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Abstract:
Purpose - This paper aims to identify two boundary conditions (consumption motive and claim set-size) affecting the effectiveness of an advertisement’s creativity.
Design/methodology/approach - Across two experiments, the authors find support for hypotheses using both hedonic vs utilitarian products (Study 1) and hedonic vs utilitarian decision goals within the same product category (Study 2).
Findings - Creativity is more effective for an advertisement when the consumption motive is utilitarian (vs hedonic). Further, using a larger claim set-size within an advertisement increases (decreases) the effectiveness of advertisement creativity for those with hedonic (utilitarian) consumption motives.
Research implications - This research contributes to the creativity literature by showing when creativity matters depending on the consumption motive and claim set-size. In addition, this research expands the utilitarian vs hedonic consumption literature by highlighting another way in which these two motives differ. Finally, this study expands the claim set-size literature by demonstrating that the effects of claim set-size depend on both consumption motive and features of the ad (i.e. its level of creativity).
Practical implications - These findings help marketers manage their advertising budget more effectively and efficiently knowing when advertisement creativity matters and thus when to invest in creativity.
Originality/value - The present research is the first to explicitly study boundary conditions for when ad creativity matters and shows that creativity matters more (i.e. enhances persuasiveness of the ad and attitudes toward the ad) when the consumption motive is utilitarian, especially when ads have small claim set-size. Additionally, creativity matters for hedonic consumption contexts if the advertisement has a large claim size.
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Introduction

A creative ad is defined as an advertisement which is both novel and relevant (both to the content and for the audience) and designing creative ads is a critical goal for advertisers. Every year, advertising agencies from all around the world join creativity festivals such as Cannes Lions, Clios, and One Show, to compete for having the most creative ads. In addition, creativity impacts satisfaction with ad agencies (Marra 1990) and whether agencies acquire or lose accounts (Helgesen, 1994; West et al., 2008). Further, creativity impacts advertising effectiveness with research showing positive effects of creativity on a wide variety of cognitive, affective, and conative consumer responses, such as ad and brand evaluations, emotional responses to ads, and purchase intentions (see Journal of Advertising, special issue on creativity, Sasser and Koslow (eds.) 2008). Such positive effects support marketers’ investments in resources (e.g., money, time, human) to create creative advertisements. However, in contrast, some researchers have argued that creativity is wasteful with respect to outcomes such as persuasiveness (Kover et al., 1995), and some have found that creativity does not influence important outcomes such as ad attitudes (Till and Baack, 2005). These conflicting findings raise the question: under what conditions will creativity matter for an advertisement’s effectiveness?

In this paper, we propose that consumption motive (utilitarian vs. hedonic) and claim set-size (i.e., number of claims) influence the effectiveness of an advertisement’s creativity. Consumption motive refers to whether the consumer’s motivation is geared towards hedonic or utilitarian consumption. Some product categories inherently lend themselves more towards satisfying utilitarian or hedonic motives. However, the same product category can also satisfy either motive depending on the consumer’s decision goal. Claim set-size refers to the number of
claims contained in the ad that provide information about the product and/or brand. We focus on these two constructs because jointly they have implications for how consumers react to overload that can result from large claim set-sizes, thus influencing how they process information. In turn, we believe the processes adopted (e.g., central or peripheral route processing) will influence creativity’s impact.

The present research is the first, to our knowledge, to explicitly study boundary conditions for when ad creativity matters and shows that creativity has a bigger impact on persuasiveness of the ad and attitudes toward the ad when the consumption motive is utilitarian, especially when ads have small claim set-size. Additionally, creativity matters for hedonic consumption contexts, if the advertisement has a large claim-size. These effects hold whether consumption motive (hedonic/ utilitarian) is manipulated integral to the ad (via product category; study 1) or incidental to the ad (within the same product category/ad but by varying decision goals; study 2). These findings contribute to the creativity, hedonic vs. utilitarian consumption, and claim set-size literatures. In the remaining sections, we provide background literature and hypotheses, present evidence from two studies supporting our hypotheses, and discuss implications and directions for future research.

**Theoretical Background**

**Consumption Motive**
Consumers are motivated to purchase products for two main reasons: (1) hedonic consumption which is oriented towards getting pleasure and involves emotional experiences, and (2) utilitarian consumption which is oriented instrumentally and involves using the product for its functional purpose (e.g. Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Kronrod et al., 2011). When consumers have a utilitarian consumption motive, they focus on performance of the
product and whether the product will serve as a means to an end. On the other hand, when consumers have a hedonic consumption motive, they focus on the positive feelings associated with the consumption. Thus, during a decision, when consumers have a utilitarian motive, they evaluate product related information in a thoughtful manner, while if they have a hedonic motive, they try to get the most enjoyment and fun out of the shopping experience (Babin et al., 1994).

By nature, some product categories are considered as more hedonic (e.g. ice cream, beer) while some are considered as more utilitarian (e.g. real estate, banking) (Adaval, 2001; Batra and Ahtola, 1990). On the other hand, consumption motive is malleable, meaning that for the same product category, consumers might have either hedonic or utilitarian consumption motives depending on their decision goal (e.g. massage to reward yourself vs. massage to ease body ache; Botti and McGill, 2010).

**Impact of Consumption Motive on Effectiveness of Creativity**

The literature shows that the level of incongruity between a stimulus and category expectations can influence the evaluation of the stimulus (Fiske, 1982). Such unexpectedness also creates surprise and has a positive effect on attitudes and purchase intentions (e.g. Dahlén, 2005). The creativity construct involves unexpectedness, deviation from the norm, and inconsistency with ads of the same product category or schema (Ang and Low, 2000; Stoltman, 1991). Thus, in situations when creativity is less expected in an advertisement, it may create even more value. That is, if the specific context where creativity is used creates a sense of incongruity or unexpectedness, it may lead to more positive attitudes toward the ad. We suggest such situations might arise as a function of consumption motive.
The match-up hypothesis, which has been applied in a variety of contexts suggests that the congruency between consumer expectations and the stimulus (e.g. product, advertising, media source) improves consumer evaluations in the related context. On the other hand, incongruence can also enhance communication effectiveness if the unexpectedness is coupled with relevancy (Dahlén 2015, Heckler and Childers, 1992). Relevancy, which is about whether the ad information contributes to the understanding of the ad message, enhances ad processing. However expectancy, which is about whether ad information fits into the preexisting knowledge structure, decreases the ad processing. Thus, communication is most impactful when relevancy is coupled with unexpectedness. Applying this to our context, while use of creativity is relevant in ads for both hedonic and utilitarian consumption contexts, the expectancy of ad creativity use in these contexts is different as we explain next.

