

The influence of editorial liking and editorial-induced affect on evaluations of subsequent ads: individual differences as moderators.

Journal of Advertising

| September 22, 2011 | Chang, Chingching |

Consumers do not view ads in a vacuum. In a natural advertising context, their view is cluttered with contextual media content, such as programs and editorial articles. When exposed to media content, consumers may experience affect and generate liking toward the content. Such media-induced affect, defined as emotions elicited by preceding media content, influences the effectiveness of subsequent ads and alters consumers' evaluations of both the ads and the advertised products (Aylesworth and MacKenzie 1998; Goldberg and Gorn 1987). Liking the contextual media content, which is a summative evaluation of this content, also influences consumers' evaluations of the ad and brand (Coulter 1998; Murry, Lastovicka, and Singh 1992). Media content might even elicit positive affect and liking simultaneously; in such conditions, it is not clear which one influences consumers' ad and brand judgments. This study examines the influence of contextual media content on the effectiveness of print magazine ads, using editorial articles as the exemplar of contextual media content.

Research examining the relative influence of liking of preceding media content and its induced affect is scant, with the exception of Murry, Lastovicka, and Singh (1992), who find that when they consider both program-induced affect and program liking, program liking explains significant variance in ad and brand attitudes, whereas program-induced affect does not. This paper extends their research by proposing that the relative influence of editorial-induced affect and editorial liking varies as a function of individual characteristics. That is, consumers who are more responsive to emotional stimuli are more likely to develop their ad evaluations on the basis of how they feel when they read the editorial (affect as information effects), whereas consumers who are responsive to likable stimuli are more likely to formulate ad evaluations in terms of how they like the editorial content (liking as information effects). This investigation explores two such moderating individual characteristics: affect intensity and absorption orientation.

Experiments 1 and 2 compare the relative effects of two types of editorial articles (positive but less liked versus less positive but better liked) on evaluations of subsequent ads and advertised brands. Experiment 1 tests affect intensity, which is an individual difference that reflects the intensity of a person's response to emotional stimuli (Diener et al. 1985), as a moderator. People with greater affect intensity are more responsive to emotional stimuli and therefore should generate more favorable evaluations of the subsequent ad and

advertised brand when they are exposed to positive but less liked editorial content rather than negative but better-liked content. Experiment 2 further predicts that people disposed toward absorption, which means that they tend to experience a vivid subjective reality and become absorbed in imagery when they engage with an attentional object (Tellegen and Atkinson 1974), should respond more according to how much they like the editorial content rather than to how the editorial makes them feel. That is, people high in absorption disposition should generate more favorable evaluations of the subsequent ads and advertised brands when they are exposed to less-positive but better-liked content versus positive but less liked editorial content.

Experiment 3 then manipulates both editorial-induced affect and editorial liking, and predicts that people high in affect intensity generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes when the editorial induces positive as opposed to neutral affect, regardless of the degree of editorial liking. As a clear contrast, those high in absorption should rate the ad and brand more favorably when the editorial is well liked as opposed to less liked, regardless of the degree of affect it induces.

THE INFLUENCE OF EDITORIAL-INDUCED AFFECT

Early advertising research documents that preexisting affective states influence ad and brand evaluations (Batra and Stayman 1990; Gardner and Wilhelm 1987; Isen 1984; Srull 1983). In extensions of this stream, advertising research has revealed that program- and editorial-induced affect influence ad and brand evaluations. For example, positive, as opposed to negative, programs generate more favorable ad attitudes (Martin 2003) and more favorable attitudes toward the advertised product (Lord, Burnkrant, and Unnava 2001). When a program induces positive instead of negative affect, participants rate the subsequent ad as more effective (Goldberg and Gorn 1987). Participants' cognitive responses to an ad are also more positive when the ad is embedded in a program that elicits happy emotions (Aylesworth and MacKenzie 1998; Mathur and Chattopadhyay 1991).

Different psychological processes might explain this phenomenon. For example, MacInnis and Jaworski (1989; see also Chang 2005a) propose an affect transfer mechanism to explain how ad-evoked affect influences ad and brand evaluations. This mechanism suggests that the affect triggered by ads biases evaluations of ads and the brand; the same process may apply for context-induced affect. Another potential mechanism relates to affect priming, which refers to the process by which affect renders congruent information available and biases people's evaluation of the target (Forgas 1994; Forgas, Bower, and Moylan 1990). In an ad context, Chang (2008) demonstrates an affect priming effect, such that ad-induced affect primes more positive thoughts about the product and results in biased evaluations, in congruence with the induced affect. Chang's study refers to ad-induced affect, but the same process may occur in a context in which editorials induce emotions.

Findings regarding the influence of context-induced affect on ad and brand evaluations are also consistent with the feelings as information model. Schwarz and Clore (1983) develop this model to suggest that mood, due to a preexisting state, may be mistaken for a reaction to a target stimulus and serve as an input for judgments.

Instead of integrating detailed information to reach a judgment, people base their judgments on the how-do-I-feel-about-it heuristic. To the extent that they feel happy, they generate more favorable judgments, perhaps in an unconscious process. Similar to mood, which is a preexisting affective state, context-induced affect appears to have the same effect (e.g., Gorn, Goldberg, and Basu 1993); for example, Keltner, Locke, and Audrain (1993) induce negative affect by asking participants to read a sad article. This context is similar to a magazine-reading context. Furthermore, many terms exist to refer to this effect, including how-do-I-feel-about-it (e.g., Schwarz and Clore 1988), feelings as information (e.g., Pham 1998), mood as information (e.g., Bohnert and Weinerth 2001), and affect as information (e.g., Forgas 1992). This study focuses on editorial-induced affect specifically, but not preexisting mood, and therefore uses the term affect as information.

People vary in the degree to which they use an affect as information heuristic. For example, Pham (1998) demonstrates that people with a consumption motive, as opposed to an instrumental motive, tend to rely on affect as a judgmental input. Drawing on this line of research, it seems reasonable to argue that the influence of editorial-induced affect on ad and brand judgments should be moderated by individual characteristics.

THE INFLUENCE OF PROGRAM AND EDITORIAL LIKING

Relatively less research considers the influence of program and editorial liking on ad and brand evaluations. Coulter (1998) finds that the more participants like a television program, the more favorably they rate embedded ads. Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2005) achieve similar results using a survey that asks participants to rate how they liked the ads in the most recent commercial blocks they watched. Murry, Lastovicka, and Singh (1992) also show that liking of television programs accounts for significant variance in ad attitudes, regardless of the valence of the affect evoked by those programs. In other words, as long as consumers like a program, they should evaluate subsequent ads more favorably, regardless of whether the program induces positive or negative affect.

In a real-life setting, Moorman, Neijens, and Smit (2002) explore liking of editorial content and editorial-induced affect on evaluations of an embedded ad. Their factor analyses reveal that items measuring editorial liking and editorial-induced positive affect load on the same factor, so they average participants' responses to all items. Their analysis also indicates a significant correlation between this averaged score and attitudes toward the ad, but it is impossible to discern the degree to which editorial liking itself contributes to variation in ad attitudes.

Krugman (1983) proposes a spillover effect to explain why program liking might lead to more favorable evaluations of embedded ads, which works like the functioning of the affect as information heuristic. To the degree that consumers believe they like a program, they are more likely to infer that they also like an ad embedded in that program. In other words, program liking serves as a judgment heuristic. In line with previous arguments, the influence of the editorial liking as information judgment heuristic on ad and brand evaluations should be moderated by individual characteristics.

RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF EDITORIAL LIKING AND EDITORIAL-INDUCED AFFECT: AN INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES-BASED CONTINGENCY MODEL

Whereas Coulter (1998) shows that program-induced affect enhances program liking, which leads to more favorable attitudes toward embedded ads, this study instead posits that the influence of editorial liking and editorial-induced affect may be independent--a view similar to the one Murry and colleagues adopt in their comparison of the relative influence of editorial liking and editorial-induced affect (Murry, Lastovicka, and Singh 1992). This study proposes a theoretical framework to suggest that both editorial liking and editorial-induced affect may serve as judgment heuristics, such that their relative influence varies as a function of individual characteristics. Two characteristics seem likely to influence the degree to which consumers use these judgment heuristics. Specifically, some people may react to affective stimuli, whereas others may be more responsive to stimuli that they like. The affect as information effect is more likely among those who are sensitive to emotional stimuli, whereas liking as information effects are more likely among those who are sensitive to what they like.

To test this idea, Experiments 1 and 2 manipulate two types of editorial content: more positive but less liked versus negative/less positive but better liked. On the one hand, consumers who are responsive to affective stimuli should generate more favorable responses to the subsequent ads and the advertised products when they are exposed to the former as opposed to the latter, because they would experience enhanced affect as information effects. On the other hand, consumers who are responsive to likable stimuli should generate more favorable responses to the ads and the advertised brands when they are exposed to the latter as opposed to the former, due to their enhanced liking as information effects.

Experiment 3 then manipulates four (2 x 2) types of editorial content that varies in terms of both liking and induced affect. People who are more reactive to affective stimuli should generate more favorable responses to the ad and the brand only if the editorial content induces positive affect, regardless of whether it is well liked. In contrast, those who are responsive to likable stimuli should generate more favorable responses toward the ad and brand only if the editorial content is well liked, regardless of whether it induces positive or negative affect.

To test these predictions, this study examines affect intensity as an individual difference variable that influences consumers' responsiveness to affective stimuli and explores absorption disposition as an individual difference variable that affects consumers' responsiveness to likable stimuli.

AFFECT INTENSITY ENHANCES THE EFFECTS OF EDITORIAL-INDUCED POSITIVE AFFECT

Diener and colleagues (1985) indicate that the intensity of positive and negative affect correlates positively across different settings, which suggests that an underlying personality trait may explain why some people feel emotions more intensely than others. These authors propose affect intensity to be an individual characteristic that refers to "stable individual differences in the strength with which individuals experience their emotions" (Larsen and Diener 1987, p. 2). Affect intensity correlates positively with reactivity and arousability (Larsen and

Diener 1987), such that people who are high in affect intensity experience stronger emotions and are readily reactive to emotional stimuli, whereas those low in affect intensity experience weaker emotions and are less reactive to emotional stimuli.

Furthermore, people with high and low degrees of affect intensity respond to emotional events or information differently. Those with high affect intensity respond to actual and hypothetical life events with more intense affect than do those with low affect intensity, regardless of whether those events induce positive or negative affect (Larsen, Diener, and Emmons 1986). When participants view emotion-provoking slides, those high in affect intensity are more likely to focus on the emotional components and personalize the events depicted in the slides than are those low in affect intensity (Larsen, Diener, and Cropanzano 1987).

Advertising research also documents that when ads induce positive emotion, participants with high affect intensity report significantly more favorable ad attitudes than do participants with low affect intensity (Chang 2006). When exposed to emotional advertising appeals, people high in affect intensity experience stronger emotions (Moore and Harris 1996; Moore, Harris, and Chen 1995). These results remain consistent even across different types of ad-induced emotion, such as upbeat and warm feelings (Escalas, Moore, and Britton 2004), erotic feelings, and humor (Geuens and de Pelsmacker 1999).

According to affect as information literature, those who are high in affect intensity should be more responsive to affective stimuli and thus more likely to generate affect as information effects: Their attitudes toward the ad and brand should be more favorable if the editorial content induces positive as opposed to negative affect. In contrast, those low in affect intensity should be less reactive to emotional stimuli, which means affect as information effects will not emerge among them.

H1: Participants high in affect intensity generate more favorable (a) ad attitudes and (b) brand attitudes when they are exposed to a less-liked editorial that induces positive affect as opposed to a better-liked editorial that induces negative affect. In contrast, those low in affect intensity do not generate different (a) ad attitudes and (b) brand attitudes when they are exposed to these two types of editorials.

EXPERIMENT 1

Research Design

Experiment 1 uses a 2 x 2 between-subjects design, in which the manipulated factor is editorial type: positive and less-liked editorial (hereafter, more positive editorial) versus negative and better-liked editorial (hereafter, better-liked editorial). In addition, participants are categorized as either high or low in affect intensity, based on a median split.

Participants

The participants ($n = 192$) were recruited from a university in Taiwan and paid a nominal fee (NT\$100, or approximately US\$3) for their participation. Fifty percent of the participants were men.

Stimuli Development

Magazine Articles

This experiment required two articles that fit the manipulated conditions, were original in content, and pertained to young people and their lives. Pretests indicated that two articles created to meet these criteria differed significantly in their positive affect and liking but not on other dimensions, such as comprehensibility, readability, or verisimilitude. It is important to note here that liking is not necessarily related to positive affect. The better-liked article featured a more fascinating plot and fewer cliches than the less-liked article. A similar effect is common in movies: Most blockbuster films tend to have plots that viewers find fascinating, regardless of whether they trigger happiness, sadness, or fear. The two stories appeared in a magazine layout.

Ad Stimuli

The target ad, featuring a fictitious printer product, was created specifically for this experiment by an advertising professional and was pretested to ensure that it induced neutral affect. College students, the participants in this experiment, commonly use printers and should be familiar with them. A pretest identified several important attributes, and information regarding these product attributes appeared in the ad.

Procedures

A mock magazine containing the magazine article, the stimuli ad, and a filler ad were created for each condition. The articles featured real-life stories, similar to those that appear in Readers' Digest, so the participants were told that a new magazine, called International Student Readers' Digest, would be launched in the near future and that

their opinion on whether the proposed layout of the new magazine would appeal to the target audience of college students was being solicited. Participants were then instructed to read the articles as they might at home. After they answered filler questions pertaining to how they liked the layout of the magazine, they rated their attitudes toward the ad and the product, how the article made them feel, and how much they liked the article.

Next, the experimental procedure asked participants to perform a favor for a psychology professor and fill out a lifestyle and personality survey, which would take about five minutes. All of the participants complied with this request and rated themselves on a list of scales, including the affect intensity scale and filler scales.

Independent Variables

All the scales reported in this paper are rated on seven-point Likert scales. These scales all came from English-language publications; the translation and back-translation procedure suggested by Brislin (1987) was used to develop the Chinese-language versions.

Editorial Type

The UWIST mood adjective checklist (Matthews, Jones, and Chamberlain 1990) serves to measure editorial-induced positive affect (pleased, cheerful, happy, satisfied, contented, and optimistic) and negative affect (low spirited, dissatisfied, gloomy, depressed, sad, and sorry) (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .96$). Ratings on the positive items and reversed negative items were averaged. The positive article ($M = 5.70$, $SD = .93$) generated more positive affect than the better-liked article, $M = 2.22$, $SD = .62$; $F(1,190) = 922.32, p < .01$. In addition, the better-liked article ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.43$) generated greater degrees of liking than the positive article ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.44$), as measured by the item "I liked the article," $F(1,190) = 5.34, p = .02$. Therefore, the manipulation was successful.

Affect Intensity

Participants rated themselves on Larsen's (1984) affect intensity scale, which includes items such as "when I feel happy,

it is a strong type of exuberance," "my emotions tend to be more intense than those of most people," and "my happy moods are so strong that I feel like I'm in heaven." The Cronbach's $[\alpha]$ was .81, and participants' responses were averaged. A median split then categorized the participants into high ($n = 94$) and low ($n = 98$) affect intensity groups. The two groups' average affect intensity scores differed significantly, $F(1, 190) = 392.99$, $[M.sub.high] = 5.26$, $SD = .42$, $[M.sub.Low] = 4.12$, $SD = .38$.

