Overview

Two theoretical frameworks are used in this study. First, to study the determinants of purchase intention of youngsters for FMCG products using television advertisement with created animated spokes-characters, the Cognitive Response Model is used. Second, in order to understand the influence of source related thoughts on attitudes and ultimately purchase intentions of consumers, the Source Credibility Model is used as one of the variable. The following paragraphs start with general studies, endorsement studies and then after spokes – character related studies for purchase intention. Then, the researcher delves for the major determinants of purchase intention and then with basic concepts of attitudes and how they tie into the Cognitive Response Model. Then the study examine all the cognitive responses i.e. Product / Message Thoughts, Source Oriented Thoughts and Ad – Execution Thoughts with detail categories and explain how they relate to purchase intention by attitudes and its appropriateness for the study is elucidated.

2.1 Purchase Intention

2.1.1 Definition

Purchase intention of brand defined as planned individual actions relating to the purchase of a brand (Ostrom, 1969; Bagozzi et al., 1979) and intentions are distinct from attitudes (Spears and Singh, 2004). Spears and Singh (2004) concisely defined purchase intentions as “an individual’s conscious plan to make an effort to purchase a brand”. Intentions also represent “the person’s motivation in the sense of his or her conscious plan to exert effort to carry out a behavior” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Spears & Singh, 2004). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), Lee (1990), Ajzen (1991) and Jin and Kang (2011) had done research in purchase intention. Among this, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) defined purchase intention as “A person's intention to behave in a certain way is contingent upon the attitude”.

2.1.2 General Behavioral Purchase Intention Studies

The dual mediation model proposed by MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1986) posited a direct causation from attitudes toward the ads to attitude toward brand, as well as a direct causal link between attitudes toward the ads and purchase intention. Subsequent research (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Brown & Stayman, 1992) found strong support for the “attitudes toward the ads -> attitudes toward the brand -> purchase intention” relationships. Further, Belch and Belch (2001) determined the types of responses evoke
by an advertising message and how this responses related to attitude toward ad, brand attitude and purchase intention. The researcher depicted three basic categories i.e. product / message, source and ad execution thought and how they may relate to attitudes and purchase intention. In the same line, Cracium and Madden (2002) took a look into how attitudes toward the ads influences brand attitudes and purchase intentions.

Recently, Fam (2008) founded that advertising liking has an influence on recall and purchase intention among the cohort of Generation X shopping consumer in Asia. Furthermore, emotional, interesting and informative advertisements showed positive relationship with attitude towards advertisement and attitude towards brand and positive attitude towards brand leads to purchase intention (Niazi, Ghani & Aziz, 2010). In addition to this, Yilmaz, Telci, Bodur and Iscioglu (2011) source characteristics influence purchase intention (Refer Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: General Behavioral Purchase Intention Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Author and Year</th>
<th>Key Determinants</th>
<th>Findings/ Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown and Stayman (1992); Cracium and Madden (2002); MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1986)</td>
<td>Attitude towards advertisement; Attitude towards Brand</td>
<td>Researchers found strong support for the “attitudes toward the ads -&gt; attitudes toward the brand -&gt; purchase intention” relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khairullah and Khairullah (1999)</td>
<td>One Construct: Attitude Towards Advertisement</td>
<td>Findings confirm that the more consumers like an advertisement the more likely they are to indicate an intention to purchase the advertised product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belch and Belch (2001)</td>
<td>Five Factors: Product / message thought, source thought and ad execution thought, attitude towards advertisement and attitude towards brand.</td>
<td>Researcher Depicted Three Basic Categories I.E. Product / Message, Source And Ad Execution Thought And How They May Relate To Attitudes And Purchase Intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pornpitakpa (2004)</td>
<td>One construct: Source credibility (expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness)</td>
<td>Findings suggested that credibility dimensions, namely, expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, are positively related to purchase intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niazi, Ghani and Aziz (2010)</td>
<td>Two Construct: Attitude toward advertisement and attitude toward brand</td>
<td>Emotional, interesting and informative advertisements showed positive relationship with attitude towards advertisement and attitude towards brand and positive attitude towards brand leads to purchase intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yilmaz, Telci, Bodur and Iscioglu (2011)</td>
<td>Two construct: Source characteristics (source credibility and source likeability), &amp; attitude towards advertisement</td>
<td>Attitude towards the advertising was found to be the main path through which source characteristics influence purchasing intentions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.3 Purchase Intention Studies: Endorsement

