



**Physical Attractiveness of the Celebrity Endorser: A Social Adaptation Perspective**

Lynn R. Kahle; Pamela M. Homer

*The Journal of Consumer Research*, Volume 11, Issue 4 (Mar., 1985), 954-961.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0093-5301%28198503%2911%3A4%3C954%3APAOTCE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

*The Journal of Consumer Research* is published by Journal of Consumer Research Inc.. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/jcr-inc.html>.

---

*The Journal of Consumer Research*  
©1985 The University of Chicago Press

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact [jstor-info@umich.edu](mailto:jstor-info@umich.edu).

©2003 JSTOR

# Physical Attractiveness of the Celebrity Endorser: A Social Adaptation Perspective

LYNN R. KAHLE  
PAMELA M. HOMER\*

Three factors were manipulated in an advertisement for disposable razors: celebrity-source physical attractiveness, celebrity-source likability, and participant product involvement. Attitudes and purchase intentions changed due to celebrity-source attractiveness, and the results were interpreted as supporting social adaptation theory.

Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann (1983) have proposed a two-process model of response to advertising stimuli, which they refer to as the Elaboration Likelihood (EL) theory (cf. Petty and Cacioppo 1981). Under conditions of high involvement, where elaboration is likely, attitude change travels through a "central route" in which a person exercises "diligent consideration of information that s/he feels is central to the true merits of a particular attitudinal position" (p. 135). However, under conditions of low involvement, and therefore low elaboration likelihood, attitude change travels through a "peripheral route" in which various simple cues associated with the issue, object, or context exert optimal influence. Chaiken (1980) has proposed a similar theory.

Petty et al. tested their theory through a laboratory study in which they factorially manipulated involvement, celebrity status, and argument quality in simulated advertisements for "Edge disposable razors." The results were interpreted as supporting their theory that under conditions of high involvement, arguments but not celebrities influenced attitudes, whereas under conditions of low involvement, celebrities but not arguments influenced attitudes. This pattern of results was taken as evidence supporting the theory because evaluation of argument quality is a central route process. Based on unreported preliminary testing they found "that for most people, the celebrity status of

the endorsers was irrelevant to an evaluation of the true merits of a disposable razor, but that because the celebrity endorsers were liked more than the average citizens, they could still serve as a positive peripheral cue" (p. 138). Thus, the fact that students liked the celebrities more than they liked the average Californians in the study was assumed to be irrelevant or peripheral to the decision to like or buy Edge razors. On a measure of behavioral intentions the involvement  $\times$  arguments interaction emerged, but no effect was obtained for celebrity status.

## SOCIAL ADAPTATION THEORY

Social Adaptation (SA) theory (Kahle 1984; Kahle and Timmer 1983), a neo-Piagetian account of attitudes, values, and other social cognitions, implies that the adaptive significance of information will determine its impact. Information based on salience may be processed, but its influence may be based on usefulness for adaptation (cf. Lynch and Srull 1982). If at some point the perceiver decides that a particular source of information has ceased to facilitate adaptation, s/he will proceed to a new source of information.

For readers of a magazine advertisement, this point may be reached quite quickly (Runyon 1984). With low-involvement products, for example, many consumers may only glance at an advertisement for a second or two before moving to the next source of information, since the advertisement is not advancing adaptation. If this hypothesis is true, the information obtained in that second or two will be the only information to have an impact. Name of the product and the visual impression of the celebrity may be all the information conveyed: the arguments in the copy, whether strong or weak, cannot influence the con-

\* Lynn R. Kahle is Assistant Professor and Pamela M. Homer is a Doctoral Candidate, both in the Department of Marketing, College of Business Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1208. They gratefully acknowledge the generosity of the BIC Corporation for donating the disposable razors used as free gifts.

sumer. In high-involvement advertisements, on the other hand, the consumer may spend a considerable amount of time reading the copy, and the probative aspects of the verbal copy may exert more influence than the visual impression. Although some evidence supports SA theory (e.g., Kahle, Kulka, and Klingel 1980; Kahle and Timmer 1983), this precise line of reasoning has not yet been verified.