Dependent Variables

Participants rated their attitudes toward the ad on a five-item scale adopted from Chang (2005a). The Cronbach's reliability for the items (good, likable, favorable, pleasant, and interesting) was .89. The measure of brand attitudes used a five-item scale adopted from Chang (2005a). The Cronbach's reliability for these items (good, likable, pleasant, positive, and good quality) was .90.

Results

A significant interaction between the manipulated variable and the moderator indicates moderation effects (Baron and Kenny 1986), and an ANOVA (analysis of variance) reveals that the interaction between affect intensity and editorial type on ad attitudes is significant, $F(1,188) = 7.04, p < .01$, $[\eta^2.sub.2.sub.P] = .04$ (see Table 1). Planned simple effect tests further show that people high in affect intensity generate more favorable

ad attitudes when exposed to a positive editorial as opposed to a better-liked editorial, $F(1, 92) = 5.42, p = .02$, $[\eta^2]_{\text{sup.2.sub.P}} = .06$, $[M_{\text{sub.positive}}] = 3.99$, $SD = 1.01$, $[M_{\text{sub.liked}}] = 3.50$, $SD = 1.01$ (see Table 2), whereas those low in affect intensity do not generate different responses, $F(1, 96) = 2.14, p = .15$, $[\eta^2]_{\text{sup.2.sub.P}} = .02$, $[M_{\text{sub.positive}}] = 3.50$, $SD = 1.03$, $[M_{\text{sub.liked}}] = 3.83$, $SD = 1.16$. These results support H 1a.

The interaction between affect intensity and editorial type on brand attitudes is also significant, $F(1, 188) = 5.14, p = .03$, $[\eta^2]_{\text{sup.2.sub.P}} = .03$ (see Table 1). Planned simple effect tests further indicate that people high in affect intensity generate more favorable brand attitudes when the editorial induces positive affect than when it is better liked, $F(1, 92) = 5.90, p = .02$, $[\eta^2]_{\text{sup.2.sub.P}} = .06$, $[M_{\text{sub.positive}}] = 4.20$, $SD = .97$, $[M_{\text{sub.liked}}] = 3.68$, $SD = 1.07$ (see Table 2), whereas those low in affect intensity do not generate different brand attitudes, $F(1, 96) = .58, p = .45$, $[\eta^2]_{\text{sup.2.sub.P}} < .01$, $[M_{\text{sub.positive}}] = 3.54$, $SD = 1.07$, $[M_{\text{sub.liked}}] = 3.69$, $SD = .98$, in support of H1b.

Discussion

Experiment 1 demonstrates that when editorials induce positive affect but are less liked, as opposed to when they induce negative affect but are better liked, participants high in affect intensity generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes, but those low in affect intensity do not. Therefore, the findings suggest that the effects of affective editorial content are stronger only for those people who react to emotional stimuli. To provide further evidence in support of the proposed framework, it is important to show that people who are reactive to likable editorials generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes when they are exposed to editorial content they like, even if it induces less positive affect. Experiment 2 therefore explores disposition toward absorption as an individual difference variable.

Disposition Toward Absorption Enhances the Effects of Editorial-Induced Liking

Absorption is "a disposition for having episodes of 'total' attention that fully engage one's representational (i.e., perceptual, enactive, imaginative, and ideational) resources" (Tellegen and Atkinson 1974, p. 268). People who are more disposed toward absorption tend to experience a more vivid subjective reality when they are engaged with an attentional object (Tellegen and Atkinson 1974). When absorbed, they are also more likely to be "immersed" in activities [or] 'absorbed' in imagery" (Wild, Kuiken, and Schopflocher 1995, p. 569).

Absorption relates positively to imagery ability, imagery vividness (McConkey and Nogrady 1986), openness to experience (Glisky et al. 1991), fantasy involvement (Lynn and Rhue 1986), storytelling ability (Merckelbach 2004), and synesthesia (Rader and Tellegen 1987). People with high absorption disposition also perform better on imagery-mediated tasks (Sweeney, Lynn, and Belleza 1986).

Absorption as a state, which is an immersion experience, receives more research attention among communication scholars than does absorption as a trait, which entails an existing orientation of imaginative

involvement. For example, Saade and Bahli (2005) demonstrate that the greater the degree of absorption experienced by people using an online learning system, the more they perceive the system as useful. Banos and colleagues (1999) also show that those who are absorbed with Internet content experience greater levels of presence and a greater sense of reality. Escalas (2004) finds that when an ad induces a greater degree of absorption, it provokes more favorable ratings. Green and Brock (2000) find that narratives can engage readers and induce a sense of transportation, which they define as absorption in a story. Thus, extant communication research implies that media content can generate a sense of absorption, which prompts more positive attitudes toward the stimuli. However, Green (2006) also proposes that absorption as a trait deserves more research attention among communication scholars, and this study responds to that call by exploring absorption as a trait.

Absorption disposition as a trait represents an intrinsic orientation to exhibit greater imaginative involvement in reading materials (Tellegen and Atkinson 1974), which may include editorial content that elicits a sense of absorption among readers (Argo, Zhu, and Dahl 2008). Those

with greater absorption disposition should be more likely to become immersed in the magazine editorial. The immersion experience can vary in terms of whether they like the editorial; a likable editorial should render the immersion experience more positive, regardless of the type of affect it induces. Because those with high absorption disposition get more immersed in an editorial, they should be more sensitive or responsive to the likability of the editorial than are those with low absorption disposition. Therefore, they are more likely to rely on liking as information when they evaluate the subsequent ad and its featured product and generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes when they are exposed to a better-liked editorial that induces less positive affect, compared with a less-liked editorial that induces greater positive affect. In contrast, for those who exhibit a lower disposition toward absorption, the degree to which they like the program should be less relevant.

H2: Participants high in absorption disposition generate more favorable (a) ad attitudes and (b) brand attitudes when they are exposed to a better-liked editorial that induces less positive affect as opposed to a less-liked editorial that induces greater positive affect. In contrast, those low in absorption disposition do not generate different (a) ad attitudes and (b) brand attitudes when they are exposed to these two types of editorials.

EXPERIMENT 2

Research Design

Experiment 2 uses a 2 x 2 x 2 between-subjects design. The first factor, editorial type, consists of the more positive and less-liked editorial versus the less positive and better-liked editorial. The second factor is product type (mini stereo system versus printer), included to increase the generalizability of the findings across different product categories. No specific hypotheses are proposed for product type differences. In addition, participants are categorized as either high or low in absorption disposition, based on a median split.

Participants and Procedures

Participants ($n = 80$) were recruited from a university in Taiwan and paid for their participation. Forty-eight percent of the participants were men. The procedures are the same as those used in Experiment 1.

Stimuli Development

Magazine Articles

Two magazine articles were developed for this research to elicit the necessary levels of affect and liking. The stories surround college students and their lives. Pretests indicated that the two articles differed significantly on positive affect and liking, but not on other dimensions, such as comprehensibility, readability, or verisimilitude.