In advertising, the use of endorsement is not a new phenomenon and multiple studies have been investigated the importance of endorsements in product advertising (P Mehlulkumar, 2005). The positive and negative effects of endorsers on desire to purchase and brand attitude have received a great deal of attention in the last several decades (Kamins, 1990; Pornpitakpan, 2004). Petty and Cacioppo (1986) provided Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) and founded that endorser serves as a cue during peripheral processing. In academic literature, endorser credibility has admitted substantial attention (Bergin, 1962; Sternthal, Phillips & Dholakia, 1978; Harmon & Coney, 1982; Goldberg & Hartwick, 1990). In the same line, studies of Lafferty and Golsmith (1999) and Golsmith et al., (2000) showed direct relation between endorser credibility and purchase intention (Refer Table 2.2).
Table 2.2: Purchase Intention Studies: Endorsement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Author and Year</th>
<th>Key Determinants</th>
<th>Findings/ Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Mahony and Meenagha (1998)</td>
<td>Two construct: Perceived credibility and endorser’s expertise</td>
<td>Perceived credibility and expertise of the endorser were found greatest influence on product purchase intentions of consumer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafferty, Goldsmith and Flynn (2005)</td>
<td>Two construct: Endorser expertise and innovativeness</td>
<td>Endorser expertise and innovativeness had significant relationship with attitude- toward-the-brand, purchase intentions, and willingness- to-pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Huang and Minghua (2007)</td>
<td>Two construct: Endorser attractiveness and endorser-product match-up</td>
<td>Regardless of endorser attractiveness was high, middle, or low, the high endorser- product match-up could produce higher purchase intention than the low endorser product match-up could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi, Yeh and Tsai (2011)</td>
<td>One construct: Perceived value</td>
<td>Perceived value significantly affected to advertising endorser, advertising endorser affected to purchase intention, perceived value affected to purchase intention, where advertising endorser had no moderation effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.4 Purchase Intention Studies: Spokes - character

Endorsers are often of four categories, namely celebrities, employees, spokes – characters and customers (Stout & Moon, 1990; Stafford, 2002). Their impact on purchase intention is also different on the bases of product endorsed, media used and market targeted. Experts recommend that the animated spoke – characters are very effective endorsers for advertisement (Stewart & Furse, 1986) and considered as a star of their commercials (Bell, 1992). The content analysis of Callcott and Lee (1994) revealed that created spokes – character more appeared for products in cereal/fruit/vegetable, candy/snacks, food/ beverage, and games/toys categories were non – celebrity created spokes – character was used with majority of male which often used to target adult to present high involvement products.
Several researchers revealed that Spokes – character likeability (Stewart & Furse, 1986; Callcott & Alvey, 1991; Urde, 1994; Phillips & Callcott, 1996), Spokes character recognition (Mizerski, 1995), action and voice of spokes – character (Neeley & Schumann, 2004), spokes – character features and character trust (Garretson & Niedrich, 2004), advertising creativity (Heiser, Sierra & Torres, 2008), personality of spokes character (Jin & Sung, 2008), source’s perceived credibility (Guido & Peluso, 2009) and presence of spokes – character (Lapierre, Vaala & Linebarger 2011; Ulger, 2009) affect purchase intention of consumer (Refer Table 2.3).

Table 2.3: Purchase Intention Studies: Spokes - character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Author and Year</th>
<th>Key Determinants</th>
<th>Findings/ Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillips and Callcott (1996); Urde, (1994); Callcott and Alvey, (1991); Stewart and Furse (1986)</td>
<td>Three construct: Spokes-character likeability, Attitude towards ad and attitude towards brand</td>
<td>Factors of likable spokes-characters (i.e. personality, physical characteristics, humor and consumer experience) generate positive attitude towards ad and attitude towards brand that affect purchase behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizerski (1995)</td>
<td>Two construct: Recognition and Attitude towards product</td>
<td>Recognition of cartoon spokes – character and favorable attitude towards the product were positively associated with the young children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garretson and Niedrich (2004)</td>
<td>Four Factors: Spokes – character features (i.e. Character Expertise, Character Relevance, Character Nostalgia), and Character Trust.</td>
<td>Spokes – character trust was an important mediator of the effects of spokes – characters on brand attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiser, Sierra and Torres (2008)</td>
<td>Three Factor: Advertising Creativity (i.e. Novelty, resolution, Elaboration and Synthesis); Attitude towards Advertisement, Attitude towards Brand</td>
<td>Consumer display more positive responses for attitude for advertisement, attitude for brand and purchase intention; and also positive relationship between advertising creativity and attitude towards advertisement, Attitude towards brand and Purchase intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin and Sung (2008)</td>
<td>Two factors: Personality of spokes character i.e. Sincere / Competent Versus Exciting</td>
<td>Sincere / Competent spokes – character showed greater source credibility, positive attitude towards the brand, and higher satisfaction with the retailer and greater purchase intentions than exciting spokes – character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido and Peluso (2009)</td>
<td>Three Factors: Source’s Perceived Credibility (i.e. Attractiveness, Expertise and Trustworthiness)</td>
<td>Baby faced spokes characters stimulate purchase intention of product when is matched to the attractiveness sub – dimension of perceived credibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Belch, Belch and Purani (2010), as an outcome of the alternative evaluation stage in the buying process, the consumer may develop a purchase intention to buy a certain brand. Thus, purchase intentions are generally based on a matching of purchase motives with attributes or characteristics of brand under consideration. In addition to this, purchase intention formation involves many of the personal sub-processes including motivation, perception, attitude formation and integration (p.157). The researcher found that purchase intentions are majorly impacted by attitude formation and many of the studies had also assumed that attitude towards advertisement and attitude towards brand both have effect on consumer’s purchase intention. (e.g. Shimp & Gresham, 1985; Goldsmith et al., 2000; Shimp, 2000).

### 2.2 Attitude

Central to understanding advertising effects on the consumer is the concept of ‘attitude’. According to Mitchell and Olson (1981), attitudes are —an individual's internal evaluation of an object such as a branded product (p. 318). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) defined attitudes as —a function of one’s salient beliefs at a given point in time (p. 222), where salient beliefs are those called upon during a particular situation. Attitudes play a dominant role in the purchase decisions of consumers and also help to decide if an emerging trend will last or not (Batra, Myers & Aaker, 1996).