SA theory differs from the EL theory espoused by Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann because it implies that information is processed in fundamentally the same way for both high and low involvement; however, information processing ends more quickly for low involvement products. In EL theory only the positivity or augmentation of information matters for low involvement attitude change; in SA theory the type and quality of information is also important.

The matchup hypothesis of celebrity selection (Foran 1980; Hawkins, Best, and Coney 1983) fits well with SA theory. In the matchup hypothesis, the message conveyed by the image of the celebrity and the message about the product ought to converge in effective advertisements. Examples of well-matched celebrities and products include Dorothy Hamill for Short & Sassy, Joe Namath for Brut, and Karl Malden for American Express. Each of these campaigns has a good matchup between celebrity image and product image from the perspective of the target market, and each has received high effectiveness scores (Hawkins, Best, and Coney 1983). The matchup hypothesis implies that visual imagery conveys information over and above the information contained in explicit verbal arguments (Rossiter and Percy 1980).

The Petty et al. study may have unwittingly matched celebrity with product. Razors are used to enhance physical attractiveness; hence, a well-matched advertisement ought to feature someone who is physically attractive: seeing a razor advertisement with an attractive, clean shaven athlete may have conveyed information about the quality and benefits of the product to the viewer. Petty et al. picked "well-liked golf (male) and tennis (female) celebrities" (1983, p. 139). It is possible that these young, athletic people may also have been more physically attractive to Missouri college students than the "average looking people" who were "middle-aged and characterized as coming from California" (p. 139). Because Petty et al. did not assess the physical attractiveness of their sources to their subjects at that time, we cannot know how attractive each source was.

One irony of the claim that likability enhances celebrity effectiveness is that a current campaign for disposable razors features a celebrity, John McEnroe, who seems to antagonize people but who seems athletic and physically attractive. The company whose product he endorses continues to employ this possibly unlikable celebrity, although for different (but correlated) reasons than those advanced here. The company retains him

because his image implies wealth and concern for protection of self-interest, two attributes the company wants consumers to associate with the consumption of disposable razors. Our assumption here is that this celebrity gains effectiveness from his physical attractiveness; his likability is not relevant. Thus, we concur with Petty et al. that likability is peripheral to disposable razors, but we do not know whether the frequently observed correlation between likability and physical attractiveness (e.g., Horai, Naccari, and Fatoullah 1974) complicates the interpretation of the Edge razor study.

## PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS

Physical attractiveness has been an important topic of research in social science (Bersheid and Walster 1974)—including attitude change research. Most studies have shown that a physically attractive source facilitates attitude change (Baker and Gilbert 1977; Caballero and Price 1984; Chaiken 1979; Horai et al. 1974; Joseph 1982; Kulka and Kessler 1978; Mills and Aronson 1965; Mills and Harvey 1972; Petty and Cacioppo 1980). But not all research has found that physical attractiveness increases attitude change. Cooper, Darley, and Henderson (1974) conducted a dissonance study in which deviant-appearing sources were more effective sources of persuasion about income tax. Maddox and Rogers (1980) studied impression formation and attitudes toward sleep in a factorial study of expertise, presence of arguments, and source physical attractiveness. Their manipulation of presence of arguments and expertise (professor of psychology versus professor of music) influenced attitude ratings, but physical attractiveness did not.

## HYPOTHESES

In the present study we manipulated three factors—celebrity-source physical attractiveness, celebrity-source likability, and participant product involvement—and then measured attitude and purchase intention. At this point we may venture several predictions based on EL theory:

- H1:** Likability and involvement should interact such that likability influences attitudes only under low involvement.
- H2:** Attractiveness should interact with involvement. If attractiveness provides central information it should only influence attitudes under high involvement. If it is a peripheral cue, like likability, then it should only influence attitudes under low involvement (cf. Petty and Cacioppo 1980).

The prediction of SA theory and the matchup hypothesis is a main effect for attractiveness because it provides the most product-relevant information here.