Ad Stimuli

Two target ads for products frequently used by college students, namely, a mini stereo system and a printer, were created by an advertising professional and pretested to ensure they induced neutral affect. The pretest identified important attributes, and accordingly, the ad featured information about those attributes. A mini stereo system is a hedonic product, whereas a printer provides a representative of a utilitarian product. In the main experiment, participants rated mini stereo systems and printers on two items: "I would buy this type of product for a utilitarian purpose" and "I would buy this type of product for a hedonic purpose." Responses to the former were reversed and averaged with responses to the latter item to create one continuous utilitarian-hedonic score. As expected, mini stereo systems generate higher hedonic ratings than printers, $F(1, 78) = 18.99, p = .01$, $[M.sub.printer] = 3.72$, $SD = .71$, $[M.sub.stereo] = 4.60$, $SD = 1.06$. The inclusion of these two types of products helps increase the generalizability of the findings.

Independent Variables

Editorial Type

Participants rated how the editorial made them feel, using the positive items reported in Experiment 1 (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .92$). The two editorials evoke different degrees of positive affect, $F(1, 78) = 4.41, p = .04$, $[M.sub.positive] = 5.18$, $SD = 1.10$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 4.71$, $SD = .89$. They also rated the degree to which they liked the editorial on two items: "I liked the article" and "The article was appealing" (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .88$). The two articles generate different degrees of liking, $F(1, 78) = 7.82, p = .01$, $[M.sub.positive] = 4.30$, $SD = 1.30$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 5.10$, $SD = 1.27$, which implies the manipulation was successful.

Absorption Disposition

From Tellegen's (1992) factor analysis of the 34-item Tellegen Absorption Scale, six factors emerge: "responsive to engaging stimuli," "synthesis," "enhanced cognition," "oblivious/dissociative involvement," "vivid reminiscence," and "enhanced awareness." The first factor relates most closely to the absorption construct in this study. Therefore, participants rated themselves on the seven items that constitute this factor (Cronbach's

[alpha] = .90): "I can be greatly moved by eloquent or poetic language"; "I like to watch cloud shapes change in the sky"; "I think that I really know what some people mean when they talk about mystical experiences"; "The crackle and flames of a wood fire stimulate my imagination"; "I often take delight in small things"; "When listening to organ music or other powerful music, I sometimes feel as if I am being lifted into the air"; and "I can be deeply moved by a sunset". The averaged responses to the seven items provide the median split information for the categorization of participants into high (n = 38) and low (n = 42) absorption disposition groups. The two groups' average absorption scores differ significantly, $F(1, 75) = 155.02$, $[M.sub.high] = 5.50$, $SD = .62$, $[M.sub.low] = 3.76$, $SD = .60$.

Dependent Variables

Participants rated attitudes toward the ad on a scale adopted from Chang (2005b). The Cronbach's [alpha] for these items (likable, good, pleasant, and interesting) is .86. The brand attitude measure consisted of three items: good, likable, and favorable. The Cronbach's reliability [alpha] for these items is .86.

Results

An ANOVA indicates that the interaction between absorption and editorial type on ad attitudes is significant, $F(1,72) = 5.72$, $p = .02$, $[[eta].sup.2.sub.P] = .07$. Planned simple effect tests further show that people high in absorption generate more favorable ad attitudes when exposed to the better-liked editorial than when exposed to the positive editorial, $F(1, 34) = 5.06$, $p = .03$, $[[eta].sup.2.sub.P] = .13$, $[M.sub.positive] = 4.37$, $SD = 1.14$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 5.24$, $SD = 1.19$, whereas those low in absorption do not, $F(1, 38) = .77$, $p = .34$, $[M.sub.positive] = 4.58$, $SD = .86$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 4.35$, $SD = .82$. Therefore, the results support H2a.

The interaction between absorption and editorial type for brand attitudes is also significant, $F(1, 72) = 12.01$, $p = .01$, $[[eta].sup.2.sub.P] = .14$. Planned simple effect tests indicate that people high in absorption generate more favorable brand attitudes when they have been exposed to the better liked editorial content, $F(1, 34) = 11.03$, $p = .01$, $[[eta].sup.2.sub.P] = .25$, $[M.sub.more positive] = 4.02$, $SD = .84$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 5.02$, $SD = 1.01$. In contrast, those low in absorption do not generate different brand attitudes, $F(1, 38) = 2.34$, $p = .14$, $[M.sub.more positive] = 4.49$, $SD = 1.03$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 4.05$, $SD = .78$. The results support H2b.

The three-way interactions among editorial type, absorption, and product type are not significant, which suggests that the patterns of the two-way interactions between editorial type and absorption do not vary when different product types appear in the ads. Moreover, product type does not generate any significant main effects for ad and brand attitudes.

Discussion

Experiment 2 reveals that participants with a higher disposition toward absorption generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes when they are exposed to a better-liked editorial that induces less positive affect as

opposed to a less-liked editorial that induces more positive affect. In contrast, those with a lower disposition toward absorption do not generate these responses. Therefore, the effects of liked editorial content are enhanced only for people who are reactive to favorable stimuli.

Experiments 1 and 2 compare the influences of two editorials that vary simultaneously on affect and liking. The next step is therefore to cross the two factors in one experiment. In accordance with the idea that affect intensity enhances the effects of editorial-induced positive affect, people high in affect intensity, as opposed to those low in affect intensity, should generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes when the editorial induces positive affect. In contrast, past research suggests that when ad stimuli do not elicit emotion, affect intensity should not affect ad responses (Moore and Homer 2000). Thus:

H3: An interaction emerges between editorial-induced affect type and participants' affect intensity. Regardless of the degree of liking of the editorial, when it induces positive affect, participants with high affect intensity generate more favorable (a) ad attitudes and (b) brand attitudes than do those with low affect intensity. When it induces neutral affect, affect intensity does not influence (a) ad attitudes or (b) brand attitudes.

Similarly, in accordance with the idea that disposition toward absorption enhances the effects of editorial-induced liking:

H4: An interaction emerges between editorial liking and participants' absorption disposition. Regardless of the degree of editorial-induced affect, when the editorial is better liked, participants with high absorption disposition generate more favorable (a) ad attitudes and (b) brand attitudes than do those with low absorption disposition. When it is not well liked, absorption disposition does not influence (a) ad attitudes or (b) brand attitudes.

EXPERIMENT 3

Research Design

Experiment 3 manipulated two factors. The first factor, editorial-induced affect, comprised two levels, positive versus neutral. The second factor, editorial liking, also had two levels, better versus less liked. Similarly, for the test of H3, participants can be categorized as either high or low in affect intensity, based on a median split, and in the test of H4, they can be categorized as either high or low in absorption disposition.

Participants and Procedures

Participants ($n = 255$) were recruited from a university in Taiwan and paid a nominal fee for their participation. Among them, 129 were men, accounting for 50.6% of the participants. The procedures were the same as those used in Experiment 1.

Stimuli Development

Four magazine articles were developed to elicit the necessary levels of affect and liking. The stories were about college students. Pretests indicated that the four articles differed significantly on positive affect and liking, but not on other dimensions, such as comprehensibility, readability, or verisimilitude. This experiment also used the printer ad from Experiment 2.

Independent Variables

Editorial-Induced Affect

Participants rated how the editorial made them feel, using the same items from Experiment 1 (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .96$), and the ratings on positive items and reversed negative items were averaged. Editorials in the positive condition ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.07$) as opposed to the neutral condition ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.04$) evoke greater positive affect, $F(1, 251) = 161.16$, $p < .01$. It is also important to note that editorials in the

two editorial liking conditions do not differ in induced affect, $F(1,251) = 2.27$, $p = .13$, $[M.sub.better-liked] = 4.38$, $SD = 1.44$, $[M.sub.less-liked] = 4.17$, $SD = 1.25$.

Editorial Liking

Participants rated their attitudes toward the editorial, using three items: "I like this article," "this article is favorable," and "this article is good" (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .94$). Editorials in the better-liked ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.44$) as opposed to the less-liked condition, $M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.43$; $F(1,251) = 13.26$, $p < .01$, evoke greater degrees of liking. In addition, editorials in the two editorial affect conditions do not differ in liking, $F(1,251) = 2.51$, $p = .11$, $[M.sub.positive] = 4.80$, $SD = 1.46$, $[M.sub.neutral] = 4.51$, $SD = 1.48$.