In a more general sense, components of attitudes that have been the focus of past research include attitude strength, certainty, complexity, and, accessibility among others (Fabrigar,
MacDonald & Wegener, 2005). The authors noted that these various attitude components are highly correlated with each other and impact persuasion differently according to the level of elaboration a person is using.

- Attitude strength is possibly the most well-known attitude characteristic, and is considered to be comprised of many characteristics, such as persistence, ability to withstand change, and the level to which it impacts thought and behavior (Petty & Krosnick, 1995).

- Attitude certainty is a measure of how sure an individual is that his or her attitude is correct (Gross, Holtz & Miller, 1995) and previous studies have demonstrated that higher attitude certainty leads to stronger attitudes, which in turn are more enduring, are more indicative of eventual behavior, and are more resistant to change when challenged (Petty & Krosnick, 1995), all of which are attributes helpful to marketers and advertisers.

- Attitude complexity is a term describing that an attitude may be based on or linked to only a few or multiple perspectives (Fabrigar, MacDonald & Wegener, 2005). Higher attitude complexity tends to result in more resistance to change (Wood & Kallgren, 1988).

- Attitude accessibility refers to how quickly and easily an object’s evaluation occurs once encountered (Fazio & Williams, 1986).

Previous studies have referred attitude towards specific dimensions such as attitude towards advertiser, attitude towards advertisement and attitude towards brand (Lutz, 1985). The present study is focusing on two of them, which are, attitude towards the ad and attitude towards the brand. Attitudes toward the ad, product, or brand are a widely measured dependent variable in advertising research. Attitude toward the ad, which is the focus of the current study, is a concept which mediates the relationship between advertisement viewing and attitude toward the brand or purchase intention (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989) and attempts to measure a response valence of an individual to a specific advertisement during one precise point in time when that advertisement is being viewed (Lutz, 1985; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989). In a typical attitude toward the ad model, usually studied under experimental conditions, attitude toward the ad impacts attitude toward the brand (possibly through classical conditioning,
with a positive attitude toward the ad leaving the viewer in a positive mood state (Shimp, 1981), which then influences purchase intention (Lutz, MacKenzie & Belch, 1983).

2.2.1 Attitude towards the Ad

Attitude toward the ad has been defined as a "predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure situation" (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986, p.130). Attitude toward the ad may contain both affective reactions, e.g., ad created feelings of happiness, and evaluations, e.g., of an ad's credibility or informativeness (Baker & Lutz, 1988). This definition does not specify the components of the ad stimulus upon which attitude toward the ad is based. The contents of the ad copy (brand attribute information), the headline, the creative platform (use of humor and other appeals to support delivery of the message), and ad images or pictures presumably all contribute to forming attitude toward the ad (e.g., Edell & Staelin, 1983; Baker & Lutz, 1988). Pictures may communicate much information about the advertised brand (Dickson et al., 1986). Presumably the consumer will consider this information when forming an overall brand attitude (Tsal, 1985). Mitchell (1986) has shown that attitude toward the ad is based on the entire contents of the ad and not just the picture.

A strong managerial relevance to advertisers, coupled with the well-defined theoretical background of multi-attribute attitude models (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), has generated considerable research into attitude toward the advertisement. Research shows that attitude toward the ad is affected by brand or non-brand processing set (Madden, Allen & Twible, 1988; Hastak & Olson, 1989; Gardner, 1985; Homer, 1990), ad exposure level (Burke & Edell, 1986; Cox & Cox, 1988), message involvement (Park & Young, 1986; Muehling & Laczniak, 1988), the cognitive (Hastak & Olson, 1989) and affective responses generated during ad exposure (Burke & Edell, 1989; Batra & Ray, 1986; Machleit & Wilson, 1988), and ad message quality and content (Hastak & Olson, 1989; Burton & Lichtenstein, 1988). In turn, attitude toward the ad has been found to be related to attitude toward the brand, (Gardner, 1985; Mitchell, 1986; Muehling & Laczniak, 1988; Stayman & Aaker, 1988; Homer, 1990), advertised deal (Burton & Lichtenstein, 1988), the likelihood a brand is considered (Moore & Hutchinson, 1983), ad recall (Zinkhan & Fornell, 1989), purchase intention (Mitchell & Olson, 1981), and attitude towards the act of buying the brand (Mitchell, 1986).
Many studies also founded the direct relationship between attitude towards ad and purchase intention (MacKenzie et al., 1986; Cox & Locander, 1987; Biehal et al., 1992). In addition to this, Homer (1990) and Phelps and Hoy (1996) found out that attitude towards advertisement had significant effect on purchase intention.

The consumer, who is effectively affected by advertising, may form a positive (Aad) that may then influence his/her (PI). A direct relationship between (Aad) and (PI) for both familiar and unfamiliar brands were found in Goldsmith’s et al., (2000) studies. The relationships appear when affective responses are evoked, especially under conditions of low involvement.

2.2.2 Attitude towards the Brand

A brand’s image is the perception of the public as a whole (Margulies, 1977). The brand image goes beyond the functional characteristics of the product itself and involves symbolic features associated with the product (Gardner & Levy, 1955; Levy, 1959; Aaker, 1991). Aaker (1991) suggests that brand image is equivalent to brand associations, those items in one’s memory linked to a brand. As further discussed by Keller (1993), these brand associations are the attributes, benefits, and attitudes perceived by the consumer concerning the brand. Attributes are the features that describe and characterize the brand, while benefits are the self-identified values that the product can do for the consumer. Finally, attitudes are the overall evaluations of the brand from the consumer’s perspective. It is the attitude toward the brand that is used for this study.

