed nearly thirty years ago. While details in the experimental design were replicated as closely as possible, the advertising environment has radically changed around us. This study provides a contemporary benchmark to extend further, investigating effects better reflecting the consumer context of today.

One substantial issue involves the interpretation of involvement relative to product consideration and advertising processing. Can contemporary students be manipulated to invoke relatively high involvement processing of a disposable razor? Perhaps product category consideration should include alternative products like energy drinks, mobile phones or iPods™.

Another issue relates to media environment context. Exactly how relevant are magazine ads in today’s market? General magazine readership rates continue to decline in many Western markets, especially among our subject student demographic. Two aspects arise: creative execution and media context.

In the present study, test ad executions were created to mimic original ads. In contrast to contemporary executions, however, the format could be considered somewhat out of date and out of context. Further research should explore alternative executions of contemporary creative. Given general trends in abstract creative association, greater distinctions between “strong and weak” arguments could be achieved in execution.

Media context is also a relevant issue in today’s environment. Magazine readership is increasingly, by default, a comparatively passive medium. The rapid growth in new and social media options has generally raised the bar for advertising effectiveness. Additional research
should consider a more dynamic, online media context as the environment for advertising stimuli.

In sum, the present study sought to replicate an historic study in a contemporary setting. The results differed. If the advertising stimuli was similar, is it consumers that differ?
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Table 1
Postulates of the Elaboration Likelihood Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulates of ELM</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 1: The Correctness Postulate</td>
<td>People are motivated to hold correct attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 2: The Elaboration Continuum Postulate</td>
<td>Although people want to hold correct attitudes, the amount and nature of issue relevant elaboration in which they are willing or able to engage to evaluate a message vary with individual and situational factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 3: The Multiple-Roles Postulate</td>
<td>Variables can effect the amount and direction of attitude change by (a) serving as persuasive arguments (b) serving as peripheral cues and/or (c) effecting the extent or direction of issue and argument elaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 4: The Objective-Processing Postulate</td>
<td>Variables effecting motivation and/or ability to process a message in a relatively objective manner can do so by either enhancing or reducing argument scrutiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 5: The Biased Processing Postulate</td>
<td>Variables effecting message processing in a relatively biased manner can produce either a positive (favourable) or negative (unfavourable) motivational and/or ability bias to the issue-relevant thoughts attempted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 6: The Tradeoff Postulate</td>
<td>As motivation and/or ability to process arguments is decreased, peripheral cues become relatively more important determinants of persuasion. Conversely, as argument scrutiny is increased, peripheral cues become relatively less important determinants of persuasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate 7: The Attitude Strength Postulate</td>
<td>Attitude changes that result mostly from processing issue-relevant arguments (central route) will show greater temporal persistence, greater prediction of behaviour and greater resistance to counter-persuasion than attitude changes that result mostly from peripheral cues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Petty and Wegener 1999
Table 2
Purchase intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to buy Edge razor</td>
<td>1.704</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Significant Differences in Purchase intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood to buy Edge razor</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive: Razor or Toothpaste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.325</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch: Local or Remote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement: Celebrity or Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument: Strong or Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.646</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
Significant Differences in Independent Variables of Product Impression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good/Bad impression of Edge razor</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive: Razor or Toothpaste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch: Local or Remote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement: Celebrity or Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument: Strong or Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory expectation of Edge razor</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive: Razor or Toothpaste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch: Local or Remote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement: Celebrity or Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument: Strong or Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favourable/Unfavourable shave with Edge razor</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive: Razor or Toothpaste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch: Local or Remote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement: Celebrity or Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument: Strong or Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Significant Differences in Purchase Intent and Product Impression based on Likeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of Ad Subject Likeability</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.888</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Impression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1
Positive relationship between Ad Subject Likeability and Product Attitude