Affect Intensity

Participants rated themselves on the same scale as in Experiment 1 (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .90$) and their responses were averaged. A median split then categorizes the participants into high ($n = 126$) and low ($n = 129$) affect intensity groups. The two groups' average affect intensity scores differ significantly, $F(1,190) = 494.63$, $p < .01$, $[M.sub.high] = 5.85$, $SD = .51$, $[M.sub.low] = 4.42$, $SD = .52$.

Absorption Disposition

Participants rated themselves on the same items as in Experiment 2 (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .86$). Participants' averaged responses to the seven items provide the median split information for the categorization of participants into high ($n = 135$) and low ($n = 120$) absorption disposition groups. The two groups' average absorption scores differ significantly, $F(1,253) = 64.04$, $[M.sub.high] = 5.63$, $SD = .88$, $[M.sub.low] = 4.75$, $SD = .87$.

Dependent Variables

Participants rated attitudes toward the ad on a scale, adopted from Holbrook and Batra (1987), which contained the following items: "I like the ad," "I react favorably to the ad," "I feel positive toward the ad," and "The ad is good" (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .96$). Participants rated attitudes toward the brand on a scale, adopted from Chang (2008), which contained the following items: "I like the product," "I feel positive toward the product," "The product is good," and "the product is pleasant" (Cronbach's $[\alpha] = .85$).

Results

An ANOVA indicates that the interaction between affect intensity and editorial-induced affect on ad attitudes is not significant, $F(1,247) = 2.50, p = .12, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .01$. Planned simple effect tests further show that when exposed to the positive editorial content, people high in affect intensity generate more favorable ad attitudes than do those low in affect intensity, $F(1,123) = 6.02, p = .02, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .05, [M.sub.high] = 5.05, SD = 1.14, [M.sub.low] = 4.51, SD = 1.29$, whereas when the editorial content induces neutral affect, those high and low in affect intensity do not generate different ad attitudes, $F(1,124) = .02, p = .88, [M.sub.high] = 4.81, SD = 1.30, [M.sub.low] = 4.76, SD = 1.26$. Therefore, the results of the planned simple effects support the prediction in H3a.

An ANOVA shows that the interaction between affect intensity and editorial-induced affect on brand attitudes is not significant, $F(1, 247) = 1.87, p = .17, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .01$. Planned simple effect tests also indicate that people high in affect intensity generate more favorable brand attitudes when exposed to the positive editorial content than do those low in affect intensity, $F(1,123) = 10.82, p = .01, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .08, [M.sub.high] = 5.12, SD = .92, [M.sub.low] = 4.56, SD = .95$, whereas when the editorial content induces neutral affect, those high and low in affect intensity do not generate different ad attitudes, $F(1, 38) = 1.72, p = .19, [M.sub.high] = 5.02, SD = 1.08, [M.sub.low] = 4.78, SD = .86$.

Therefore, the results of the planned simple effects support the prediction in H3b.

As predicted, the interaction between absorption disposition and editorial liking on ad attitudes is significant, $F(1,247) = 4.78, p = .03, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .02$. Simple effect tests show that when editorials are better liked, people high in absorption disposition generate more favorable ad attitudes than do people low in absorption disposition, $F(1, 124) = 7.77, p < .01, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .06, [M.sub.high] = 5.17, SD = 1.37, [M.sub.low] = 4.52, SD = 1.28$, whereas when editorials are less liked, those high and low in absorption disposition do not generate different ad attitudes, $F(1,123) = .02, p = .89, [M.sub.high] = 4.75, SD = 1.20, [M.sub.low] = 4.78, SD = 1.08$. These results fully support H4a.

Consistent with H4b, the interaction between absorption disposition and editorial liking on brand attitudes is significant, $F(1,247) = 4.44, p = .04, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .02$. Simple effect tests show that when editorials are better liked, people high in absorption disposition generate more favorable brand attitudes than do people low in absorption disposition, $F(1, 124) = 4.61, p = .03, [[\eta].sub.p.sup.2] = .04, [M.sub.high] = 5.05, SD = 1.05, [M.sub.low] = 4.67, SD = .99$, whereas when the editorial content is less liked, those high and low in absorption

disposition do not generate different brand attitudes, $F(1, 124) = .58$, $p = .45$, $[M.sub.high] = 4.85$, $SD = .99$, $[M.sub.low] = 4.96$, $SD = .81$, in support of H4b.

Discussion

Experiment 3 reveals that participants with high affect intensity generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes than those with low affect intensity only when they are exposed to editorials that induce positive affect, not when they are exposed to editorials that induce neutral affect. These findings are consistent with those reported in Experiment 1. Altogether, the results suggest that the influence of editorial-induced positive affect on ad and brand evaluations is enhanced only for those people who are reactive to emotional stimuli.

Experiment 3 also shows that participants with a higher disposition toward absorption generate more favorable ad and brand attitudes than do those with a lower disposition toward absorption when they are exposed to editorials that are well liked, not when they are exposed to editorials that are less well liked. These findings are consistent with those reported in Experiment 2. Therefore, the influence of editorial liking on ad and brand evaluations appears enhanced only for those people who are reactive to likable stimuli.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Findings and Contributions

This study extends extant advertising research in two important ways. First, it integrates two lines of literature--editorial-induced affect and editorial liking--within the same research framework and illustrates how their relative influences on evaluations of subsequent ads and advertised brands can vary. Second, this study proposes that individual differences in terms of responsiveness to emotional and likable stimuli are major contingent factors that have impacts on the relative influences of editorial-induced affect and editorial liking.

The results of three experiments provide supporting evidence. Experiment 1 shows that participants high in affect intensity evaluate an ad and brand more favorably after reading a positive editorial that is less liked as opposed to a negative editorial that is better liked, whereas those low in affect intensity do not. Those high in affect intensity, but not those low in affect intensity, are more responsive to emotional stimuli; therefore, an affect as information effect is more likely to emerge among them.

Experiment 2 finds that absorption disposition moderates the influence of a better-liked editorial that induces less positive affect and a less-liked editorial that evokes more positive affect on ad and brand evaluations. Participants who are more disposed toward absorption like the ad and advertised brand more after they have read an article that they like better as opposed to an article that makes them happier. For those not disposed toward absorption, the two editorial articles do not generate different influences on ad and brand evaluations. Again, the findings support the idea that people differ in their responsiveness to editorial liking; therefore, the liking as information effect is more likely to emerge among those who are responsive to likable stimuli.

Experiment 3 provides even stronger evidence by manipulating both editorial-induced affect and editorial liking. The results reveal that regardless of whether editorials are liked, when they induce positive affect, people high in affect intensity generate more favorable responses toward the subsequent ad and brand than do those low in affect intensity. Moreover, regardless of whether editorials induce positive affect, when they are better liked, people high in absorption disposition rate the ad and advertised products more favorably than do those low in absorption.

This study does not manipulate consumers' situational involvement with message processing or consider existing product involvement, because judgments based on feelings may occur in contexts that engage either a systematic or heuristic mode of processing. In Schwarz and Clore's (1988) early discussions, they argue that processing based on mood represents a heuristic strategy that is more likely when elaboration likelihood is low. Yet Schwarz (2001) later suggests that relying on affect as a judgment input is not limited to situations that encourage heuristic processing. Similarly, the heuristic-systematic model suggests that heuristics can influence judgments when the motivation to process is low or high (Chaiken, Liberman, and Eagly 1989): When the motivation to process is low, participants rely on heuristics; when it is high, both heuristics and message elaboration concurrently influence judgments, generating additivity effects. Therefore, affect as information effects likely can emerge in both conditions. Chang (2005c) also documents the effects of context-induced affect among participants who have high and low product involvement, which implies affect as information and liking as information effects may be general phenomena.