## PRELIMINARY STUDY

A group of 43 students enrolled in an undergraduate course in consumer behavior used a nine-point scale (9 = high) to rate a list of celebrities on physical attractiveness, likability, and familiarity. Only names—no pictures—were utilized for this phase of the research. The overall medians for physical attractiveness, likability, and familiarity means were, respectively, 4.80, 5.24, and 6.81. Consistent with the possibility that Petty et al.'s celebrities were both attractive and likable, all male golfers and female tennis players who were above the group median on likability were also above the median on attractiveness. The attractiveness mean was 6.03 for likable female tennis stars and for likable male golfers, the attractiveness mean was 6.06. John McEnroe had a below average likability rating of 3.74 and an above average attractiveness rating of 5.64.

For our experimental advertisements we selected from among celebrities who ranked above the median in familiarity those who best fit the quadrants defined by higher versus lower likability and higher versus lower attractiveness. The attractive and likable celebrities, according to our survey respondents, were Robert Redford and Jaclyn Smith. The attractive but unlikable celebrities were Bo Derek and John Travolta. Woody Allen and Jean Stapleton were the unattractive but likable celebrities, and the unattractive and unlikable celebrities were Howard Cosell and Billy Jean King. Table 1 summarizes how the subjects ranked these celebrities who were chosen for the experimental advertisement conditions. These rankings reflect the views of the students who participated in the survey, not necessarily the views of the authors, and could easily vary from one population of respondents to another.

## METHOD

### Subjects

A total of 200 men and women, enrolled in undergraduate sections of consumer behavior, volunteered to participate in this study. Subjects sat apart from one another but participated simultaneously in groups of about 20. All experimental conditions were run simultaneously. Subjects were assigned randomly to one of two levels of these conditions: involvement, attractiveness, and likability of celebrity.

### Procedure

The procedure followed that of Petty et al. (1983) as closely as possible. Subjects read one booklet, which included the independent variables, and completed a second booklet, which included the dependent variables. The first booklet began with a page explaining that the study was concerned with the evaluation of

**TABLE 1**  
MEAN FROM PRELIMINARY STUDY FOR LIKABILITY AND ATTRACTIVENESS OF CELEBRITIES

	Attractiveness			
	Higher		Lower	
	Likability	Attractiveness	Likability	Attractiveness
Higher likability				
male	7.47	7.97	6.44	3.44
female	6.84	8.06	6.60	3.80
Lower likability				
male	4.55	5.62	2.97	2.34
female	4.87	7.44	4.91	3.62

magazine advertisements. That page also included the first part of the involvement manipulation (described below). The booklet included eleven real magazine advertisements and one bogus advertisement, which was the sixth out of the twelve in the booklet. The instructions told subjects to read through the booklet at their own pace and to raise their hands when finished. Afterward, they completed the dependent variable booklets and were debriefed. Finally, all participants received a free disposable razor.

The stimulus materials also duplicated those of Petty et al. as closely as possible: the same "Edge Disposable Razors" were described with the same weak arguments. But although the positioning statement ("Get the Edge Difference!") was identical, the headline changed, because Petty et al.'s headlines ("Professional Athletes Agree" and "Bakersfield, California Agrees") were part of their "peripheral cue" manipulations, which we manipulated differently. Our headlines proclaimed, "Celebrities Agree."

### Independent Variables

*Attractiveness and Likability.* Pictures of the celebrities picked on the basis of the preliminary study adorned each advertisement. A male and female, matched in attractiveness and likability, smiled from each version, and celebrity names always appeared beneath celebrity pictures. Pictures did not differ in how clean-shaven the faces of any models were, and no legs or bodies were depicted (although one could argue that, in some instances, the primary attributes for physical attractiveness existed some distance below the cerebrum).

*Involvement.* We manipulated involvement in two places in the booklet, following Petty et al. First, from the cover page of the booklet, participants learned that they would receive a free gift of either a disposable razor (higher involvement) or toothpaste (lower involvement). (A toothpaste advertisement did appear

in the booklet.) In addition, the page that introduced the disposable razor advertisement promised that the razor would soon be test-marketed either throughout the West, including the reader's own town (higher involvement), or on the East Coast (lower involvement).