By definition, Mitchell and Olson (1981) defined attitude toward the brand as the consumer’s overall evaluation of the brand (good or bad). Kirmani and Zeithaml (1993) conceptualized brand attitude as “a more complex construct than perceived quality” and defined perceived quality as “the consumer’s judgment about a product’s overall excellence or superiority”. Further, in 1996, Phelps and Hoy defined attitude toward brand as a predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular brand after the advertising stimulus has been shown to the individual.

Previous studies indicated that (Aad) and (Ab) are not considered as one variable as they are different from each other, and had been used as separated variables (e.g.,

---

9 Attitude towards the Advertisement
10 Purchase Intention
11 Attitude towards the Brand
Goldsmith et al., 2000). The difference between the two, i.e. (A_{ad}) and (A_{b}) is very clear from each one’s given definition in the literature.

As for association between (A_{b}) and (P_{i}), many studies found that (A_{b}) to have a positive and significant effect on (P_{i}) (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Shimp & Gresham, 1985; Batra & Ray, 1986; Phelps & Hoy, 1996) as well as strong relationship. When familiar and unfamiliar brands were tested, many studies found positive effect of attitude towards brand and purchase intention (e.g., Shimp & Gresham, 1985; Homer, 1990; Brown & Stayman, 1992; Homer & Yoon, 1992; Phelps & Hoy, 1996).

### 2.2.3 Attitude towards the ad, Attitude towards the brand and Purchase Intentions

Some research has been dedicated to study the relationship between attitude to an advertisement, attitude toward a brand and consumer intentions where two models have received the most attention. Attitude towards ad and attitude towards brand study assume to have effect on consumer’s purchase intention (e.g. Shimp & Gresham, 1985; Goldsmith et al., 2000; Shimp, 2000).

- First, the indirect effects model implies that attitude toward an advertisement can affect attitude to a brand and purchase intentions through various factors or mediators whether it is product attribute beliefs, emotions such as feeling of disgust, or explanations of meanings (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Mitchell, 1986; Homer, 1990; Brown & Stayman, 1992; Muchling & Laczniak, 1992; Hanson & Biehal 1995; Shimp & Stuart, 2004; Hong & Lee, 2010). Hong and Lee (2010), for instance, view construal level of subjects as a mediator in attitude to the advertising where the participants who process information at a higher abstract level found mixed emotional appeals in advertising just as persuasive as pure positive appeals. Furthermore, Craciun and Madden (2002) also took a look into how attitudes toward the ads influences brand attitudes and purchase intentions.

- Second, the direct effects model, on the other hand, suggests that both attitude to an advertisement and attitude to a brand are independent from each other and have separate influences on intentions (Gresham & Shimp, 1985; Biehal, Stephens & Curlo, 1992; Pope, et al., 2004).
MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986) compared four alternative causal models representing the theoretical links among cognitions, attitude towards the ad, brand attitudes, and purchase intentions: the affect transfer hypothesis (ATH), the dual mediation hypothesis (DMH), the independent influences hypothesis (IIH), and the reciprocal mediation hypothesis (RMH). Each model has received at least partial support in the past, which makes them candidates for further examination.

- The affect transfer hypothesis postulates a direct one-way causal flow from attitude towards the ad to attitude towards the brand, which is consistent with the peripheral route in Petty and Cacioppo's (1986) elaboration likelihood model (ELM), as well as the central route link between brand cognitions and attitude towards the brand.

- Similarly, the Aad -> Ab link of the affect transfer hypothesis is present in the dual mediation model. An indirect causal flow from attitude towards the ad to attitude towards the brand through brand cognitions also is included, the rationale being that consumers' affective reactions to ads influence their propensity to accept message content. This model implies that central and peripheral processes are intertwined (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986). Petty and Cacioppo (1986, p. 182) support the notion that "some variables have multiple effects on information processing" and that peripheral and central processing may operate simultaneously. It has been argued that attitude towards the ad is a global concept, yet the different ad elements (e.g., visual vs. verbal) may be processed differently (centrally vs. peripherally), thus implying that attitude towards the ad will influence attitude towards brand at all times (Miniard, Bhatla & Rose, 1988). Previously, Mitchell (1986, p. 18) concluded that "attitude towards the advertisement is determined by the entire advertisement, not just the affect-laden photograph."
Figure 2.1: Four Alternative Structural Specification of the Mediating Role of Aad

Affect Transfer Hypothesis

\[ C_{ad} \rightarrow A_{ad} \]
\[ C_{b} \rightarrow A_{b} \rightarrow I_{b} \]

Dual Mediation Hypothesis

\[ C_{ad} \rightarrow A_{ad} \]
\[ C_{b} \rightarrow A_{b} \rightarrow I_{b} \]

Reciprocal Mediation Hypothesis

\[ C_{ad} \leftrightarrow A_{ad} \]
\[ C_{b} \rightarrow A_{b} \rightarrow I_{b} \]

Independent Influences Hypothesis

\[ C_{ad} \rightarrow A_{ad} \]
\[ C_{b} \rightarrow A_{b} \rightarrow I_{b} \]