Responsiveness to emotional stimuli is a key factor that enhances the effects of editorial-induced positive affect; this study tests that claim using affect intensity as an example. Similarly, responsiveness to likable media content should be a key factor that increases the effects of editorial-induced liking; this study uses absorption disposition to test that prediction. However, affect intensity and absorption disposition are not the only individual variables that determine a person's responsiveness to emotional and likable media content. Rather, this study offers a general model from which other individual variables can be explored further.

Further Research Directions

According to Lord, Lee, and Sauer (1994), research into program context effects focuses on four types of psychological responses that can affect subsequent ad processing: program-induced involvement, program-evoked affect, program liking, and program priming. Programs might trigger all of these psychological responses simultaneously, and their relative effects may vary as a function of individual differences. However, this study reports findings regarding only the relative influence of editorial liking and editorial-induced affect. The relative influence of editorial priming and editorial-evoked affect should also be explored.

In addition to these psychological responses, programs and editorial content vary in terms of the enjoyment (Norris and Colman 1996), appreciation (De Pelsmacker, Geuens, and Anckaert 2002), or credibility that they evoke. Prior research shows that ads embedded in more credible editorial content receive more favorable

ratings (Appel 2000), and ads embedded in appreciated programs or editorial content generate more favorable attitudes (De Pelsmacker, Geuens, and Anckaert 2002). What remains unclear is how consumers respond to ads embedded in programs that evoke different levels of liking, enjoyment, appreciation, or credibility. This question might be explored by considering individual differences.

This study explores the influence of editorial-induced affect and liking on two specific responses: evaluations of the ad and the brand. Prior research also examines the influences of media context on other dependent variables, such as processing strategies (Shapiro, MacInnis, and Park 2002) or the degree of ad elaboration, which relates to ad recall (Mathur and Chattopadhyay 1991). When other dependent measures, such as processing strategies, recall, recognition, or comprehension, are of interest, psychological processes other than affect/liking as information may be triggered. Different personality traits may play moderating roles in these processes.

Further research might also take the ads' characteristics into account. The nature of embedded ads moderates the influence of program-induced affect on ad evaluations (Goldberg and Gorn 1987), such that when programs generate the same affect as the ad, participants offer more favorable ad attitudes (Kamins, Marks, and Skinner 1991; Lord, Burnkrant, and Unnava 2001). Additional research should test whether the effects of program-induced affect may be stronger than the effects of program liking when ads elicit congruent as opposed to incongruent affect. Other research shows that when both ads and contexts induce affect, the influence of context-induced affect becomes attenuated (Chang 2006). Therefore, Chang (2006) reveals that individual differences, such as affect intensity, interact with ad-induced affect but not with context-induced affect. This study only used neutral ads, but additional research might explore whether the influence of editorial liking and editorial-induced affect on attitudes toward the ad may be attenuated when the ad evokes strong affect. Moreover, the congruency between editorial content and ad theme influences ad processing (Moorman, Neijens, and Smit 2002) and biases the way information gets taken into consideration. The possible influence of ad characteristics, such as ad themes or ad appeals, warrants research attention.

Product types might have unique influences that can be examined in further research as well. Although Experiment 2 reveals that the interaction between absorption disposition and editorial type does not vary when the ad features a utilitarian product (printers) or hedonic product (mini stereo system), products differ on other characteristics and dimensions that warrant more research attention.

Finally, the editorial content explored in this study consists of narratives, which are common in magazines, though further research should test whether the same effects emerge when the editorials are not narratives. According to the definition, people with a high disposition toward absorption tend to experience enhanced involvement with attentional objects (Tellegen and Atkinson 1974). The same effects thus may occur, regardless of the objects' format. Therefore, the documented effects may not be limited to narrative editorials.

Limitations

The findings reported herein should be interpreted in reference to three limitations. First, participants in the three experiments are college students, who may differ from the general public in their affect intensity or absorption disposition. Generalizing the findings to a broader public requires caution, and further research should replicate this study among other consumer populations. Second, Experiment 1 uses only one item to measure editorial liking, which may be unreliable. Third, this study relies on editorial content. More research is needed to explore the proposed effects using other content, such as television programs.

This research proposes a theoretical framework to address why editorial-induced affect influences ad and brand evaluations in some cases, whereas in others, editorial liking influences ad and brand evaluations. Individual characteristics appear to moderate these effects. These findings extend and enrich prior research and can serve as a foundation for future explorations.

REFERENCES

- Appel, Valentine (2000), "Editorial Environment and Advertising Effectiveness," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40 (6), 89-95.
- Argo, Jennifer J., Rui (Juliet) Zhu, and Darren W. Dahl (2008), "Fact or Fiction: An Investigation of Empathy Differences in Response to Emotional Melodramatic Entertainment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34 (5), 614-623.
- Aylesworth, Andrew B., and Scott B. MacKenzie (1998), "Context Is Key: The Effect of Program-Induced Mood on Thoughts About the Ad," *Journal of Advertising*, 27 (2), 17-31.
- Banos, R., C. Botella, A. Garcia-Palacios, H. Villa, C. Perpina, and M. Gallardo (1999), "Psychological Variables and Reality Judgments in Virtual Environments: The Role of Absorption and Dissociation," *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 2 (2), 135-142.
- Baron, Reuben M., and David A. Kenny (1986), "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic and Statistical Considerations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6), 1173-1182.
- Batra, Rajeev, and Douglas M. Stayman (1990), "The Role of Mood in Advertising Effectiveness," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (2), 203-214.
- Bohner, Gerd, and Thomas Weinerth (2001), "Negative Affect Can Increase or Decrease Message Scrutiny: The Affect Interpretation Hypothesis," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27 (11), 1417-1429.
- Brislin, Richard W. (1987), "The Wording and Translation of Research Instruments," in *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research*, Walter J. Lonner and John W. Berry, eds., Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 137-164.

Chaiken, Shelly, Akiva Liberman, and Alice E. Eagly (1989), "Heuristic and Systematic Information Processing Within and Beyond the Persuasion Context," in *Unintended Thought*, James S. Uleman and John A. Bargh, eds., New York: Guilford Press.

Chang, Chingching (2005a), "The Moderating Influence of Ad Framing for Ad-Self-Congruency Effects," *Psychology and Marketing*, 22 (12), 955-968.

--(2005b), "Ad-Self-Congruency Effects: Self-Enhancing Cognitive and Affective Mechanisms," *Psychology and Marketing*, 22 (11), 887-910.

--(2005c), "How Individuals Develop Brand Evaluations in Different Contexts: The Relative Impacts of Affect, Self-Relevant Thoughts and Product Attribute Thoughts," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 32, Geeta Menon and Akshay R. Rao, eds., Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 106-111.

--(2006), "Context-Induced and Ad-Induced Affect: Individual Differences as Moderators," *Psychology and Marketing*, 23 (9), 757-782.

--(2008), "Ad Framing Effects for Consumption Products: An Affect Priming Process," *Psychology and Marketing*, 25 (1), 25-47.

Coulter, Keith S. (1998), "The Effects of Affective Responses to Media Context on Advertising Evaluations," *Journal of Advertising*, 27 (4), 41-51.

de Pelsmacker, Patrick, Maggie Geuens, and Pascal Anckaert (2002), "Media Context and Advertising Effectiveness: The Role of Context Appreciation and Context/Ad Similarity," *Journal of Advertising*, 31 (2), 49-61.

