so. In an additional study Johar found that involvement interacted with the amount of
processing demanded by the advertisement. That is, when the processing demands of an
ad were high (e.g., claims were qualified by an inconspicuous disclosure), only low
involvement subjects were deceived. High involvement subjects, on the other hand,
benefited from the information in the disclosure and were not deceived.

While involvement appears to play a significant role in generating such
inferences, the research reviewed here did not conceptualize involvement in terms of the
degree of care with which consumers processed the advertisements. Instead, the
operationalization manipulated personal relevance in terms of a time horizon (when the
product would be available) or location (availability of a product within the subjects’
geographic area). It would be more helpful to conceptualize personal involvement as the
extent to which consumers seek to avoid negative consequences associated with a
suboptimal choice (e.g., adverse health consequences, monetary loss, etc.). Then,
personal relevance of a message would be a better indicator of the degree of care with
which consumers process advertising information. Moreover, it would allow a better
assessment of the extent to which consumers will rely on such information when making
a decision (i.e., is the information material).

Research on implied claims has also focused on complete comparisons.
Wyckham (1987) presented consumers with implied superiority claims that included a
general comparison referent (e.g., “No leading brand gets rid of dandruff better than
Selsun Blue”). He found that a majority of subjects interpreted the claim to say that the
sponsor brand was superior to unnamed competitors. Consumers also believed the
superiority inferences to be true. In 1989, Snyder replicated Wyckham’s findings. More