*Results*

Data file opened 1:39pm EDT 8/12/19

The Luth survey company recruited participants to take part in the study. We set a target sample size of 1,500 participants, to be collected in two waves of 750. Luth collects data from participants in 20-minute sessions and considers a complete survey to be one in which the participant finishes the entire 20-minute session. Because each session contains a number of studies, there is inevitably dropout between the first and last study in the session; this means that although ~1500 participants completed the total session, 1,701 participants consented to take part in the survey and completed the target study (“Advertisements”). Similarly, although we refer to participants being split into two waves of 750, more than 750 participants completed the target study in each wave. The waves of the study are identified by when data collection began (4/13/18 for wave 1 and 4/16/18 at 2:05pm for wave 2.)

The dummy variable for condition was coded such that 1 = participants saw the McDonald’s ad first and 0 = they saw the Prudential ad first.

We excluded participants if they incorrectly responded to a pre-registered attention check item. Participants were told to select “slightly disagree” from a 7-item scale ranging from 1 = strongly agree to 7 = strongly disagree. The correct response was (5).

We conducted a structural equation model (SEM) measuring the effect of the independent variable (whether participants saw the McDonald’s ad first) on the dependent variable. The dependent variable was a latent variable measured by three indicator variables: likelihood to recommend McDonald’s, likelihood to recommend McDonald’s French fries, and likelihood to recommend McDonald’s food. Each of these indicator variables was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = Extremely Likely to 5 = Not at All. The first measured variable (recommend McDonald’s) was set to load on the latent variable with a loading of 1. The other two could load freely (note: this appears to be a default in Stata 16, but we specified the loading in the analysis script).

We included several demographic controls including gender, Hispanic ethnicity, race – Black/African American, race – Other, education – HS grad, education – some college, education – college grad, income – 30 to 50k, income – 50 to 75k, income – 75k to 100k, income – 100k plus, region – Midwest, region – South, and region – West. Each of these demographic controls was modeled as a latent variable predicted by a measured dummy variable (1 or 0). The measured variables were set with a loading value of 1 on the corresponding latent variable and with an error variance of 0. The independent variable for condition was specified in the same way as the demographic variables. The model then measured the effect of the latent constructs for each of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

\*A note: As in OLS, there needs to be a base case for each set of dummy variables. In this analysis, the base case was male (female = 0), ethnicity – not Hispanic (Hispanic = 0), race – white (Black & Other ethnicity = 0), education – less than high school (HS, some college, and college = 0), income – less than 30k (income 30-50, 50-75, 75-100, and 100+ = 0), and Northeast region (Midwest, South, and West = 0). We also computed dummy variables to indicate if each of the demographic variables was missing. However, because of all the dummy variables there were only 2 missing cases (only for region, and only in the set of Wave 2 participants) we did not include any of these “missing” dummies in the model. Including them would have prevented the analysis from completing due to the model not being concave.

**Wave 1 Results** (analysis started at 4:30pm EDT on 8/12/2019)

893 Wave 1 participants completed the study; of these, 811 met the pre-registered attention check conditions.

The SEM analysis revealed that participants who watched the McDonald’s ad first were more likely to recommend McDonald’s than those who watched it second (we expect a negative coefficient because stronger likelihood of recommendation is indicated by smaller values), *coef*. = -.047677, SE = .0134226, *z* = -3.55, *p* < .001, 95% CI: -.0739849, -.0213691.



**Wave 2 Results** (analysis started at 4:40pm on 8/12/2019)

808 Wave 2 participants completed the study; of these, 726 met the pre-registered attention check conditions.

The SEM analysis revealed that participants who watched the McDonald’s ad first were more likely to recommend McDonald’s than those who watched it second, *coef.* = -.0430469, SE = .0143515, *z* = -3.00, *p* = .003, 95% CI: -.0711753, -.0149185.



**Total Sample Results** (analysis started at 4:40pm EDT on 8/12/19)

1,701 total participants completed the study; of these, 1,537 met the pre-registered attention check conditions.

The SEM analysis revealed that participants who watched the McDonald’s ad first were more likely to recommend McDonald’s than those who watched it second, *coef.* = -.0451006, SE = .0098034, *z* = -4.60, *p* < .001, 95% CI: -.0643149, -.0258862