Diener, Ed, Randy J. Larsen, Steven Levine, and Robert A. Emmons (1985), "Intensity and Frequency: Dimensions Underlying Positive and Negative Affect," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48 (5), 1253-1265.

Escalas, Jennifer E. (2004), "Imagine Yourself in the Product," *Journal of Advertising*, 33 (2), 37-48.

--, Marian Chapman Moore, and Julie Edell Britton (2004), "Fishing for Feelings: Hooking Viewers Helps!" *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (1-2), 105-114.

Forgas, Joseph Paul (1992), "Affect in Social Judgments and Decisions: A Multiprocess Model," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 25, Mark P. Zanna, ed., New York: Academic Press, 227-275.

--(1994), "The Role of Emotion in Social Judgments: An Introductory Review and an Affect Infusion Model (AIM)," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24 (1), 1-24.

--, Gordon H. Bower, and Stephanie J. Moylan (1990), "Praise or Blame? Affective Influences on Attributions for Achievement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (4), 809-819.

Gardner, Meryl P., and Frederick O. Wilhelm, Jr. (1987), "Consumer Responses to Ads with Positive Vs. Negative Appeals: Some Mediating Effects of Context-Induced Mood and Congruency Between Context and Ad," *Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 10 (1), 81-99.

Geuens, Maggie, and Patrick De Pelsmacker (1999), "Affect Intensity Revisited: Individual Differences and the Communication Effects on Emotional Stimuli," *Psychology and Marketing*, 16 (3), 195-209.

Glisky, Martha L., Douglas J. Tataryn, Kevin M. McConkey, Betsy A. Tobias, and John E. Kihlstrom (1991), "Absorption, Openness to Experience, and Hypnotizability," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60 (2), 263-272.

Goldberg, Marvin E., and Gerald J. Gorn (1987), "Happy and Sad TV Programs: How They Affect Reactions to Commercials," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (3), 387-403.

Gorn, Gerald J., Marvin E. Goldberg, and Kundal Basu (1993), "Mood, Awareness, and Product Evaluation," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2 (3), 237-256.

Green, Melanie C. (2006), "Narratives and Cancer Communication," *Journal of Communication*, 56 (supp. 1), S163-183.

--, and Timothy C. Brock (2000), "The Role of Transportation in Persuasiveness of Public Narratives," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (5), 701-721.

Holbrook, Morris B., and Rajeev Batra (1987), "Assessing the Role of Emotions as Mediators of Consumer Responses to Advertising," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (3), 404-420.

Isen, Alice M. (1984), "The Influence of Positive Affect on Decision Making and Cognitive Organization," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 11, Thomas C. Kinnear, ed., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 534-537.

Kamins, Michael A., Lawrence J. Marks, and Deborah Skinner (1991), "Television Commercial Evaluation in the Context of Program Induced Mood: Congruency Versus Consistency Effects," *Journal of Advertising*, 20 (2), 1-14.

Keltner, Dacher, Kenneth D. Locke, and Paul C. Audrain (1993), "The Influence of Attributions on the Relevance of Negative Feelings to Personal Satisfaction," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19 (1), 21-29.

Krugman, Herbert E. (1983), "Television Program Interest and Commercial Interruption," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 23 (1), 21-23.

Larsen, Randy J. (1984), "Theory and Measurement of Affect Intensity as an Individual Difference Characteristic," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 85, 2297B (University Microfilms No. 84-22112).

--, and Ed Diener (1987), "Affect Intensity as an Individual Difference Characteristic: A Review," *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21 (1), 1-39.

--, --, and Russell S. Cropanzano (1987), "Cognitive Operations Associated with Individual Differences in Affect Intensity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53 (4), 767-774.

--, --, and Robert A. Emmons (1986), "Affect Intensity and Reactions to Daily Life Events," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (4), 803-814.

Lord, Kenneth R., Robert E. Burnkrant, and H. Rao Unnava (2001), "The Effects of Program-Induced Mood States on Memory for Commercial Information," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 23 (1), 1-15.

--, Myung-Soo Lee, and Paul L. Sauer (1994), "Program Context Antecedents of Attitude Toward Radio Commercials," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (1), 3-15.

Lynn, Steven Jay, and Judith W. Rhue (1986), "The Fantasy-Prone Person: Hypnosis, Imagination, and Creativity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (2), 404-408.

MacInnis, Deborah J., and Bernard J. Jaworski (1989), "Information Processing from Advertisements: Toward an Integrative Framework," *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (4), 1-23.

Martin, Brett A. S. (2003), "The Influence of Gender on Mood Effects in Advertising," *Psychology and Marketing*, 20 (3), 249-273.

Mathur, Mahima, and Amitava Chattopadhyay (1991), "The Impact of Moods Generated by Television Programs on Responses to Advertising," *Psychology and Marketing*, 8 (1), 59-77.

Matthews, Gerald, Dylan M. Jones, and A. Graham Chamberlain (1990), "Refining the Measurement of Mood: The UWIST Mood Adjective Checklist," *British Journal of Psychology*, 81 (1), 17-42.

McConkey, Kevin, and Heather Nogrady (1986), "Visual Elaboration Scale: Analysis of Individual and Group Versions," *Journal of Mental Imagery*, 10 (1), 37-46.

- Merckelbach, Harald (2004), "Telling a Good Story: Fantasy Proneness and the Quality of Fabricated Memories," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37 (7), 1371-1382.
- Moore, David J., and William D. Harris (1996), "Affect Intensity and the Consumer's Attitude Toward High Impact Emotional Advertising Appeals," *Journal of Advertising*, 25 (2), 37-50.
- , and Pamela M. Homer (2000), "Dimensions of Temperament: Affect Intensity and Consumer Lifestyles," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9 (1-2), 231-242.
- , --, and Hong C. Chen (1995), "Affect Intensity: An Individual Difference Response to Advertising Appeals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (2), 154-165.
- Moorman, Marjolein, Peter C. Neijens, and Edith G. Smit (2002), "The Effects of Magazine-Induced Psychological Responses and Thematic Congruence on Memory and Attitude Toward the Ad in a Real-Life Setting," *Journal of Advertising*, 31 (4), 27-41.
- , --, and --(2005), "The Effects of Program Responses on the Processing of Commercials Placed at Various Positions in the Program and the Block," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 45 (1), 49-59.
- Murry, John P., Jr., John L. Lastovicka, and Surendra N. Singh (1992), "Feeling and Liking Responses to Television Programs: An Examination of Two Explanations for Media-Context Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (4), 441-452.
- Norris, Clare E., and Andrew M. Colman (1996), "Context Effects of Radio Programming on Cognitive Processing of Embedded Advertisements," *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 10 (6), 473-486.
- Pham, Michel Tuan (1998), "Representativeness, Relevance, and the Use of Feelings in Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (2), 144-159.
- Rader, Charles M., and Auke Tellegen (1987), "An Investigation of Synesthesia," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (5), 981-987.
- Saade, Raafat, and Bouchaib Bahli (2005), "The Impact of Cognitive Absorption on Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Ease of Use in On-line Learning: An Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model," *Information and Management*, 42, 315-327.
- Schwarz, Norbert (2001), "Feelings as Information: Implications for Affective Influences on Information Processing," in *Theories of Mood and Cognition*, Leonard L. Martin and Gerald L. Clore, eds., Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum, 159-176.

--, and Gerald L. Clore (1983), "Mood, Misattribution, and Judgments of Well-Being: Informative and Directive Functions of Affective States," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45 (3), 513-523.

--, and --(1988), "How Do I Feel About It? The Informative Function of Affective States," in *Affect, Cognition, and Social Behavior*, Klaus Fiedler and Joseph Forgas, eds., Toronto: Hogrefe, 44-62.