Key points:
- \( C_{ad} \) represents ad cognitions
- \( C_{b} \) represents brand cognitions
- \( A_{ad} \) represents attitude toward the ad
- \( A_{b} \) represents attitude toward the brand
- \( I_{b} \) represents intention to purchase the brand

- A balance theory (Heider, 1946) account of the nature of causality between attitude towards the ad and attitude towards the brand is offered by the reciprocal mediation hypothesis. Specifically, a reciprocal the relative strengths of the two paths vary across consumers and situations. For example, the feedback path may have a more dominant role when prior experience and brand attitudes are substantial.
- Finally, no causal relationship is assumed between attitude towards the ad and attitude towards the brand in the independent influences hypothesis (IIH); each is assumed to influence purchase intentions independently. This approach follows Howard's (1977) argument of two attitudinal constructs: an "evaluative element" of the brand concept and an "impersonal attitude."

Advertising and marketing researchers have directed considerable attention to attitude toward the ad as an affective construct and mediating influence on brand attitudes and purchase intentions (e.g., Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Shimp, 1981; Lutz, MacKenzie &
Belch, 1983; MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986). Thus, there can also be an indirect relationship between (Aad) and (PI) through (Ab), as will appear when the consumer develops a positive (Aad) which leads him or her to form (Ab) before starting to build a positive (PI) (Shimp & Gresham, 1985; Brown & Stayman, 1992; Yoon et al., 1998). Furthermore, Phelps and Hoy (1996) in their study found out there is a significant effect of (Aad) on (PI) for both familiar and unfamiliar brands. However, Shimp and Gresham (1985) found out that (Aad) had both the direct effect on (PI) and the indirect effect through (Ab). In addition, Homer (1990) also found out that (Aad) had an effect on (PI).

2.3 Cognitive Response Approach

The term cognition involves reasoning, evaluations, and beliefs (either positive or negative) about an attitude object (Fabrigar & Petty, 1999), or “appraisals, interpretations, schemas, attributions, and strategies” (Berkowitz, 1993, p. 12). These can be considered to be thoughts that occur when a person experiences any stimulus (Yoo & Kim, 2005). Cognitive responses are typically more deliberate, analytic, and rational than affective responses. They are less automatic than affective responses and tend to be considered a higher order process (Hoch & Loewenstein, 1991; Berkowitz, 1993; Epstein, 1993). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) proposed that attitudes were formed through cognition only, although other researchers have pointed out the importance of affect (Holbrook & Batra, 1987; Trafimow & Sheeran, 1998).

However, research in 1960s and early 1970s revealed that message recall had only a minor role to play towards attitude building. Even the response hierarchy models fail to explain the attitude formation phenomenon. According to Anthony Greenwald (1968), people actively relate information contained in advertising message to their existing feelings, beliefs and experience about the message topic and these may be positive, negative or neutral to the message. It is likely that people agree with persuasions that support their own beliefs and disagree with persuasions that are not consistent with their preconceived beliefs. These are known as cognitive responses – the thoughts that occur to consumer while reading, viewing and / or hearing advertisement. These determine the attitude a consumer depicts after seeing an advertisement (Greenwald & Albert, 1968). In addition to this, Wright (1973) suggested that consumer acceptance of advertising was mediated by the cognitive responses generated by message recipients rather than by the content of the ad itself. Cognitive responses or thoughts can be measured by asking
consumers to write down or verbally express their reactions to a message during its exposure.

The list of cognitive responses that have been studied has been too expanded. Some of the categories of responses consist of sub-classifications of various kinds of support and counter arguments (Wright, 1973). Other new categories include simple affirmations and disaffirmation (Beaber, 1975); neutral irrelevant thoughts (Cacioppo & Petty, 1979); ad – execution responses (Lutz & MacKenzie, 1982); and source bolstering and study – specific “repetition – related evaluations” (Belch & Lutz, 1982). But cognitive responses to ads include counterarguments and source derogation, which are negative responses, and support arguments and source bolstering, which are positive responses (Wright, 1973; Batra & Ray, 1986). Only a few studies, mostly in the social psychology literature, have used this conceptual and methodological orientation. In these investigations, the research emphasis has centered on the study of distraction effects (Osterhouse & Brock, 1970; Insko, Turnbull & Yandell, 1974; Petty, 1977; Petty, Wells & Brock, 1976), attitude change/persuasive impact (Cook, 1969; Wright, 1973), product versus task involvement (Krugman, 1967; Wright, 1973) repetition and media modality effects (Ray, Sawyer & Strong, 1971; Wright, 1973; Ray & Webb, 1976), source credibility (Cook, 1969) and fear arousing messages (Janis & Terwilliger, 1962). Wright (1973) has reviewed the current literature on cognitive response models. The potential of the cognitive response/thought monitoring approach to advertising research, although largely unexplored, appears strong and warrants the attention of consumer behaviorists.

