

Cognitive and Affective ratings

The slogan and relatedness towards the model in the advertisement affected neither the cognitive, $F(1,123)_{\text{Slogan}} = 1.07, p = .302, \eta_p^2 = .009$; $F(1,123)_{\text{Relatedness}} = 0.01, p = .919, \eta_p^2 < .001$; $F(1,123)_{\text{Slogan X Relatedness}} = 0.10, p = .758, \eta_p^2 < .001$, nor the affective, $F(1,123)_{\text{Slogan}} = 2.97, p = .087, \eta_p^2 = .024$; $F(1,123)_{\text{Relatedness}} < 0.01, p = .955, \eta_p^2 < .001$; $F(1,123)_{\text{Slogan X Relatedness}} < 0.01, p = .927, \eta_p^2 < .001$, scale. Means and standard deviations are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Means and standard deviations of the affective and cognitive attitude towards the ad scale from Study 1.

	Relatedness	
	Non-familiar <i>M (SD)</i>	Familiar <i>M (SD)</i>
Affective attitude towards the ad		
Empowerment slogan	4.44 (1.34)	4.41 (1.28)
Exchange slogan	4.04 (1.15)	4.04 (1.23)
Cognitive attitude towards the ad		
Empowerment slogan	3.65 (1.25)	3.70 (1.20)
Exchange slogan	3.49 (1.14)	3.40 (1.38)

The lack of effect on more specific cognitive or affective measures might indicate that the underlying process is neither clearly driven by cognitive reasoning nor affective reactions. Instead, one might argue that cognitive and affective processes might have both been responsible for the effects observed on the more general measure of attitude towards the ad.

Mood

To rule out the possibility that the effects might be driven directly by mood, we first calculated difference scores for the negative and the positive mood separately. We subtracted the ratings at t2 (after the manipulation) from the ratings at t1 (before the manipulation) of the negative affect scores. The same was done for the positive affect. A positive difference therefore indicates an increase in affect and a negative a decrease in affect. With these scores, an analysis of variance was performed separately for negative and for positive affect. Neither the change in negative mood, $F(3,123) = 0.85, p = .468, \eta_p = .020$, nor the change in positive mood, $F(3,123) = 1.59, p = .195, \eta_p = .037$, differed between the different conditions.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mood levels before and after the manipulation. As can be seen in Table A1, positive as well as negative mood was higher before seeing the advertisement compared to the second measurement after the presentation and after answering the different dependent variables, $t_{pos}(126) = 5.01, p < .001, d = 0.44$ and $t_{neg}(126) = 4.88, p < .001, d = 0.43$.

Table A1

Positive and negative mood difference scores over the four conditions

	Relatedness	
	Non-familiar M (SD)	Familiar M (SD)
	Positive affect	
Empowerment slogan	-0.18 (0.36)	-0.07 (0.24)
Exchange slogan	-0.21 (0.28)	-0.09 (0.36)
	Negative affect	
Empowerment slogan	-0.07 (0.18)	-0.11 (0.16)
Exchange slogan	-0.11 (0.24)	-0.05 (0.20)

Note. The difference scores were calculated after manipulation minus before manipulation. Negative numbers therefore indicate a decrease in affect.

Dominance

Testing for the perceived dominance of the model in Study 1 yields a significant effect of familiarity. The non-familiar version was perceived as more dominant ($M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.55$) than the familiar version ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.94$), $F(3,123) = 8.00$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .061$. No other effect was significant, $F(1,123)_{\text{Slogan}} = 3.33$, $p = .071$, $\eta_p^2 = .026$; $F(1,123)_{\text{Slogan X Relatedness}} = 0.57$, $p = .452$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$. However, controlling for perceived dominance did not result in any change of statistical significance of the reported results.