### Dependent Measures

First, participants were asked to recall the products and brands that they had seen in the initial booklet. Then they attempted to recognize the brands they had seen from among seven brands in each product category. After answering questions about a legitimate advertisement, participants faced a series of questions about Edge razors. The wording of these questions about purchase intention, attitudes (3 questions), recall, and manipulations followed Petty et al. as closely as possible.

The intention question asked: "How likely is it that you will purchase an Edge disposable razor the next time that you need a product of this type?" There were four reply categories: not buy, might buy, probably buy, and definitely buy. The attitude question read: "Rate your overall impression of the Edge product on the 3 scales below." Three semantic differential-like scales followed, ranging from -4 (bad, unsatisfactory, unfavorable) to +4 (good, satisfactory, favorable). A constant of 5 was added to each scale before entering the data into a computer, in order to eliminate negative numbers. Participants then recalled attributes of the razors, indicated where test marketing would occur, described the anticipated free gift, and stated whether they recognized the celebrities. The manipulation check items sought information on 11-point scales judging the celebrities on attractiveness and likability and judging the arguments on persuasiveness and reason strength.

The final part of the questionnaire was a funnel-type, post-experimental questionnaire (Page and Kahle 1976) designed to assess awareness of experimental demand characteristics. No subjects were eliminated from the analyses because of responses to this questionnaire, which implies that the design was sufficiently complex and the cover sufficiently convincing.

## RESULTS

### Manipulation Checks

Two questions were used to check for effectiveness of the involvement manipulation. When asked where Edge razors would be test marketed, 67 percent of the participants correctly recalled the place in both high and low involvement conditions. When asked about a promised gift, 84 percent of the participants in the high involvement condition remembered that they would receive a free razor, and 87 percent of the low

involvement participants recalled a promise of toothpaste. (Only 5 percent recalled the opposite of what they had been promised.) These percentages are relatively comparable to the 78 percent who correctly recalled the toothpaste promise and the 92.5 percent who correctly recalled the razor promise in Petty et al.

We also checked the effectiveness of the celebrity manipulation. Overall, 90 percent of the participants claimed to recognize the celebrities, and this percentage did not vary significantly across conditions. This percentage varies by only 4 percent from what Petty et al. report. Table 2 summarizes the significant results for respondents' ratings of each dependent variable. On the attractiveness question, respondents rated the attractive ( $M = 4.65$ ) and likable ( $M = 5.93$ ) celebrities as more attractive than the unattractive ( $M = 8.21$ ) and unlikable ( $M = 6.91$ ) celebrities on an 11-point scale, where high scores indicated unattractiveness. On the likability question, respondents found the likable celebrities ( $M = 6.94$ ) and the attractive celebrities ( $M = 6.38$ ) more likable than the unliked ( $M = 4.54$ ) and unattractive celebrities ( $M = 5.13$ ) on an 11-point scale, where high scores indicated liking. In the case of both attractiveness and likability, the strongest effect was for the manipulated variable; however, the two constructs were not entirely independent, since the correlation between the two manipulation check items was  $-0.44$  (with one of the two items worded negatively), which differs from 0,  $p < 0.05$ .

### Attitudes and Purchase Intentions

We summed the three attitude questions and obtained an index with a coefficient alpha of 0.96. The ANOVA, summarized in Table 2, showed only one significant difference on this crucial measure: a main effect for attractiveness. Participants who saw an endorsement by an attractive celebrity liked the Edge product more ( $M = 14.02$ ) than participants who saw an unattractive source ( $M = 12.16$ ). The likability difference was not significant ( $M = 13.02$  vs.  $13.12$ ), but the sex  $\times$  involvement interaction revealed that in low-involvement conditions the difference between men ( $M = 11.81$ ) and women ( $M = 14.47$ ) was marginally greater than the male ( $M = 13.54$ )—female ( $M = 12.68$ ) difference among high-involvement conditions.