Consumers may have different expectations regarding the use of creativity depending on the consumption goal (cf., Reinartz and Saffert, 2013). Hedonic consumption is associated with playfulness (Botti and McGill, 2010) which is frequently mentioned in relation to creativity (Kohler et al., 2011). In addition, while the creativity construct has been repeatedly defined to include novelty and meaningfulness sub-dimensions, some researchers (e.g., Ang and Low, 2000) have argued for including emotion as another sub-dimension of the construct. Yang and Smith (2009) have shown that ad creativity evokes positive emotions on the target audience. Together, these findings suggest emotions and creativity are closely associated. Relatedly, if we are to compare utilitarian and hedonic consumption, we see that while utilitarian consumption is usually associated with rational appeals (Hirschman, 1986), hedonic consumption is usually associated with emotional appeals (Alba and Williams, 2012). Accordingly, parallel with an associative network memory model (Anderson, 1983), since people formulate correlations in
their minds based on their lived experiences, they may have formed connections between creativity, emotions and hedonic consumption. Thus creativity usage may be less expected for utilitarian (vs. hedonic) consumption, making the ad creativity more influential there. Dahlén (2005) has shown that unexpected media usage can enhance attitudes toward the ad, and posited that this is because using unexpected media is surprising for the audience leading it to have a positive effect on attitudes. Similarly, we propose that the unexpected use of ad creativity in a consumption context not typically associated with creativity (i.e., utilitarian) can be more effective:

H1: A creative advertisement enhances ad evaluations for utilitarian consumption more than hedonic consumption.

Impact of Claim Set-Size on Effectiveness of Creativity
Marketers need to make multiple decisions when they are creating their ads. Two of the main decisions are (1) whether they should invest in ad creativity and (2) the number of claims to share about the product. While sharing multiple claims may increase the ad’s effectiveness by increasing the likelihood that some of these claims will align with what a specific consumer is looking for, research indicates that processing large amounts of information is overloading (Jacoby, 1984). As the amount of information provided increases, cognitive limits prevent consumers from processing the relevant information thoroughly (Jacoby et al., 1974; Lee and Lee, 2004; Lurie, 2004). Consequently, consumers start feeling relatively more overloaded due to the depleted cognitive resources (Benoit and Miller, 2017). Accordingly, the more claims an ad has, the more consumers will start feeling overloaded; and we argue that consumption motive (utilitarian vs. hedonic) will influence the strategies consumers choose to deal with this overload.

In particular, consumers can deal with overload by either narrowing their attention only to the most relevant information such as claim information or by adopting heuristics in which
(less relevant) cues are utilized in lieu of engaging in effortless information processing. These two strategies roughly correspond to two modes of decision processing and are influenced by a consumer’s motivation and ability to process information. Specifically, existing decision models posit that persuasion can be driven either by careful evaluation of the central elements of the message content (System 2/ Systematic/ Central Processing) or by more superficial, peripheral cues (System 1/ Heuristic/ Peripheral Processing) (Chaiken, 1980; Kahneman and Frederick, 2002; Petty and Cacioppo, 1986b, 1986c). Further, these models indicate that careful examination of information is taxing; thus it requires both motivation and ability for consumers to process information in a central/ systematic way. While consumers may differ in their individual proclivities towards one style or the other, these processes are also affected by situational factors, such as motivation and ability (Cacioppo et al., 1986; Petty and Cacioppo, 1986a). Utilitarian motive coupled with large claim set-size will provide both the motivation and ability to process centrally. Accordingly, we argue that when the claim set-size is larger, for those with utilitarian consumption motives, overload will lead consumers to apply system 2 processing and ignore peripheral pieces of the ad, such as creativity, in order to focus their depleted resources on better understanding the more relevant/central claim information. In contrast, because hedonic consumption motives are associated with enhancing fun/enjoyment, and thus do not provide the necessary motivation to process centrally, those with hedonic consumption motives will seek to mitigate overload feelings by adopting heuristics (system 1 processing) focused on peripheral cues, such as the ad’s creativity.

Utilitarian Consumption

Consumers with utilitarian consumption goals are generally motivated to carefully process information (Childers et al., 2001). This mindset is well-suited for System 2 processing which
involves greater scrutiny and comprehensive evaluation of the central information (e.g., Childers et al., 2001; McElroy and Seta, 2003). However, while consumers may be motivated to process information, in order to apply System 2 processing, they also must have the ability to do so. As the amount of information to be processed (here, claims) increases, cognitive resources become depleted making it more difficult to easily process all the information. This reduction in resources then leads to feelings of overload. Because consumers with utilitarian consumption motives care about processing the most relevant information, they resolve these overload feelings by focusing their attention on the claims which are central to the merits of the product. This narrowing of focus is similar to findings by Melnyk et al. (2012) who found that utilitarian decisions increased consumers’ ability to differentiate relevant product information and ignore relatively irrelevant cues, such as country-of-origin of the product.

Thus, for consumers with utilitarian consumption motives, as claim-set size increases, reducing cognitive resources, rather than using their depleting cognitive resources to understand the creative elements of an ad and how it is relevant/meaningful for them, these consumers will narrow their focus onto the advertising claims which contain information more relevant to their current consumption motive. This narrowing will be driven by the number of claims, as it is the increased information processing requirements which create the feeling of overload and the need for a strategy to reduce that overload. In doing so, by narrowing their focus towards the claims and away from understanding the creative elements of the ad, the impact of creativity on evaluations should decrease. That is, while creativity has a positive influence on ad evaluations for utilitarian consumption overall (H1), as claim set-size increases, the impact of creativity on an advertisement’s evaluations should decrease. In other words, for those with a utilitarian
consumption motive, we expect creativity will have the strongest impact for advertisements with small claim set-size.

H2: When the consumption motive is utilitarian, creativity increases ad evaluations more for small (vs. larger) claim set-size.

