that ads be embedded in favorable context, too many unpredictable variables are at play during exposure conditions. There is no guarantee that consumers will have the opportunity to process the content and the ad in the appropriate order required for priming effects. Second, given advertising clutter, the actual impact of a priming cue embedded in surrounding content is likely to be minimal. Yi’s contribution is even more negligible in the context of public policy and legal decisions about deceptive advertising. It would be impossible to fault an advertiser with deception that results from the interaction of claims and an advertisement’s surrounding context.

Nevertheless, Yi’s focus on advertisers’ use of indirect strategies to change consumer beliefs is consistent with the previous discussion of combined comparatives. When there is little or no basis to make truthful claims about important attributes, advertisers indirectly suggest benefits rather than explicitly state falsehoods.

**Framing Effects and Combined Comparatives**

Currently, no advertising research has addressed the processing of combined comparative claims. However, the research of Barone and Miniard (1999) provides some insight, as they investigated deceptive partial comparatives. They specifically looked at copy by copy interactions, where processing of a direct comparison claim leads to false beliefs about a non-comparative claim. The researchers hypothesized that copy by copy interactions could result from one of two processes: inferences or priming effects. If inference processes were responsible, Barone and Miniard expected to find that beliefs about attributes featured in the non-comparative claims would be affected by the direct comparison claim. However, this would only occur if the attributes were typical (if schematic inferences were generated) or correlated (if probabilistic inferences were