one claim on another when these are presented within the same ad, their findings are not entirely helpful in understanding the processes involved in such effects.

**Framing Effects involving Parity and Superiority Claims.** In a previous chapter it was discussed how combined comparative claims may include parity statements, superiority claims, and even puffery and how they may refer to specific attributes or to general performance (Barry 1993). It was also argued that the form of the parity claims has been the source of a number of legal challenges. Claims such as "Brand X is not faster than [the sponsor]" which have been traditionally treated as parity claims, have recently been challenged because other comparative claims within the ad suggest to consumers a superiority interpretation. That is, consumers take away that “Brand X is slower than [the sponsor]”, even if that interpretation has no factual basis.

The problem with the form of such parity claims is that their interpretation is strongly suggested by everyday language conventions (Grice 1977; Harris and Monaco 1978). For subjects, negating a dichotomous antonym (e.g., “not alive”) logically implies its antonym (dead), while negating a continuous antonym (e.g., “not hot”) pragmatically implies its antonym (cold). As a result, subjects erroneously identify the pragmatically implied antonyms as if they were the original sentences (Brewer and Lichtenstein 1975).

Other evidence of linguistic and verbal framing effects has been reported in studies involving logical reasoning tasks (Fiedler and Hertel 1994). When testing an if \( p \) then \( q \) rule, such as “If you tell the truth, I will treat you kind” subjects easily understand the rule to mean if \( q \) then \( p \), that is, “If you want me to treat you kind, you have to tell the truth.” Given a problem-solving task, subjects were less likely to attempt to falsify the rule (to test with not-\( q \)), unless they were instructed to do so. Thus, it does not appear