

Division of Research  
Graduate School of Business Administration

May 1987

THE ASSOCIATION EFFECT  
IN COMPARATIVE ADVERTISING

Working Paper #461A

David A. Horne  
University of Michigan

Michael D. Johnson  
University of Michigan

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

None of this material is to be quoted or  
reproduced without the expressed permission  
of the Division of Research.

Copyright 1987  
University of Michigan  
School of Business Administration  
Ann Arbor Michigan 48109



THE ASSOCIATION EFFECT IN COMPARATIVE ADVERTISING\*

by

David A. Horne and Michael D. Johnson\*\*

The University of Michigan  
Graduate School of Business Administration

May, 1987

\* This manuscript may not be quoted or reproduced without the prior permission of the authors.

\*\* Authors' names are in alphabetical order. David A. Horne is Visiting Assistant Professor of Marketing and Michael D. Johnson is Assistant Professor of Marketing, both at the University of Michigan's Graduate School of Business Administration, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1234. The authors thank Donald R. Lehmann for his helpful comments on an eariler draft of this manuscript. The assistance of Kurt R. Gerber in conducting the experiments and data analysis as well as the financial assistance of the University of Michigan's School of Business Adminsitration are also gratefully acknowledged.



## ABSTRACT

The paper explores both empirical results and provides a psychological explanation of comparative advertising's ability to foster association between brands in a product category (Gorn and Weinberg 1984). Two qualitatively different experiments, one involving forced exposure to comparative ads and one involving more natural exposure to comparative ads embedded in text, demonstrate both the robustness of the association effect as well as limited support for the effect of ad layout on association.

## INTRODUCTION

Ever since the early 1970's when the FTC began encouraging explicit comparative advertising, investigators have been examining the effects of this communication format on consumers. Most of this research has contrasted effectiveness measures, cognitive responses, and/or situational covariates between comparative and non-comparative ad conditions. On the positive side, studies by Prasad (1976), Sheluga and Jacoby (1978), Shimp and Dyer (1978), McDougall (1978), Swinyard (1981), Etgar and Goodwin (1982), Demirdjian (1983), Gorn and Weinberg (1984), and Walker, Swasy, and Rethans (1986) all offer some level of support for comparative advertising being more "effective," at least under some circumstances. In contrast, studies by Wilson (1976), Levine (1977), Pride, Lamb, and Pletcher (1977), Golden (1979), Goodwin and Etgar (1980), Wilson and Muderrisoglu (1980), Murphy and Amundsen (1981), Belch (1981), and Taschian and Slama (1984) all found comparative ads "no-more" or even less effective than noncomparative ads. (Ash and Wee (1983) and Lincoln and Salmi (1979) both provide an in-depth look at most of these comparative advertising studies.)

Although these empirical results have been somewhat inconsistent, there is an intriguing exception. In two recent studies, comparative ads have been

shown to promote perceptual similarity or an association between brands in the same product category (Gorn and Weinberg 1984; Walker, Swasy, and Rethans 1986). This potential association or similarity effect may be why Hisrich (1983) reports generally favorable attitudes toward and experiences with comparative advertising among advertising agencies. It also suggests that comparative advertising is foremost a product positioning tool and that comparative ads should be judged on their ability to affect a product's perceived position (Shimp and Dyer 1978; Wilkie and Farris 1975).

The goal of this paper is to present the results of two qualitatively different studies which test the ability of different comparative ads, as well as ad layouts, to promote perceptual similarity. First we briefly describe both an existing explanation of this association effect and an expanded, complementary explanation based on associated product features (Tversky 1977). The research hypotheses are then developed and tested in the two experiments. The results strongly support the potential for comparative ads to promote association, even when ads appear to be differentiating products. Limited support is also provided for particular ad layouts either fostering or inhibiting association.