The item assessing behavioral intentions revealed a main effect for attractiveness and a weaker but significant effect for likability. Participants were more likely to intend to purchase after exposure to an attractive ( $M = 1.68$ ) than an unattractive ( $M = 1.38$ ) celebrity. Contrary to balance theory's prediction, people were less likely to intend to purchase an Edge after exposure to a likable ( $M = 1.41$ ) than an unlikable ( $M = 1.64$ ) celebrity. A marginal sex difference implied that

**TABLE 2**  
SIGNIFICANT RESULTS FROM ANOVA ANALYSES

Rated variable	F Value	df	Significance
<u>Results of manipulation checks</u>			
Attractiveness			
Attractiveness	101.61	1,196	$p < 0.001$
Likability	8.03	1,196	$p < 0.05$
Likability			
Attractiveness	12.98	1,197	$p < 0.05$
Likability	46.97	1,197	$p < 0.001$
Strength of reasons			
Likability	8.01	1,197	$p < 0.01$
Sex $\times$ Involvement	6.08	1,197	$p < 0.05$
<u>Results of attitudes and intentions</u>			
Attitudes			
Attractiveness	5.21	1,196	$p < 0.025$
Sex $\times$ Involvement	3.49	1,196	$p < 0.07$
Behavioral intentions			
Attractiveness	8.46	1,196	$p < 0.005$
Likability	5.14	1,196	$p < 0.05$
Sex $\times$ Involvement	3.00	1,196	$p < 0.10$
<u>Results of memory tests</u>			
Brand recall for razor			
Attractiveness	8.49	1,199	$p < 0.01$
Brand recall for toothpaste			
Attractiveness	6.34	1,199	$p < 0.05$
Product recall for razor			
Likability	5.85	1,199	$p < 0.05$
Involvement	3.38	1,199	$p < 0.07$
Product recall for toothpaste			
Involvement	9.33	1,199	$p < 0.005$
Sex $\times$ Attractiveness	5.54	1,199	$p < 0.05$
Attractiveness $\times$ Involvement	5.08	1,199	$p < 0.05$
Total number of brands recalled			
Sex	6.10	1,199	$p < 0.05$
Total number of products recalled			
Sex	4.49	1,199	$p < 0.05$
Recognition of razor brand			
Likability	7.23	1,198	$p < 0.01$
Involvement $\times$ Attractiveness	3.54	1,198	$p < 0.07$
Sex $\times$ Attractiveness	3.86	1,198	$p = 0.05$
Recognition of toothpaste brand			
Likability	4.93	1,198	$p < 0.05$
Recognition of all brands			
Sex	6.16	1,198	$p < 0.05$
Recall of razor arguments			
Attractiveness	6.14	1,196	$p < 0.05$
Likability	4.54	1,196	$p < 0.05$
Sex $\times$ Likability	4.48	1,196	$p < 0.05$
Likability $\times$ Sex $\times$ Involvement	7.93	1,196	$p < 0.01$

women ( $M = 1.64$ ) were more likely to report that they intended to buy an Edge than were men ( $M = 1.45$ ).

The correlation between intention and attitude was 0.46. Petty et al. separated this correlation between

high and low involvement groups, arguing that a significant difference supported their position. In this study the high involvement correlation was 0.51 and the low involvement correlation was 0.42. Both differ from 0,  $p < 0.001$ , but the two do not differ significantly from one another.

## Recall and Recognition

Participants listed all brands and products they had seen and later identified the brands they had seen. Following the procedure described by Petty et al. we analyzed all data with ANOVAs, as summarized in Table 2.

Brand recall for Edge was higher for participants exposed to an attractive than an unattractive celebrity, and recall of the razor product was greater with a likable than an unlikable celebrity. Highly involved subjects tended to recall the product more. Attractive celebrities were associated with greater product recall, but not at a significant level. On the Edge recognition measures, people who saw unlikable celebrities performed better. Women recognized Edge more with attractive sources, and uninvolved people recognized Edge somewhat less often when it was paired with unattractive celebrities.