**Hedonic Consumption**

Because consumption motives change consumers’ relative motivation, when faced with increased information processing demands, those with hedonic consumption motives should respond differently than those with utilitarian consumption motives to the increased information processing demands caused by the large claim set-size. As we discussed, when the claim set-size increases, cognitive resources will start getting depleted, causing consumers to start getting overloaded. Since with hedonic consumption motive, consumers are oriented towards enhancing their enjoyment out of the shopping experience, they will try to mitigate those negative feelings of overload. Consequently, rather than narrowing their focus on claims in response to overload, those with hedonic consumption motives are expected to shift to heuristic processing.

Heuristics, making inferences about the task utilizing peripheral cues, are used when individuals have either low motivation or limited cognitive ability (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986a; Sicilia and Ruiz, 2009). Because hedonic consumption is associated with fun and enjoyment, those with hedonic consumption motives generally have low motivation to process complex information (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986c). Thus, they lack the motivation for deep elaboration and have less tendency to evaluate central information. These characteristics should lead such consumers more towards System 1/heuristic processing. Consequently, as claim set-size increases and cognitive resources start getting depleted, those with hedonic consumption motives should seek to reduce the resulting overload feelings by relying more on heuristics involving...
peripheral cues. Creativity can serve as one such cue for persuasion and impression formation (Lee and Schumann, 2004). Consequently, in contrast to those with utilitarian consumption motives, as claim set-size increases for those with hedonic consumption motives, the influence of creativity on evaluations should increase. Thus, we predict:

   H3: When the consumption motive is hedonic, creativity will increase ad evaluations more for large (vs. smaller) claim set-size.

Consumption motives can be influenced by a variety of factors, including individual and situational factors. In our studies, we investigate the impact of situational influences on consumption motives (and the consequent impact on creativity effectiveness) as such influences are more easily identified and actionable by marketers. Specifically, consumption motives can be influenced by both the product category and how individuals intend to use a product (decision goal). We find support for our hypotheses across two studies, using both product category (Study 1) and decision goal (Study 2) manipulations of consumption motive. Specifically, in study 1, we use a hedonic vs. utilitarian product/ad and show initial support for our hypotheses. In study 2, we hold the advertisement, and thus product category and claims, constant and manipulate the consumption motive via a decision goal framing scenario. In the second study, we also test the theorized processes.

Study 1

Pretests
We conducted 4 pretests to create the ads for the main study. These pretests were designed to test underlying assumptions of our theory as well as the appropriateness of our experimental manipulations. Because a central component underlying the proposed psychological process leading to H1 is that the unexpected use of creativity influences its effectiveness, in Pretest 1, we
assessed whether use of ad creativity is less expected when the consumption motive is utilitarian rather than hedonic. In Pretest 2, we identify creative ads to be used in the main study; in Pretest 3, we ensure that different versions of the ads differ in terms of creativity but not in terms of claim importance; and in Pretest 4, we confirm the effectiveness of our consumption motive (hedonic/utilitarian) manipulation. Methodological details and results for each of these pretests follow.

Pretest 1

Method. Pretest 1 (N = 684 MTurkers, MAge = 38, 60% female, 88.7% has some college degree or more, 11% has a high school degree; all from US), which was conducted as part of a separate research project, provided evidence that creativity is more unexpected in utilitarian (vs. hedonic) contexts.

Prior research associates utilitarian consumption with rational, and hedonic consumption with emotional, appeals (Alba and Williams, 2012; Hirschman, 1986). Thus, we had participants view 3 advertisements randomly selected from 162 advertisements that varied in appeal (emotional, rational) but had a similar message. Each advertisement was evaluated by 12 people on average. For each ad, participants rated the creativity (creative, novel, innovative; α = .97), extent to which they felt surprise, and extent to which the ad used rational and emotional appeals (1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

Results. We conducted median-split for rational appeal and emotional appeal scores, and identified the advertisements with “high rational appeal and low emotional appeal” (rational/utilitarian advertisements; N = 39), and advertisements with “high emotional appeal and low rational appeal” (emotional/hedonic advertisements; N = 39). Next, we ran two separate simple regressions for each type of ad, using creativity as the independent variable and surprise
as the dependent variable. As expected, for utilitarian ads, creativity was positively associated with surprise ($\beta = .39, p < .01$), but not for hedonic ads ($p > .3$), supporting our presupposition that in a utilitarian advertisement, creativity is unexpected/surprising, while in a hedonic advertisement, use of creativity is not surprising.

**Pretest 2**

*Method.* The goal of Pretest 2 was to identify creative ads (which could be easily modified to create non-creative versions) to use as our product stimuli in the main study. Thirty-five MTurkers ($M_{Age} = 32$, 46% female; 86% has some college degree or more, 14% has a high school degree; all from US) evaluated the creativity of 8 real ads ($0 =$ Not at all creative, $10 =$ Very creative; Dahlén et al., 2008).

*Results.* Participants perceived all 8 ads as creative (all means significantly greater than midpoint (5), $p$’s < .05) so for the main study, we selected an ad for a coffee company and a furniture store, as we expected these contexts to differ on the hedonic/utilitarian dimension. We then tested these perceptions in Pretest 4. We also created non-creative versions of these two ads, and tested the creativity manipulation in Pretest 3.

**Pretest 3**

*Method.* In Pretest 3 ($N = 364$ students, 41% female), we employed a 2 (creativity: creative, non-creative) x 2 (product category: furniture store, coffee) between subjects design in order to pretest our creativity manipulations, and create claim set-size conditions whose claims’ importance will not be different from each other.

Respondents were asked to evaluate the creativity of the ads ($1 =$ Not at all creative, $7 =$ Very creative). In addition, in the second part of this pretest, we presented 25 claims for each product category (coffee and furniture store) that we collected from real advertisements and...
websites, and asked respondents to evaluate the importance of each claim (1 = not at all, 7 = very important).

**Results.** As expected, the creative versions of both ads were rated as more creative ($M_{\text{Coffee}} = 4.64$, $M_{\text{FurnStore}} = 5.63$) than the noncreative ads we created ($M_{\text{Coffee}} = 3.36$, $M_{\text{FurnStore}} = 4.94$) ($p$’s < .001). Using participants’ importance ratings, we then constructed claim sets of varying sizes (small: 3, medium: 5, large: 12 claims) to be used in the main study. Repeated-measures ANOVA confirmed that the claim sets did not differ with regards to average importance ($p$’s > .6 for both Greenhouse-Geisser and Huynh-Feldt adjustments) (coffee: $M_{\text{Small}} = 4.84$, $M_{\text{Medium}} = 4.83$, $M_{\text{Large}} = 4.81$; furniture store: $M_{\text{Small}} = 5.69$, $M_{\text{Medium}} = 5.68$, $M_{\text{Large}} = 5.67$).

