tend to be less scrutinized, exaggerated superiority statements may be used along with other claims that allow advertisers to suggest, sometimes falsely, that a brand is comparatively superior on important attributes.

Based on the previous discussion it is hypothesized that the combination of broad superiority statements and negated parity claims leads consumers to overgeneralize sponsor superiority. Negated parity claims are ambiguous and thus more susceptible to the influence of other ad elements in their interpretation (Harris 1977; Wyckham 1987). In addition, consumers expect a comparative ad to present only favorable information about the sponsor brand. Interpretation of the parity statements may be anchored on the superiority claims, which are consistent with consumers’ expectations (cf. Friestad and Wright 1994).

H1: The combination of exaggerated superiority statements or puffery with negated parity claims leads consumers to overgeneralize sponsor superiority on the attribute depicted by the parity claim.

H2: The combination of exaggerated superiority statements or puffery with negated parity claims suggests overall superiority of the sponsor over the comparison brand.

If an advertisement is to influence consumers’ product decisions, it has to be memorable. The most memorable elements of an ad may affect how consumers frame a problem, which brands enter a consideration set, and even how they formulate a search strategy (Hoch and Ha 1986; Lynch Marmorstein and Weigold 1988; Pechmann 1996). In order to explore framing’s lasting effects, a delay condition was included in this study.

Memory for specific attribute information decays to a greater extent than recall of general superiority statements (Alba and Chattopadhyay 1988; cf. Bartlett 1932; Sulin and Dooling 1974; Bransford, Barclay and Franks 1972). Thus, as memory for the parity