For the toothpaste brand, an unattractive celebrity in the razor advertisement created less recall than for the other groups. Product recognition was far better for low than high-involvement subjects; however, two interactions were also significant for toothpaste recall. For males, the unattractive source in the razor advertisement was related to less recall of the toothpaste, and for low-involvement subjects, recall was less with an unattractive source. Low involvement here refers to the razor advertisement, which implies high involvement with the toothpaste advertisement (i.e., expectation of a toothpaste gift). Women recognized the toothpaste brand better with a likable celebrity in the razor advertisement. For all brands, in all advertisements, women ( $M = 10.50$ ) recognized more brands than men ( $M = 9.92$ ). For the total of all brands recalled, women ( $M = 6.98$ ) recalled more than men ( $M = 6.17$ ). Women ( $M = 8.44$ ) also recalled more products than men ( $M = 7.79$ ).

Ability to recall arguments from the Edge advertisement varied as a result of several influences. Participants recalled more with an attractive source ( $M = 1.89$ ) than with an unattractive source ( $M = 1.41$ ). Male participants recalled more arguments with unlikable ( $M = 1.85$ ) than likable ( $M = 1.45$ ) sources. More precisely, under conditions of high involvement, men recalled more arguments with an unlikable source ( $M = 2.48$ ) than with a likable source ( $M = 1.26$ ), whereas involved women recalled more arguments with a likable source ( $M = 2.27$ ) than with an unlikable source ( $M = 1.56$ ).

## DISCUSSION

On the crucial attitude dependent variable, only the attractiveness difference attained significance at the 0.05 level. This finding fits the matchup hypothesis and social adaptation predictions because of the source's informational value. The same effect for attractiveness was also observed on the behavioral intention measure.

This complete replication of the celebrity effect on attitudes of the Petty et al. study in the attractive celebrity condition alone implies that the earlier Edge razor study may have confounded likability and attractiveness. The manipulation of likability may also have been a manipulation of attractiveness, suggesting that the informational value of attractiveness may have traveled through the central rather than the peripheral route. If one assumes that the pictures were processed more quickly than the arguments but were less probative, one need not assume separate processes or routes to explain the results of the earlier Edge razor study. The effect of lack of involvement was to terminate processing more quickly.

Petty and Cacioppo (1980) have also studied physical attractiveness and involvement, although they manipulated argument strength rather than likability as the third factor. They, too, found a main effect for attractiveness and no attractiveness  $\times$  involvement interaction. They had hypothesized that attractiveness was a peripheral cue for shampoo, the topic of their study, but they concluded, "in retrospect, it may have been that how the models looked was viewed as a relevant persuasive argument for some subjects" (p. 78). This explanation, however, still does not account for the lack of interaction between attractiveness and involvement. In EL theory one must assume that attractiveness is both central information and a peripheral cue (Cacioppo, Petty, and Stoltenberg 1984) in order to explain the Petty and Cacioppo (1980) study or the present study, because high versus low involvement implies different processing strategies. Furthermore, one must assume that the impact of attractiveness as central information in high-involvement conditions has the same magnitude as the impact of attractiveness as a peripheral cue in low-involvement conditions. This assumption must apply to both studies, where the effectiveness of the attractiveness manipulation differed. The SA assumption that attractiveness provides information seems more parsimonious, although parsimony is not the only relevant criterion here.

Like Petty et al. we found that involvement enhances recall of product. But while they found that it also enhances recall of brand, we found that brand recall is enhanced by source attractiveness. They found no effects on argument recall, but we found a strong effect for attractiveness as well as a complex interaction of likability, involvement, and sex. We know from these studies, as well as others (e.g., Chaiken 1980),

that involvement often improves memory, but it is as yet unclear exactly how this occurs. It likewise appears that an attractive source enhances memory. This finding contradicts Kelman's (1961) view that the effect of attractiveness on attitudes is mediated by identification rather than by learning arguments; that is, that attractiveness influences persuasion because people identify with attractive sources. Overall, we share Petty et al.'s skepticism toward memory-based measures in attitude research. The results across studies are often complex and seemingly contradictory.