**Pretest 4**

**Method.** Based on the results from Pretest 3, we constructed the final stimuli for the main study (see appendix) and ran Pretest 4 ($N = 151$ students, 66% female) using the 12-claim version of the noncreative ads for both utilitarian (furniture store) and hedonic (coffee) products to confirm that the consumption motive manipulation was successful. We asked how hedonic the ads are perceived (1 = goal-oriented, 7 = pleasure-oriented) (Smith et al., 2005), as well as product relevancy of the ads (4 items adapted from Cox and Cox, 2001; Lord et al., 1994; e.g. “The ad’s message seemed relevant to me,” $\alpha = .86$).

**Results.** As expected, the coffee ad was perceived as more hedonic than the furniture store ad ($M_{\text{Coffee}} = 4.98$, $M_{\text{FurnStore}} = 2.55$; $p < .001$). Both advertisements were perceived as equally relevant to participants ($p > .5$), ruling out product relevance as a possible alternative explanation for our results.
**Method**

The main study ($N = 178$ students; 43.3% female) used a 2 (creativity: creative, noncreative) x 3 (claim set-size: small (3), medium (5), large (12 claims)) x 2 (consumption motive: utilitarian, hedonic) mixed-design online experiment. Consumption motive was manipulated within-subject, while claim set-size and creativity were manipulated between-subjects. The ads for utilitarian and hedonic products were presented in a counter-balanced order to preclude possible order effects. Claim set-size was kept the same across the two ads to prevent hypothesis guessing, while creativity was allowed to vary. Thus, participants could see the creative or noncreative versions of both ads, or one creative and one noncreative ad.

Respondents were shown the advertisements and answered questions about their attitude toward the ad ($A_{Ad}$) (1 = Bad, 7 = Good; 1 = Negative, 7 = Positive (utilitarian $r = .77$, hedonic $r = .83$)); ad persuasiveness (1 = Unpersuasive, 7 = Persuasive; 1 = Weak, 7 = strong; 1 = Unbelievable, 7 = Believable (Miniard et al., 1990) (utilitarian $\alpha = .80$, hedonic $\alpha = .76$); creativity (1 = Not creative, 7 = Creative) (Dahlén et al., 2008); claim set-size perception (1 = Too few, 7 = Too many) (Iyengar and Lepper, 2000); and control variables (CVs) of brand and ad familiarity since familiarity leads to enhanced attitude; Zajonc, 1968).

**Results**

The manipulation of claim set-size was successful for both utilitarian ($M_{Small} = 3.86, M_{Medium} = 4.48, M_{Large} = 5.66$) ($F(2, 175) = 35.47$) and hedonic ($M_{Small} = 4.46, M_{Medium} = 5.28, M_{Large} = 6.30$) ($F(2, 175) = 37.33$) product ads ($p$’s < .01). Ad with the large claim set-size was perceived as having more claims than ads with both medium and small claim set-sizes. In addition medium claim set-size was perceived as having more claims than small claim set-size. Further, for both products, the creative ad was perceived as more creative than the noncreative ad (utilitarian:
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M_{Creative} = 5.09, M_{Noncreative} = 4.04, F(1, 176) = 13.99; hedonic: M_{Creative} = 4.91, M_{Noncreative} = 3.70, F(1, 176) = 23.67) (p’s < .001).

Hypothesis 1: Consumption Motive

ANCOVAs revealed that, for utilitarian product, consumers had higher A_{Ad} for creative ad (M_{Creative} = 4.59 vs. M_{Noncreative} = 4.15) (F(1, 174) = 5.37, p < .05) (CV p’s < .09), while for hedonic product, creativity did not affect A_{Ad} (M_{Creative} = 4.76 vs. M_{Noncreative} = 4.89) (F < 1) (CV p’s > .3). Ad persuasiveness mirrored these findings (utilitarian: M_{Creative} = 4.27, M_{Noncreative} = 3.93, F(1, 174) = 3.39, p < .07; hedonic: M_{Creative} = 4.74, M_{Noncreative} = 4.50, p > .2) (CV p’s > .1). These results support that creativity is more influential for those with a utilitarian consumption motive than those with a hedonic consumption motive (H1).

Hypothesis 2: Utilitarian Consumption and Claim Set-size

For utilitarian product, a two-way ANCOVA showed a significant interaction of creativity and claim set-size on A_{Ad} (F(2, 170) = 3.05, p < .05) (CV p’s < .07). Planned comparisons showed that creativity did not matter for large (M_{Creative} = 4.10, M_{Noncreative} = 4.23; p > .8) and medium (M_{Creative} = 4.89, M_{Noncreative} = 4.56; p > .2) claim set-sizes, while for small claim set-size creativity increased A_{Ad} (M_{Creative} = 4.80, M_{Noncreative} = 3.64; p < .01). Ad persuasiveness mirrored these findings (interaction: F(2, 170) = 2.77, p < .07) (large: M_{Creative} = 3.89, M_{Noncreative} = 4.10; p > .6; medium: M_{Creative} = 4.40, M_{Noncreative} = 4.08; p > .2; small: M_{Creative} = 4.57, M_{Noncreative} = 3.60; p < .01) (CV p’s > .1). These results provide support for H2; when the consumption motive is utilitarian, the effects of creativity are stronger for small claim set-size than for medium or large claim set-sizes.
**Hypothesis 3: Hedonic Consumption and Claim Set-size**

For hedonic product, we conducted a two-way ANCOVA on $A_{Ad}$ (interaction of creativity and claim set-size: $F(2, 170) = 2.25, p = .10$; creativity: $p < .4$; claim set-size: $F(2, 170) = 10.39, p < .001$). Planned comparisons showed that creativity did not matter for small ($M_{Creative} = 5.07$, $M_{Noncreative} = 5.22; p > .5$) and medium ($M_{Creative} = 5.05, M_{Noncreative} = 5.13; p > .7$) claim set-sizes, while for large claim set-size, creativity increased $A_{Ad}$ ($M_{Creative} = 4.59, M_{Noncreative} = 3.90; p < .05$) (CV $p's > .3$). Ad persuasiveness mirrored these findings (interaction: $F(2, 170) = 2.25, p = .10$; creativity: $p > .1$; claim set-size: $F(2, 170) = 6.93, p < .01$) (small: $M_{Creative} = 4.82$, $M_{Noncreative} = 4.78, p > .9$; medium: $M_{Creative} = 4.86, M_{Noncreative} = 4.90, p > .8$; large: $M_{Creative} = 4.56, M_{Noncreative} = 3.80, p < .05$) (CV $p's > .3$). These results provide support for H3: for a hedonic consumption motive, creativity increases ad evaluations for large claim set-size, but not for small and medium claim set-sizes.