According to Hovland, Janis and Kelley (1953), consumer thinks of his own opinion and also of the opinion suggested by the communicator when exposed to a persuasive message. The idea of persuasion implies that advertisers have the opportunity of influencing consumers through knowledge. Researchers have developed many variants of the cognitive response theory to understand the consumer belief and attitudes. One such model that attempts to relate cognitive responses to purchase intention by attitude towards the advertisement and attitude towards the advertised brand is given in Figure 2.2 (Belch & Belch, 2001). It depicts that three main categories of cognitive responses identified by researchers, i.e. Product / Message thoughts, source oriented thoughts and ad – execution thoughts, and explain how they relate to purchase intention by attitudes (p. 206).
2.3.1 Product / Message Thought

The first category of thought comprises those directed at the product or service and/or claim being made in the communication. Wright (1973), Batra and Ray (1986) had focused attention on two particular types of responses in product / message thoughts, i.e. counterarguments and support arguments.

2.3.1.1 Counterargument

A counterargument is activated when incoming information is compared to the existing belief system and a discrepancy or disapproval is noted. The spontaneous thought activated is assumed to neutralize or counter message evidence. For example, in response to the advertisement's claim that a new food product made from soybean derivatives oilers improved cleanliness in packaging operations, the receiver may immediately think of a disadvantage ("side effect from the derivatives") or an alternate solution to the problem cited ("tighter government controls are the best answer"). Counterargument has been cited previously as both an explanatory mediator (Festinger & Nathan, 1964) (most notably in the research on distraction effects) or as an independent variable in the work on attitude immunization (McGuide, 1964).
2.3.1.2 Support Argument

If counterargument represents one interesting mediator, it is reasonable to assume that support argument may be equally important. In relating incoming information to existing beliefs, the receiver must activate responses indicating that congruent associations have been discovered or that the message argument is supported by already entrenched belief (Kelman, 1953) or thoughts that affirm the claim made in the message. In the example above, the response generated might be “Packaging of regular food products is indeed unsanitary” or “Nader complained about slaughter conditions too.” Generation of this type of response cue would appear vital if advertising is to have a chance of acceptance. Examining the relationship between the support argument process and attitudinal acceptance may also provide a basis for clearer thinking on the meaning of “learning” as it applies to attitude modification.

As explained by Greenwald (1968), it is likely that people agree with persuasion that support their own belief and disagree with persuasions that are not consistent with their preconceived beliefs. Thus, counterarguments increase when a message makes claims inconsistent with the receiver’s beliefs. The more the counterarguments, the less the message acceptance. Contrariwise, support arguments increase chances of message acceptance (Wright, 1980). As suggested, marketer or advertiser should develop ads or other promotional messages that minimize counter-arguing and encourage support arguments.

2.3.2 Source – Oriented Thoughts

The second category of cognitive responses is directed at the source of the communication. The term ‘source’ means the spokesman or endorser involved in communicating a marketing message, either directly or indirectly (Triandis, 1971). Communication receivers can either have negative or positive thoughts relate to sources. Negative thoughts, called source derogations, can also lead to resistance in message acceptance. On the other hand, favorable reactions towards sources, called source bolsters, can increase acceptance of a message. Ohanian developed source credibility model with three dimensions i.e. Source expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness (Ohanian, 1990; 1991) and suggested that each dimensions influences the recipient’s attitude or behavior through different process.
2.3.2.1 Source Derogations
An alternate type of resistive response focuses on the source of the information. The source derogating response may serve as a substitute for counterargument and may be used quite frequently in situations where the source is easily viewed as biased (an unfortunate description of mass-media advertising). The individual may spontaneously derogate the specific spokesman or the sponsoring organization ("they never show respect for my intelligence") or advertising in general ("another brainwash job"). The impact of the source derogation process on acceptance of the ad's arguments may be as devastating as the effect of Counter-arguing, but the durability of this effect across time to another situation where product evaluation again become salient is open to question.

2.3.2.2 Source Bolster
Source bolster are favorable reaction towards sources by the recipient and can increase the acceptance of the message. This categorization is the positive counterpart of source derogation.

2.3.2.3 Source Credibility Model
‘Credibility’ refers to the extent to which the recipient sees the source as having relevant knowledge, skill, or experience and trusts the source to give unbiased, objective information. By definition, source credibility defined as, “a communicator’s positive characteristics that affect the receiver’s acceptance of a message” (Ohanian, 1990, p. 41). Hovland, Janis and Keller (1953) popularized the term “source credibility” by concluding that perceived expertise and trustworthiness were inherent in the concept of source credibility, where expertise defined as “an individual’s superior ability to solve problems in a given area” and trustworthiness was defined as “the degree of confidence that respondent has in the communicator’s intentions and ability to make valid assertion” (Hovland et al. 1953).

In the advertising literature as well, endorser perceived credibility has received considerable attention (Friedman & Friedman, 1979; Atkin & Block, 1983; Ohanian, 1990, 1991; Goldsmith, Lafferty & Newell, 2000). Some studies
concluded that trustworthiness is the most important dimension of credibility of source (Hovland & Weiss, 1951–52; Friedman & Friedman, 1979; McGinnis & Ward, 1980; Atkin & Block, 1983; Kamins et al., 1989). Other studies emphasized on expertise (Maddux & Rogers, 1980; Ohanian, 1991; Wilson & Sherrell, 1993; Chawla, Dave & Barr, 1994).

One of the most reliable effects found in communication research was that expert and/or trustworthy sources are more persuasive than sources that were less expert or trustworthy. According to Kelman (1961), information from a credible source influences beliefs, opinions, attitudes and intention through a process known as internalization, which occurs when the receiver adopts the opinion of the credible communicator since he or she believes information from this source accurate.