Physical attractiveness of a celebrity may often be central in attitude-change contexts. In the present study with weak arguments the message of physical attractiveness transcends involvement level as a contributor to attitude change. Physical attractiveness may affect attitude change at several different places in the attitude-change process. Sometimes an attractive model may lure readers into an advertisement, in effect increasing the ad's involvement by transforming it into a source of information about that adaptive topic, sexuality. To the extent that a physically attractive model exudes sensuality, he or she may also increase arousal and thus have a catalytic effect on information processing. Attribution theorists (Dienstbier 1978; Valins 1966) have long known that arousal alters information processing. Likewise, conformity or identification could foster an attractiveness effect in attitude-change research.

None of these processes, however, provides a compelling explanation for the results of this study, where the sensual aspects were downplayed and the attractiveness manipulation altered recall of arguments and brand. A more probable explanation invokes the matchup hypothesis and the SA theory that physical attractiveness is a source of information. If a stunningly attractive person claims to use a beauty product, that product may be assumed to be an element of the beauty formula. The attractiveness information is conveyed more quickly than other information, even if it is not highly probative. In an examination of the few studies where physical attractiveness failed to change attitudes, it can be seen that physical attractiveness was divorced from the topic. Certainly income tax has little to do with physical attractiveness, and physical attractiveness probably is not an important element in a communication about sleep.

One reviewer questioned the use of the term *attitude change* rather than *formation* to describe the present study and the Petty et al. study. Because presumably none of the subjects had an initial attitude toward fictitious Edge razors, this observation is accurate from a logical perspective. However, respondents will often answer attitudinal questions about fictions (Kahle 1984); hence, from an empirical perspective, change may be an adequate term. We assume that all subjects have had similar attitudes prior to being randomly assigned to experimental conditions; this implies that

the postexperimental differences must reflect differential changes from something. While "change" from a nonexistent or neutral attitude may be easier to obtain than change from a well-established attitude, the process of change would not differ in a manner relevant to our study. Therefore, we believe that our conclusions are valid for attitude change from a "zero point" (attitude formation) and from a "nonzero point" (attitude change).

For a variety of philosophical reasons, the present study cannot be viewed as a crucial test of SA vs. EL theories. Both theories predict an infinite number of empirical results, and this study only examined one of them. Both theories probably have more points of agreement than disagreement. For example, both agree that information is important for high involvement decisions. Both theories agree that sources and consequences of influence may differ in higher and lower involvement. Furthermore, at this point in the history of knowledge about attitudes, a healthy tolerance of divergent conceptualizations has merit.

## CONCLUSION

This study showed that the involvement effect previously demonstrated for advertisements of disposable razors may be quite sensitive to variation. The phenomenon disappeared in this study and was replaced with an effect for physical attractiveness. These results more closely approximate the hypotheses of social adaptation theory and the matchup hypothesis. The results also jibe with Aristotle's observation: "Beauty is a greater recommendation than any letter of introduction."

[Received August 1984. Revised November 1984.]