**Discussion**

In the current study, we manipulated consumption motive through the product category, with coffee being associated with hedonic consumption motives and furniture being associated with utilitarian consumption motives. As expected, we find that the impact of the use of creativity depends on consumption motive and claim set-size. Specifically, as we predicted, we found that creativity was more influential on $A_{Ad}$ and persuasiveness for utilitarian consumption compared to hedonic consumption. Further, for utilitarian consumption, creativity was more effective when the claim set-size was small (vs. larger). In contrast, for hedonic consumption, creativity was more effective for an advertisement with large (vs. smaller) claim set-size.

Although this study provides support for our hypotheses, the use of different products, and thus, claims and advertisements, presents limitations. Therefore, in study 2, we manipulate...
consumption motive using a scenario-based goal framing manipulation so that the same advertisement (with the same claims) can be used for both conditions. We also include additional measures to assess the theorized underlying process behind the creativity effects.

**Study 2**
Consumption motives can be hedonic or utilitarian based on the decision goal (e.g. Botti and McGill, 2010). Therefore, we manipulated consumption motive via a scenario-based goal framing task that allowed us to use the same product/advertisement for both conditions. Carry-on luggage was used as the product category as research indicates that carry-on luggage can be perceived as either hedonic or utilitarian (e.g. Benoit and Miller, 2017; Hirschman, 1986).

**Pretest**
A pretest \( (N = 36 \text{ students, } 66.7\% \text{ female}) \) confirmed that the manipulations were successful. Respondents read the decision scenario which included words and descriptions to trigger either a hedonic or a utilitarian consumption goal (Benoit and Miller, 2017) (see appendix), then they were directed to evaluate a carry-on advertisement. As expected, the hedonic decision task was seen as more hedonic \( (M = 3.72) \) than the utilitarian task \( (M = 2.65, p < .05) \) (Consumption motive scale: My reaction to the ad was based on 1 = rational attributes, 7 = my heart; I would describe my decision making process as: 1 = achieving a goal, 7 = experiencing pleasure, 1 = logical, 7 = emotional; \( \alpha = .85; \) Benoit and Miller, 2017). Pre-test participants also rated the creativity of either the creative or noncreative versions of 6 different real carry-on luggage ads. We then selected an ad for use in the main experiment whose noncreative and creative versions significantly differed on perceived creativity \( (M_{\text{Creative}} = 5.12, M_{\text{Noncreative}} = 2.90, p < .001) \) and whose means significantly differed from the scale midpoint 4 \( (p’s < .01) \).
Finally, in the last part of the pretest, participants assessed the perceived importance of 54 ad claims (1 = not at all, 7 = very important) that we collected from real luggage ads or websites. We then created two claim set-size conditions using claims of equal importance within each set (p’s > .1 for both Greenhouse-Geisser and Huynh-Feldt adjustments), and confirmed that the average importance of claims for small claim set-size (3 claims, \( M_{\text{Small}} = 5.05 \)) and large claim set-size (12 claims, \( M_{\text{Large}} = 5.06 \)) did not differ from each other (p’s > .9 for both adjustments).

**Method**

One-hundred-and-sixty-seven students participated in the main study (41.9% female). We employed a 2 (consumption motive: hedonic, utilitarian) x 2 (creativity: creative, noncreative) x 2 (claim set-size: small (3 claims), large (12 claims)) between-subjects design.

Respondents first read either the hedonic or utilitarian decision scenario depending on the consumption motive condition they were randomly assigned to. They then viewed one of the 4 advertisements (creative vs. noncreative x small vs. large claim set-size) (see appendix) and answered questions about their \( A_{\text{Ad}} \) (same measures as study 1; \( r = .68 \)). A timer which was invisible to the participant recorded how much time the respondent spent for the ad evaluation. Next, participants answered questions to assess overload feelings (“Overwhelmed,” “Confused,” “Overloaded,” “Tired;” \( \alpha = .82 \)) along with some filler positive emotions (“Happy”, “Joyful”, “Pleasant”). Next, they evaluated the ad’s creativity (1 = Not creative, 7 = Creative; 1 = Not novel, 7 = Novel; 1 = Not original, 7 = Original) (\( \alpha = .79 \)) and indicated to what degree this creativity was expected (1 = Much less, 7 = Much more creative ad than I expected). Then, participants completed the manipulation check questions (the same consumption motive scale from the pretest (\( \alpha = .67 \)) and a claim set-size perception question: “the number of the claims were: 1 = Too few, 7 = Too many”) and control variable questions (the same brand and ad
familiarity questions from study 1 as well as course name since participants were recruited from two different classes for this study).

Results

Manipulation checks

The manipulations of claim set-size ($M_{Small} = 3.98$, $M_{Large} = 6.16$; $t(165) = -13.45$), creativity ($M_{Creative} = 3.72$, $M_{Noncreative} = 2.87$; $t(165) = -4.47$), and consumption motive ($M_{Hedonic} = 3.36$, $M_{Utilitarian} = 2.67$; $t(165) = 3.63$) were successful ($p’s < .001$).

