generated). Distorted beliefs about non-featured attributes would suggest that evaluation-based inferences were generated. On the other hand, if priming was the responsible process, they expected to find that beliefs about attributes in non-comparative claims would be distorted, regardless of their typicality or correlation.

Their data was consistent with a priming explanation. Subjects rated attributes mentioned in non-comparative claims more favorably when direct comparative claims preceded such claims. Several issues must be raised regarding Barone and Miniard’s characterization of the process involved in copy by copy interactions. First, their description of the process is more consistent with framing than with priming effects. They argue that processing of direct comparative claims primes thoughts of superior performance of the sponsor against the comparison brand. As attention shifts to other parts of the ad, concepts primed by the previous claims will influence their interpretation of non-comparative statements. This is framing, not priming. Priming is a memory phenomenon referring to facilitative effects on recall or recognition from the increased accessibility of concepts that were previously activated. Shorter response times in recall or recognition of the target, for instance, is the usual dependent variable used to determine if priming took place (Ashcraft 1989; McNamara 1992).

Second, Barone and Miniard (1999) concluded that their findings were only consistent with a priming (framing) explanation, not with inferential processing. Framing and inferential processes are not mutually exclusive, however. Comprehension requires that we extract the general meaning of an advertisement, simplifying the details into the gist of the message. This process is often guided by the general theme of the ad and other salient elements. At the same time, comprehension involves elaboration upon the