Shapiro, Stewart, Deborah J. MacInnis, and C. Whan Park (2002), "Understanding Program-Induced Mood Effects: Decoupling Arousal from Valence," *Journal of Advertising*, 31 (4), 15-26.

Srull, Thomas K. (1983), "Affect and Memory: The Impact of Affective Reactions in Advertising on the Representation of Product Information in Memory," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 10, Richard P. Bagozzi and Alice M. Tybout, eds., Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 520-526.

Sweeney, Carol A., Steven Jay Lynn, and Francis S. Belleza (1986), "Hypnosis, Hypnotizability, and Imagery-Mediated Learning," *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 34 (1), 29-40.

Tellegen, Auke (1992), "Note on Structure and Naming of the MPQ Absorption Scale," unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

--, and Gilbert Atkinson (1974), "Openness to Absorbing and Self-Altering Experiences ('Absorption'), a Trait Related to Hypnotic Susceptibility," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 83 (3), 268-277.

Wild, T. Cameron, Don Kuiken, and Don Schopflocher (1995), "The Role of Absorption in Experiential Involvement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (3), 569-572.

Chingching Chang (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison) is Chair Professor of Advertising, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan.

The author gratefully acknowledges the Editor and three anonymous reviewers for their valuable insights and constructive comments.

DOI 10.2753/JOA0091-3367400304

TABLE 1

ANOVA Results for Experiments 1-3

Ad attitudes

Experiment 1: Affect intensity as a moderator

F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
---	---	---------------------

Editorial type (T)	.28	.60	.01
Affect intensity (A)	.28	.60	.01
T x A	7.04	.01	.04

Experiment 2: Absorption disposition as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial type (T)	1.91	.17	.03
Product type (P)	.07	.79	.01
Absorption (A)	2.12	.15	.03
T x P	.01	.96	.01
T x A	5.72	.02	.07
P x A	.02	.90	.01
T x P x A	.12	.73	.01

Experiment 3: Affect intensity as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial affect (A)	.01	.97	.01
Editorial liking (L)	.26	.61	.01
Affect intensity (I)	3.23	.07	.01
A x L	.08	.77	.01
A x I	2.50	.12	.01
L x I	2.16	.14	.01
A x L x I	.02	.90	.01

Experiment 3: Absorption disposition as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial affect (A)	.25	.61	.01
Editorial liking (L)	.05	.83	.01
Absorption disposition (B)	4.02	.05	.01
A x L	.02	.88	.01
A x B	4.78	.03	.02

L x 1	1.15	.29	.01
A x L x B	1.75	.18	.01

Brand attitudes

Experiment 1: Affect intensity as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial type (T)	1.43	.23	.01
Affect intensity (A)	4.85	.03	.03
T x A	5.14	.03	.03

Experiment 2: Absorption disposition as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial type (T)	1.85	.18	.03
Product type (P)	.20	.66	.01
Absorption (A)	1.44	.23	.02
T x P	.47	.49	.01
T x A	12.01	.01	.14
P x A	.06	.81	.01
T x P x A	1.56	.22	.02

Experiment 3: Affect intensity as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial affect (A)	.19	.66	.01
Editorial liking (L)	.17	.69	.01
Affect intensity (I)	10.48	.01	.04
A x L	1.52	.22	.01
A x I	1.87	.17	.01
L x 1	1.34	.25	.01
A x L x 1	.46	.50	.01

Experiment 3: Absorption disposition as a moderator

	F	P	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Editorial affect (A)	.17	.68	.01
Editorial liking (L)	.01	.97	.01
Absorption disposition (B)	1.21	.27	.01
A x L	1.50	.22	.01
A x B	4.44	.04	.02
L x 1	.18	.67	.01
A x L x B	.39	.53	.01

Note: ANOVA = analysis of variance.

TABLE 2

Results of Planned Simple Effect Tests for Experiments 1-3

Experiment 1: Affect intensity as a moderator

	High affect intensity (n = 94)	
	Means	
	More positive (n = 49)	Better liked (n = 45)
Ad attitudes	3.99(1.01)	3.50 (1.00)
Brand attitudes	4.20 (.97)	3.68 (1.07)

Experiment 2: Absorption disposition as a moderator

High in absorption
(n = 38)

Means

	More positive (n = 20)	Better liked (n = 18)
Ad attitudes	4.37 (1.14)	5.24 (1.19)
Brand attitudes	4.02 (.84)	5.02 (1.01)

Experiment 3: Affect intensity (AI) as a moderator

	Positive editorial (n = 127)	
	Means	
	High AI (n = 73)	Low AI (n = 54)
Ad attitudes	5.05 (1.14)	4.52 (1.29)
Brand attitudes	5.12 (.92)	4.56 (.95)

Experiment 3: Absorption disposition (AD) as a moderator

	Better liked editorial (n = 128)	
	Means	
	High AD (n = 63)	Low AD (n = 65)
Ad attitudes	5.17 (1.37)	4.52 (1.28)
Brand attitudes	5.05 (1.05)	4.67 (.99)

Experiment 1: Affect intensity as a moderator

High affect intensity
(n = 94)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	5.42	0.02	0.06
Brand attitudes	5.90	0.02	0.06

Experiment 2: Absorption disposition as a moderator

High in absorption
(n = 38)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	5.06	0.03	0.13
Brand attitudes	11.03	0.01	0.25

Experiment 3: Affect intensity (AI) as a moderator

Positive editorial
(n = 127)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	6.02	0.02	0.05
Brand attitudes	10.82	0.01	0.08

Experiment 3: Absorption disposition (AD) as a moderator

Better liked editorial
(n = 128)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
--	---	---	---------------------

Ad attitudes	7.77	0.01	0.06
Brand attitudes	4.61	0.03	0.04

Experiment 1: Affect intensity as a moderator

Low affect intensity
(n = 98)

Means

	More positive (n = 49)	Better liked (n = 45)
Ad attitudes	3.50 (1.03)	3.83 (1.16)
Brand attitudes	3.54 (1.07)	3.69 (.98)

Experiment 2: Absorption disposition as a moderator

Low in absorption
(n = 42)

Means

	More positive (n = 20)	Better liked (n = 22)
Ad attitudes	4.58 (.86)	4.35 (.82)
Brand attitudes	4.49 (1.03)	4.05 (.78)

Experiment 3: Affect intensity (AI) as a moderator

Neutral editorial
(n = 128)

Means		
	High AI (n = 56)	Low AI (n = 72)
Ad attitudes	4.81 (1.30)	4.76 (1.26)
Brand attitudes	5.02 (1.08)	4.78 (1.08)

Experiment 3: Absorption disposition (AD) as a moderator

Less liked editorial (n = 127)		
Means		
	High AD (n = 57)	Low AD (n = 70)
Ad attitudes	4.75 (1.20)	4.78 (1.08)
Brand attitudes	4.85 (.99)	4.96 (.81)

Experiment 1: Affect intensity as a moderator

Low affect intensity (n = 98)			
	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	2.14	0.15	0.02
Brand attitudes	0.58	0.45	0.01

Experiment 2: Absorption disposition as a moderator

Low in absorption (n = 42)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	0.77	0.34	0.06
Brand attitudes	2.34	0.14	0.02

Experiment 3: Affect intensity (AI) as a moderator

Neutral editorial
(n = 128)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	0.02	0.88	0.01
Brand attitudes	1.72	0.19	0.01

Experiment 3: Absorption disposition (AD) as a moderator

Less liked editorial
(n = 127)

	F	p	[[eta].sub.p.sup.2]
Ad attitudes	0.02	0.89	0.01
Brand attitudes	0.58	0.45	0.01