Hypothesis 1: Decision Context

In order to test whether creativity enhances ad evaluations more for utilitarian consumption motive than hedonic motive (H1), we ran an ANCOVA with $A_{Ad}$ as dependent variable and creativity (noncreative vs. creative) and consumption motive (hedonic vs. utilitarian) as independent variables, along with their interaction. There were main effects of creativity ($M_{Creative} = 4.60$, $M_{NonCreative} = 4.23$; $F(1, 160) = 3.4$, $p < .07$) and consumption motive ($M_{Hedonic} = 4.20$, $M_{Utilitarian} = 4.62$; $F(1, 160) = 5.16$, $p < .05$) (CV $p’s > .6$). Thus, there was a trend suggesting creativity enhanced ad effectiveness overall. However, consistent with H1, pre-planned comparisons\(^1\) showed that creativity does not matter for hedonic consumption ($M_{Creative} = 4.29$, $M_{NonCreative} = 4.11$, $p > .5$), while it matters for utilitarian consumption ($M_{Creative} = 4.89$, $M_{NonCreative} = 4.35$, $p < .05$). Also, when an ad is creative, it is perceived more positively if the consumption motive is utilitarian ($M_{UtilitarianCreative} = 4.89$, $M_{HedonicCreative} = 4.29$; $F(1, 160) = 5.06$,

\(^1\) Although the interaction was not significant ($p > .3$), the pre-planned comparisons were still statistically appropriate, since the tests are orthogonal, the number of tests is lower than “cell number-1” (8-1 = 7 in our design), and the tests were preplanned (see Iacobucci, 2001; Roberts and Russo, 2014).
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Together, these results suggest that creativity enhances ad evaluations more for utilitarian consumption motives than hedonic consumption motives, consistent with H1.

We hypothesized that creativity of an advertisement in a utilitarian consumption context is more valuable than in a hedonic consumption context (H1) because creativity is less expected in a utilitarian context. While Study 1’s Pretest 1 supported that consumers expect less creativity in a utilitarian (vs. hedonic) ad, in this study we test whether this unexpectedness mediates the positive impact of creativity in the utilitarian (vs. hedonic) consumption context. First, a three-way ANCOVA (DV: unexpectedness of creativity) showed that while the three-way interaction (creativity x consumption motive x claim set-size) was not statistically significant ($p > .3$), as expected there was an interaction of creativity level and consumption motive ($F(1, 156) = 6.14, p < .05$) (other two-way interactions and CV $p$’s $> .2$). The unexpectedness of creativity does not differ between the noncreative utilitarian ad ($M = 2.19$) and the noncreative hedonic ad ($M = 2.50$) ($p > .3$), while the creative utilitarian ad ($M = 3.26$) violated expectations of creativity more than the creative hedonic ad ($M = 2.54$) ($p < .01$).

Next, using PROCESS Model 4 (Hayes, 2013), we ran a bootstrapping mediation analysis (5,000 resamples) to test whether this unexpectedness of creativity for utilitarian consumption explains why creativity enhances evaluations more in a utilitarian (vs. hedonic) consumption context. We defined creative consumption motive as our independent variable (coded creative ad with utilitarian motive as 1, and creative ad with hedonic motive as 0), creativity unexpectedness as the mediator and $A_{Ad}$ as the dependent variable, again including our control variables. The findings indicated a significant indirect effect of utilitarian (vs. hedonic) creative ad on $A_{Ad}$ through creativity expectation/unexpectedness level ($\beta = .29, p < .05$) (CV and direct effect $p$’s $> .2$), supporting our theorized process.
Hypotheses 2 & 3: Consumption Motive and Claim Set-size

For testing H2 & H3 (creativity will increase ad evaluations for a small claim set-size for utilitarian consumption motives and for large claim set-size for hedonic consumption motives), we conducted a three-way ANCOVA with $A_{Ad}$ as our dependent variable. As expected, there was a three-way interaction (creativity level x claim set-size x consumption motive) ($F(1, 156) = 3.89, p = .05$) (CV p’s > .4). The planned comparisons showed that for utilitarian consumption motives, while creativity does not matter for large claim set-size ($M_{Creative} = 4.84, M_{Noncreative} = 4.53; p > .4$), when the claim set-size is small, creativity increases $A_{Ad}$ ($M_{Creative} = 4.95, M_{Noncreative} = 4.20; p < .05$). In contrast, for hedonic consumption motives, creativity does not significantly impact $A_{Ad}$ with small claim set-size ($M_{Creative} = 4.11, M_{Noncreative} = 4.37; p > .4$), but shows a positive trend on $A_{Ad}$ for a large claim set-size ($M_{Creative} = 4.48, M_{Noncreative} = 3.75; p < .07$). These findings support H2 & H3.

We argued that the impact of creativity would differ depending on consumption motive and claim set-size because consumers adopt different decision processes depending on their consumption motive when cognitive load increases due to higher number of claims. Those with a utilitarian consumption motive narrow their focus to the more relevant claim information, reducing focus on less relevant cues such as creativity, while those with a hedonic consumption motive use creativity as a heuristic cue to cope with overload and form their impressions about the advertisement. To test this theory, we ran a three-way ANCOVA with overload as the dependent variable and found a significant three-way interaction (creativity x claim set-size x consumption motive) ($F(1, 156) = 5.20, p < .05$). As expected, feelings of overload increased as...
claim set-size increased \((F(1, 156) = 70.39; M_{\text{small}} = 2.57, M_{\text{large}} = 4.17)\), for both hedonic and utilitarian consumption motives \((p's < .001)\). However, more importantly, consistent with our proposed process, the impact of creativity on overload depended on the consumption motive. We expected utilitarian consumption motive would narrow consumers’ focus to claim information, ignoring creativity. Indeed, planned comparisons showed that for the utilitarian consumption context, creativity did not impact overload feelings for either small or large claim set-size \((p's > .1)\). In contrast, we argued that with hedonic consumption motive, consumers use creativity as a heuristic to reduce overload when faced with large amounts of information. Consistent with this argument, in the hedonic consumption context with large claim set-size, participants reported lower overload for the creative ad compared to the noncreative one \((M_{\text{LargeCreative}} = 3.78, M_{\text{LargeNoncreative}} = 4.82; p < .01)\) (for small claim set-size \(p > .7\)).