## REFERENCES

- Baker, Michael J. and Gilbert A. Churchill, Jr. (1977), "The Impact of Physically Attractive Models on Advertising Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (November), 538-555.
- Berscheid, Ellen and Elaine Walster (1974), "Physical Attractiveness," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. Leonard Berkowitz, Vol. 7, New York: Academic Press.
- Caballero, Marjorie J. and William M. Price (1984), "Selected Effects of Salesperson Sex and Attractiveness in Direct Mail Advertisements," *Journal of Marketing*, 48 (January), 94-100.
- Cacioppo, John T., Richard E. Petty, and Cal D. Stoltenberg (1984), *Processes of Social Influence: The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion*, Department of Psychology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, Iowa Social Psychological Inquiry.
- Chaiken, Shelly (1979), "Communicator Physical Attractiveness and Persuasion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37 (August), 1387-1397.
- (1980), "Heuristic Versus Systematic Information Processing and the Use of Source Versus Message Cues in Persuasion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (November), 752-766.
- Cooper, Joel, John M. Darley, and J. E. Henderson (1974), "On the Effectiveness of Deviant- and Conventional-appearing Communications," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29 (May), 752-757.
- Dienstbier, Richard A. (1978), "Emotion-Attribution Theory: Establishing Roots and Exploring Future Perspectives," in *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Vol. 26, ed. Richard A. Dienstbier, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Forkan, J. (1980), "Product Matchup Key to Effective Star Presentations," *Advertising Age*, 51 (October 6), 42.
- Hawkins, Del I., Roger J. Best, and Kenneth A. Coney (1983), *Consumer Behavior: Implications for Marketing Strategy*, Rev. ed., Plano, TX: Business Publications.
- Horai, JoAnn, Nicholas Naccari, and Elliot Fatoullah (1974), "The Effects of Expertise and Physical Attractiveness upon Opinion Agreement and Liking," *Sociometry*, 37 (December), 601-606.
- Joseph, W. Beney (1982), "The Credibility of Physically Attractive Communications: A Review," *Journal of Advertising*, 11 (3), 15-24.
- Kahle, Lynn R. (1984), *Attitudes and Social Adaptation: A Person-Situation Interaction Approach*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- , Richard A. Kulka, and David M. Klingel (1980), "Low Adolescent Self-Esteem Leads to Multiple Interpersonal Problems: A Test of Social Adaptation Theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (September), 496-502.
- and Susan Goff Timmer (1983), "A Theory and a Method for Studying Values," in *Social Values and Social Change: Adaptation to Life in America*, ed. Lynn R. Kahle, New York: Praeger.
- Kelman, Herbert C. (1961), "Processes of Opinion Change," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 25 (Winter), 57-78.
- Kulka, Richard A. and Joan B. Kessler (1978), "Is Justice Really Blind—The Influence of Litigant Physical Attractiveness in Juridical Judgments," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 8 (October), 366-381.
- Lynch, John G., Jr. and Thomas K. Srull (1982), "Memory and Attentional Factors in Consumer Choice: Concepts and Research Methods," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (June), 18-37.
- Maddox, James E. and Ronald W. Rogers (1980), "Effects of Source Expertness, Physical Attractiveness, and Supporting Arguments on Persuasion: A Case of Brains Over Beauty," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (August), 235-244.
- Mills, Judson and John Harvey (1972), "Opinion Change as a Function of When Information About the Communicator is Received and Whether He is Attractive or Expert," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 21 (January), 52-55.
- and Elliot Aronson (1965), "Opinion Change as a Function of the Communicator's Physical Attractiveness



- and Desire to Influence," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1 (February), 173-177.
- Page, Monte M. and Lynn R. Kahle (1976), "Demand Characteristics in the Satiation-Deprivation Effect on Attitude Conditioning," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33 (May), 553-562.
- Petty, Richard E. and John T. Cacioppo (1980), "Effects of Issue Involvement on Attitudes in an Advertising Context," in *Proceedings of the Division 23 Program*, eds. Gerald G. Gorn and Marvin E. Goldberg, Montreal, Quebec, Canada: American Psychological Association, 75-79.
- and John T. Cacioppo (1981), *Attitudes and Persuasion: Classic and Contemporary Approaches*, Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- , John T. Cacioppo, and David Schumann (1983), "Central and Peripheral Routes to Advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (September), 135-146.
- Reis, Harry T., John Nezlek, and Ladd Wheeler (1980), "Physical Attractiveness in Social Interaction," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38 (April), 604-617.
- Rossiter, John R. and L. Percy (1980), "Attitude Change Through Visual Imagery in Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 9 (2), 10-16.
- Runyon, Kenneth E. (1984), *Advertising*, 2nd ed., Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Valins, Stuart (1966), "Cognitive Effects of False Heart-Rate Feedback," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4 (October), 400-408.