the parity brand (ChiSq.=5.7, p<.01). Subjects in the complete comparison condition were less likely to recall sponsor superiority on speed of relief than subjects in the negated parity condition (2.7% and 8% respectively). H2 was also supported by the statistically significant main effect of ad condition for the close-ended recall questions about the parity brand (ChiSq.=5.93, p<.04). Significantly fewer subjects in the complete comparison condition said the sponsor was superior to the parity brand on speed of relief than subjects in the negated parity condition (14.8% versus 33%).

Sponsor superiority responses to the open-ended aided recall question did not support H2. As reported earlier, there were no statistically significant differences between the negated-parity condition subjects and those in the complete comparison condition (48.2% and 40.74% respectively, see Table 20). Table 22 summarizes results for H2.

Test of H3

H3 predicted that subjects would be less likely to generate false superiority inferences when the parity claim was phrased as a comparison of equality than when the claim was in negated form. Again, as discussed in relation to H1, the pattern of results from the statistically significant ad-condition main effects supports H3. Significantly fewer subjects in this condition versus the negated parity condition said the sponsor was superior on speed of relief over the parity brand. The effects were found for responses to the unaided recall question (1.3% versus 8%, ChiSq.=5.7, p<.01), to the aided open-ended question (11.1% versus 48.2% respectively, ChiSq.=7.44, p<.02), and to the close-ended recall question (18% versus 33%, ChiSq.=5.93, p<.04) (see Table 18). Table 23 summarizes results for H3.