To test whether this decrease in overload due to creativity helps explain the change in ad evaluation for the hedonic consumption context, using PROCESS Model 4 (Hayes, 2013), we ran a bootstrapping mediation analysis with 5,000 resamples with creativity as the independent variable by coding noncreative ad with large claim set-size and hedonic motive as 0 and creative ad with large claim set-size and hedonic motive as 1, \(A_{\text{Ad}}\) as the dependent variable, and overload as the mediator. We found support that for an advertisement with large claim set-size and hedonic motive, creativity increases \(A_{\text{Ad}}\) through decreased overload \((\beta = .45, p < .05)\) (CV and direct effect \(p's > .1\)). This is consistent with our theory that when the claim set-size is large and the consumption motive is hedonic, due to the overload, consumers tend to use creativity as a heuristic. In addition, if this is the mechanism, since heuristic processing is faster than systematic processing (De Neys, 2006), those with hedonic consumption motives should spend less time on the ad evaluation with large claim set-size if the advertisement is creative (vs. This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here at https://ligimarketing.files.wordpress.com. Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
noncreative). Indeed, we found support that for those with the hedonic consumption motive, for large claim set-size, creative ad decreased the time spent on the ad evaluation ($M_{Creative} = 38.49$ secs, $M_{Noncreative} = 65.52$ secs; $p < .01$) (CV p’s > .2) (for small claim set-size $p > .6$). Together these findings suggest that, parallel with our expectations, the increase in claim set-size leads to increased overload causing those with a hedonic consumption motive to shift to heuristic/peripheral processing, and use creativity as a cue to form their ad evaluations.

**Discussion**

Study 2 replicated our findings from study 1 while also providing empirical evidence for the proposed mechanism underlying these effects. Specifically, we again found that creativity is more influential for utilitarian consumption than hedonic consumption and that this effect is due to the relative unexpectedness of creativity in a utilitarian consumption context. Additionally, our results supported that for hedonic consumption, creativity becomes important for advertisement evaluation as claim set-size increases. This effect occurs because as claim-set size gets large, the increased amount of information leads to overload which leads consumers to use creativity as a heuristic cue to form their evaluations. In contrast, for utilitarian consumption, when the claim set-size is large, creativity becomes less relevant and does not reflect on overload. While for utilitarian consumption, creativity of the advertisement is generally more influential due to the unexpectedness of creativity, the creativity’s positive impact lessens as claim set-size increases because the increased information load leads consumers to narrow their focus to the more relevant claim information and discount peripheral elements such as creativity.

**General Discussion**

Although a majority of prior research supports the positive impact of creativity on an advertisement’s effectiveness (see *Journal of Advertising*, special issue on creativity, Sasser and
Koslow (eds.) 2008), the existence of contrary findings raises the question of under what conditions creativity impacts an advertisement’s effectiveness. In this paper, we identify two factors – consumption motive and claim set-size – which influence creativity’s impact. Since creativity is less expected when the consumption motive is utilitarian (vs. hedonic), its use is more impactful there. However, this impact is further influenced by the claim set-size. As the claim set-size of the advertisement increases, consumers start feeling overloaded. But, because with a utilitarian consumption motive, consumers are motivated to process the claims, these consumers deal with the resulting information overload by narrowing their focus to the most central information, claims, and paying less attention to peripheral cues, such as creativity. As a result, creativity has a larger impact on evaluations for smaller claim set-sizes in utilitarian consumption contexts. In contrast, when the consumption motive is hedonic, consumers deal with information overload by using creativity as a heuristic (peripheral cue) to form their advertisement evaluations. As a result, as cognitive load increases, they give greater weight to creativity, leading creativity to have a larger impact on evaluations when claim set-size is large.

Our research contributes to the creativity literature by being the first paper to explicitly study boundary conditions for when creativity matters and by showing the impact of consumption motive and claim set-size. In addition, our research expands the utilitarian (vs. hedonic) consumption literature by highlighting another way in which hedonic and utilitarian contexts differ. More specifically, we show how consumption motive interacts with claim set-size to impact the value of an advertisement’s creativity. Finally, our research expands the claim set-size literature by demonstrating that the effects of claim set-size depend on both consumption motive and features of the ad such as its level of creativity.
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Managerial Implications
The findings of this research have important practical applications for managers. While it has been widely accepted that ad creativity positively influences ad effectiveness, creativity requires a variety of resources, such as human resources, time, cognitive effort, and money. Thus, it is important to help marketers decide when to invest in creativity. Our paper shows that the value of creativity is affected by other elements of the advertisement and consumers’ consumption motives and presents a roadmap for marketers to assess when creativity is most impactful. For a utilitarian product or decision, creativity has a larger impact when the claim set-size is small. However, for a hedonic product or decision, creativity is most important when the claim set-size is large.

Marketers can determine their advertising strategy based on the decisions of whether to invest in creativity, whether to use a large (vs. small) claim set-size and whether the consumption motive is utilitarian (vs. hedonic). For instance, a new product might need to present more claims in their advertisement compared to an established product in order to inform the target audience as much as possible. In that case, if the consumers perceive that product category as hedonic, marketers investing in creativity will be worthwhile. However, if consumers perceive the product category as utilitarian, then marketers can choose not to invest in creativity. As another example, a marketer might not have the necessary resources such as money, time, or human resources to invest in creativity. In that case, if the product category is seen as hedonic, then marketers should include only those claims that are most important to the target audience in order to keep the claim set-size small. On the other hand, if the product category is seen as utilitarian, the marketer does not have to limit the number of claims, yet should tell more about the product.
While some product categories are utilitarian or hedonic by nature, as we showed in Study 2, marketers can also choose to position the product category as either a utilitarian or hedonic experience (e.g. Kronrod et al., 2011) depending on the amount of information to be communicated, and the ability to invest in creativity. For instance, if a marketer has a lot to say about his new product, and if s/he has the resources to invest in creativity, then the product should be framed as hedonic highlighting the experiential and affective sides of the product. On the other hand, if s/he does not have the resources to invest in creativity, then the product should be framed as utilitarian highlighting its performance and how it will help the consumer with a particular problem/need.

Limitations and Future Research
While in the advertising literature, it is common to apply experiments for the sake of internal validity, especially at the phase of theory development (like in our case), future research can focus on external validity and replicate our results in a more natural setting. In addition, we focused on consumption motive and claim set-size of an advertisement to understand their interaction with creativity. Future studies can examine other factors. For example, in our studies, we manipulated creativity via images and used mostly functional claims. Future research can study the impact of textual elements, such as the use of wordplay, on perceived creativity, as well as whether the nature of the claims (functional vs. hedonic) matters. In addition, while advertisers tend to hold textual and pictorial elements congruent with each other to enhance the ad message (Belch and Belch, 2018; Solomon, 2011), Heckler and Childers (1992) find that incongruence between these two elements can enhance ad effectiveness. Thus, future research can also study the impact of (in)congruence of textual and pictorial ad elements on creativity effectiveness.
In our research, we limited our exploration of the effects of consumption motive to situational influences on these motives and the consequent decision processes. However, individuals may differ in their proclivities towards one processing style vs. another. Future research can investigate how individual traits interact with situational factors to influence how consumers manage information overload and consequent effects on the impact of creativity. For example, might creativity never matter at any claim set-size for an individual who is a strong central processor? Similarly, might creativity always have strong effects for those who are strong peripheral processors?