2.3.2.3.1 Expertise
By definition, Hovland et al. (1953) states expertise as the “extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions and refers to the knowledge, experience or skills possessed by an endorser”. In addition to this, expertise of a celebrity endorser should relate to the product he/she endorses (Till & Busler, 1998). By using the internalization process, Friedman and Friedman (1979), concluded that consumer purchase complex and expensive products which were endorsed by experts. Ohanian (1990) states that the perceived expertise of celebrity endorser is more important in explaining purchase intentions rather than their attractiveness and trustworthiness.

2.3.2.3.2 Trustworthiness
The use of the word “trustworthiness” in the literature of celebrity endorsement refers to honesty, integrity and believability of an endorser (Erdogan, 1999). Celebrity needs to be trustworthy when endorsing a product or a service (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2004). However, Ohanian (1990) states that when a celebrity is perceived more trustworthy, the message will be more effective and the receiver will be more integrated.
2.3.2.4 Source Attractiveness Model

Attractiveness was defined in terms of facial and physical attractiveness (Baker and Churchill, 1977; Patzer, 1983; Caballero & Soloman, 1984) and later was operationalized in terms of model attractiveness (Baker & Churchill, 1977; Kahle & Homer, 1985), sexiness (Steadman, 1969) or sexuality and liability (Maddux & Rogers, 1980). A research body in advertising and communication proposed that physical attractiveness as an important cue in an individual’s initial judgment of another person (Baker & Churchill, 1977; Chaiken, 1979; Joseph, 1982; Kahle & Homer, 1985).

However, the level of attractiveness can influence not only advertising evaluation and behavioral changes, but also the other components of source credibility such as expertise and trustworthiness, and liking towards the endorser (Patzer, 1983). So, according to McGuire (1985), Source attractiveness model is more related with the physical attributes, such as similarity, familiarity and likeability. Similarity is a supposed resemblance between the source and the receiver of the message; it can be measured if the source and receiver have similar needs, goals interest and lifestyle (Ohanian, 1990), while familiarity refers to the knowledge of the source through exposure. Likeability is affection for the source as a result of physical appearance, behavior or other personal traits (Belch & Belch, 2001, p.222).

According to Kelman (1961), source attractiveness leads to persuasion through a process of identification, whereby the receiver motivated to seek relationship with the source and thus adopt similar belief, attitudes, preference, and ultimately purchase intention. Marketers recognize that receivers of persuasive communications are more likely to attend and identify with people they find likable or similar to themselves. Thus, similarity and likability are the two source attractiveness characteristics marketers’ seek when choosing a communicator (Belch & Belch, 2001, p. 223).
2.3.2.4.1 Similarity
Marketers recognized that people are more likely to be influenced by a message coming from someone with whom they feel a sense of similarity (Mills & Jellison, 1969). If the communicator and receiver have similar needs, goals, interests and lifestyles, the position advocated by the source is better understood and received (Belch & Belch, 2001, p.223). In previous research, similarity in perceived attitudes had the greatest effect on attraction to a same-sex person, similarity in dress had the next greatest effect (Buckley & Roach, 1981) and similarity was also influenced by perceived age of source (Kozar & Damhorst, 2008). In this study, the characteristic has not been considered as it was included in the Ohanian’s Source Credibility Model.

2.3.2.4.2 Source Likability
Liking can be defined as a global positive response toward an object or idea that has underlying cognitive and affective components (Walker & Dubitsky, 1994). There are two reasons why advertising likability translates into advertising effectiveness: (a) when consumers like an advertisement / source they will be more likely to pay attention to it and learn its message, and (b) when consumers like an ad they may transfer those positive feelings to the brand (Walker & Dubitsky, 1994). In fact, applied studies have suggested that liking of an ad may be one of the best indicators of advertising effectiveness (Brown & Stayman, 1992). Although, Phillips and Callcott (1996) proposed four dimensions of spokes – character likability, i.e. Personality, Physical characteristics, Humor and Consumer experience.

2.3.2.5 Source Credibility
Some studies have taken all the three dimensions (Ohanian, 1990). Ohanian (1990) developed a scale to measure the credibility by using all three dimensions i.e. Source trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness. There were studies which incorporated only two dimensions (Weiner & Mowen, 1985; Friedman & Friedman, 1979; Kamins & Gupta, 1994). But the findings were contradictory. Some studies concluded that trustworthiness is the most important dimension of credibility of source (McGinnis & Ward, 1980; Atkin & Block, 1983; Kamins, 1989). Other studies emphasized on expertise (Maddux & Rogers, 1980; Ohanian,
1991) and some other studies supported attractiveness (Baker & Churchill, 1977; Kahle & Homer, 1985; Caballero et al., 1989; Silven et al., 2004). In addition to this, McGuire (1985) has defined source attractiveness in “Source Valence” model which refers to the perceived attractiveness of the source (Kahle & Homer, 1985; Ohanian, 1991; Kamins, 1990). In fact, Ohanian (1990) adapted two components from this ‘Source credibility model’ and one component from ‘Source Valence model’ and developed tri-component scale to measure source credibility i.e. Source expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. In this study, researcher had used the scale developed by Ohanian (1990) by using all three dimensions.

Abundant studies support that perceived source (i.e., spokesperson) credibility influences attitudes and behavioral intentions (e.g. Miller & Baseheart, 1969; Warren, 1969; Sternthal, Dholakia & Leavitt, 1978; Harmon & Coney, 1982; Wu & Shaffer, 1987; Moore, Hausknecht & Thamodaran, 1988). In addition, it was also founded that endorser credibility as an important antecedent to an individual’s attitude towards an advertisement and advertising effectiveness (Sternthal, Dholakia & Leavitt, 1978; Ohanian, 1990; Lafferty et al., 2002). In the same line, the study by Lafferty and Goldsmith (1999) showed that endorser credibility have an influential effect on attitude towards ad, in the context of 

\[
\text{Attitude towards Ad} \rightarrow \text{Attitude towards brand} \rightarrow \text{Purchase Intention.}
\]

Many research shows that endorsers source credibility leads to react positive towards brand (e.g., Woodside & Davenport, 1974; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Craig and McCann, 1978; Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Atkin & Block, 1983; Goldberg & Hartwick, 1990). Further, according to Elaboration likelihood Model (ELM), when consumer are more motivated to centrally process an ad, the brand relevant aspects increase and the peripheral cues decrease (Petty & Cacioppo, 1983). The direct relationship of corporate credibility and attitude towards brand was confirmed in the studies (Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999; Goldsmith et al., 2000).

Admittedly, it was demonstrated across multiple studies that likeable spokes – characters in advertisement have the ability to increase the likelihood of purchase
intention (Stewart & Furse, 1986; Callcott & Alvey, 1991; Urde, 1994; Callcott & Phillips, 1996). In addition to this, Guido and Peluso (2009) investigated that animated spokes-character stimulate purchase intention only when the advertised product is matched to the attractiveness sub-dimension of perceived credibility. Also, Lafferty and Golsmith (1999) and Goldsmith et al. (2000) showed direct relation between credibility and purchase intention.

2.3.3 Ad – Execution Thoughts
The third category of cognitive responses consists of the individual’s thought about the ad itself. Many of the thoughts receivers have when reading or viewing an ad do not concern the product and / or message claims directly. Rather, they are affective reactions representing the consumer’s feelings towards the advertisement. These thoughts may include reaction to ad execution factors such as the creativity of the ad, the quality of the visual effects, colors, and voice tones. Ad execution related thoughts can be either favorable or unfavorable. They are important because of their effect on attitudes towards the advertisement as well as brand (Belch & Belch, 2001, p. 207).

2.3.3.1 Creativity
Conceptualizations of creativity and ad creativity encompass dimensions such as artistic, usefulness, uniqueness, relevance, connectedness, meaningfulness, and divergence of thought (Smith & Yang, 2004; Ang, Lee & Leong, 2007). Plucker, Beghetto and Dow (2004) noted that creativity construct frequently contained elements of novelty and usefulness that could or did change thinking within a particular social context. Different solutions and divergent thinking, in turn, can change people’s attitudes or thinking about their environment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999).

Novel and meaningful ads that viewers could connect with, for example, elicited higher ad recall and more favorable attitude towards the ad compared to non-novel, non-meaningful, and non-connecting ads (Ang, Lee & Leong, 2007). White and Smith (2001) and Pieters, Warlop and Wedel (2002) discovered significant relationship between expertly judged creative executions and consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions. White and Smith found that consumer did not necessarily rate unexpected or surprising ads as creative. Only advertisements that
are surprising and match product expectations or solve problem were rated by consumers as creative; and this findings was confirmed with Kover, Goldberg and James (1995).

2.4 Literature Gap
In past, very few studies have tried to measure an impact of television advertisement with created animated spokes – character, on purchase intention of youngsters. So, it is needed to study the variables impacting purchase intention of youngsters with special focus on created animated spokes – characters in television advertisement for developing more effective advertising strategies for Indian market. Most literature in the past focused only on recognition of the spokes-character (e.g. Callcott & Phillips, 1994; Phillips & Gyoerick, 1999; Garretson & Niedrich, 2004), some literature focused on comparison of animated spokes – character versus human spokesperson in print advertisement (Waldt, Loggerenberg & Wehmeyer, 2009) to evaluate viewer’s assessments of ad creativity, attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention among the children (Neeley & Schumann, 2004; Heiser, Sierra & Torres, 2008) but they are silent about the variables of created animated spokes – characters in television advertisement which impact purchase intention of youngsters.

2.5 Theoretical Model
After reviewing several consumer attitude models and using them as a guide, the present theoretical model for this research was based on past literature on purchase intention and endorsement research, specifically spokes - character research. The theoretical model was created to gain a better understanding of the impact of determinants on purchase intention of youngsters for FMCG products using television advertisement with created animated spokes-characters. These variables were chosen because of their powerful attributes exhibited cognitive response model that had been used to potentially influence consumer purchases intentions through attitudes of consumers.

This model differs from previous models by the relationships between the independent and dependent variables and how created spokes – character plays a role in the purchase intentions of youngsters in FMCG advertised products. Among the four Alternative Structural Specification of the Mediating Role of (Aad) (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Homer, 1990), this model is going to considered only two types i.e. Affect Transfer
Hypothesis and Independent Influences Hypothesis for impact on purchase intention through attitudes. This model will also examine the impact of source credibility model on purchase intention through attitudes, which was scare in past studies. Thus, as shown in Figure 2.3, a theoretical model was created to show the predicted flows between the independent and dependent variables.

**Figure 2.3: Theoretical model showing the relationship between the independent and dependent variables of study**