Marketers and ad agencies strive for creativity and they spend various and plentiful resources to achieve it. Yet, more research is needed to understand when creativity in advertisements matters the most and consequently, when marketers should invest in creativity. This paper is the first to discover some boundary conditions in such regards. We invite researchers to expand the literature for this new -yet important- research area.
**APPENDIX**

**Study 1: Ads Used**

Below are descriptions of the stimuli used in Study 1. Exact stimuli are available from the authors upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Ad Used &amp; Creativity Manipulation</th>
<th>LAR (Utilitarian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Link to Original Ad</td>
<td><a href="https://www.adsoftheworld.com/media/print/lar_center_tired_furniture_3">https://www.adsoftheworld.com/media/print/lar_center_tired_furniture_3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Ad Used &amp; Creativity Manipulation</td>
<td>A white background added to the original advertisement/image. A line of text was added beneath the image stating “It is time to change your furniture. In our center, you will find it all.” This text was then followed by a bulleted list of claims. For the creative condition, the original image was kept as it is. For the noncreative condition, the drawer knobs and tie sticking out of the lower drawer were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Ad Used &amp; Creativity Manipulation</td>
<td>The list of claims was added beneath the coffee cup and above the company logo. For the creative condition, the original image was kept as it is. For the noncreative condition, the words “off” and “on” were removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims for small claim set condition:</th>
<th>LAR (Utilitarian)</th>
<th>BB (Hedonic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unique products</td>
<td>• Rich aroma</td>
<td>• Rich aroma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full delivery and installation</td>
<td>• Finest cup of coffee</td>
<td>• Finest cup of coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Payment options that will fit your budget</td>
<td>• Bold yet ideally balanced, with a subtle hint of smokiness and a sweet, clean finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims for medium claim set condition:</th>
<th>LAR (Utilitarian)</th>
<th>BB (Hedonic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same claims for small claim set condition</td>
<td>The same claims for medium claim set condition were used, plus these additional claims:</td>
<td>The same claims for small claim set condition were used, plus these additional claims:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were used, plus these additional claims:</td>
<td>• Low prices</td>
<td>• Fair trade certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low prices</td>
<td>• Finest service</td>
<td>• Rated in the top 1% in the world by the Coffee Quality Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finest service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims for large claim set condition:</th>
<th>LAR (Utilitarian)</th>
<th>BB (Hedonic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same claims for medium claim set condition</td>
<td>The same claims for medium claim set condition were used, plus these additional claims:</td>
<td>The same claims for medium claim set condition were used, plus these additional claims:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were used, plus these additional claims:</td>
<td>• Quick delivery</td>
<td>• Made from the world’s best grades of coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quick delivery</td>
<td>• Wide selection of brands</td>
<td>• A variety of premium coffees, ground and whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wide selection of brands</td>
<td>• Wide variety of products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wide variety of products</td>
<td>• Free shipping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Free shipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study 2: Scenarios Used

Hedonic Scenario:
Take a moment to imagine that you just got some time off and you will take a vacation...

This weekend you will take a flight for your fun vacation. You realize you do not have an appropriate carry-on bag.

You would like to find a carry-on that fits with your style and that would please you, starting your flight off right for your upcoming fun vacation.

You have been looking forward to this vacation knowing that it will be such a fun experience. You think that this vacation represents a great way to reward yourself and that you will be enjoying every part of your vacation. So first, you want to find a carry-on that appeals to you, and which will make you feel good, and the whole vacation experience more enjoyable.

Utilitarian Scenario:
Take a moment to imagine that you just got a job that requires frequent flights.

This weekend you need to take your first business trip. You realize you do not have an appropriate carry-on bag.

You know that when you practically live on the road, carry-on is the only way to go. So you should find a carry-on luggage which is of high quality and that you can use for your future trips as well.

In your brief research, you read that business travelers find versatility important in carry-ons. They prefer a carry-on that is functional and holds everything needed for a two to three day trip and that is both cabin-friendly and sturdy. Business travelers also find it useful to have a bag which is lightweight and is easy and fast to manage throughout airports.
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Next Page (Both Scenarios):
Having your trip in your mind, while looking at a magazine, you come across the following advertisement for Derimod carry-on. Please view the ad below.

**Study 2: Ads Used**

Below are descriptions of the stimuli used in Study 2. Exact stimuli are available from the authors upon request.

| Description of Ad Used & Creativity Manipulation | Background of ad was white fading into blue sky at the top. At approximately where the sky meets the white, the letters “FLY” were printed in red. Below this, was the brand name Derimod (also in red) along with their website. A horizontal grey line appeared below the website address. Below the line, the claims appeared. For the creative condition, the “L” in “FLY” was formed with an open piece of carry-on luggage shaped as the letter “L.” For the non-creative condition, the luggage image appeared to the right of the brand name. Ad was adapted from an advertisement for Delsey (a luggage brand) and Jashanmal (a department store in Dubai), see: [https://paragonanubis.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/teamy26rkwt.jpg](https://paragonanubis.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/teamy26rkwt.jpg) |
| Claims for small claim set condition: | • Honeycomb frame system provides lightweight durability • Large spinner wheels for effortless maneuvering • Large front panel for additional organization |
| Claims for large claim set condition: | The same claims for small claim set condition were used, plus the following claims: • Fabric abrasion resistant for long lasting wear and color • Official TSA locks with keys • Multi-stage locking handle system to adjust to the height that you prefer • Foam padded pocket provides protection and easy access to a laptop or iPad in the security line • Side bezels allow upright to stand on its side • All carry handles are padded for comfort • Fully framed construction absorbs shock upon and flexes back to its original shape • Polyurethane (PU) coated zipper which prevents water penetration • Stylish design |
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