#### RESEARCH ON THE ASSOCIATION EFFECT

Gorn and Weinberg (1984) first demonstrated the positive effect of comparative ads on product association. These authors, using actual ads taken from three different product categories (toothpastes, cigarettes, and golf balls) in a controlled setting, showed that comparative ads increased the perceived similarity of leading brands and challengers relative to noncomparative ads. More recently, Walker et al. (1986) showed directional though nonsignificant support for comparative ads increasing the perceived similarity among brands of beer, but only when the products in the ads where

in the same category of brands. Walker et al. also suggest that a categorization-based theoretical framework may explain this apparent association effect. They argue that consumers simplify their processing tasks by placing products into categories, and that comparative ads attempt to establish a new brand within a basic category in the consumers' minds. (This categorization approach builds on work in psychology by Rosch (1975; Rosch et al. 1976) and in consumer behavior by Sujan (1985).)

A complementary view of how comparative ads affect perception, based on Tversky's (1977) contrast model of similarity, provides additional insight into this "association effect." Tversky argues that when people judge similarity they extract and compile from memory a limited list of features that they associate to the stimuli in question. Proximity judgments are simply the result of a contrasting of the common and distinctive features we associate to the stimuli. Common features add to similarity while distinctive features detract. Tversky also argues that the salience or weight of different common and distinctive features varies with the context of the judgment. Judgments of similarity, for example, focus attention on common features while judgments of dissimilarity focus attention on distinctive features. Alternatively, focusing on a particular product in a comparison should increase the salience of that product's features. (See Tversky (1977) or Johnson (1986) for a more detailed description of the model and Tversky (1977), Tversky and Gati (1978), and/or Johnson (1981, 1986) for examples of these contextual effects.)

Overall, consideration of the categorization of products, combined with the notion that association or inclusion in a category is a function of common and distinctive features, explains why comparative ads involving brands from the same category should promote association. First of all, brands from the

same basic product category, by their very nature, should have more common than distinctive features. Consider, for example, the correspondence between traditional product categories and the basic level categories described in the psychological literature (Rosch et al. 1976; Murphy and Smith 1982; Tversky and Hemenway 1984). Both exhibit a high degree of category inclusiveness, defined as the ratio of common to distinctive attributes among the members of the category (Rosch et al. 1976). (A recent study by Johnson and Fornell (1987) supports the similarity between the basic level categories studied in psychology and typical consumer product and service categories.) Second, the contrast model predicts that if two products are associated with more common than distinctive features (*ceteris parabis*), a comparative ad involving the products should reinforce the similarity of the products in the minds of consumers.

Therefore, one would generally predict that comparative ads involving products from the same basic category should increase or reinforce the perceived similarity of the products. (Naturally, as the category from which the brands are taken is expanded to include more distant competitors, association should diminish and differentiation may then occur (cf. Walker et al. 1986).) This prediction, which is consistent with the results of both the Gorn and Weinberg and the Walker et al. studies, constitutes our first hypothesis:

H1: Comparative advertisements involving products from the same basic product categories will increase the perceived similarity of the products.

What is particularly interesting about this prediction is the potential generality of the effect. It suggests, for example, that ads which appear to be comparatively differentiating relatively homogeneous products may perceptually associate those products.



Tversky's model, by considering the effects of context on perception, provides an additional insight and prediction regarding comparative advertising's effects on perception. Advertisers may view the layout of a comparative ad as a means to partially control the context of the desired product comparison. In particular, whether the ad focuses or anchors on a particular product may systematically affect ad-based perceptions (Johnson 1986). Recall that focusing on a particular product or object in a comparison increases the salience or weight of that product's features on perceptions. One very direct way to maximize the associative effect of a comparative ad may be to take advantage of this focus.

For example, a brand with relatively few distinctive features, such as a low share or new product entry, may want to position itself close to a relative market leader. Previous research (Johnson 1986) has shown that, in general, relative market leaders are associated with a greater number of distinctive features. Therefore, an effective comparative advertising strategy may be to focus or anchor on the nonleader to limit the salience of the market leader's distinctive features. Alternatively, focusing or anchoring the comparison on the leader should place more emphasis on the leader's larger distinctive feature set and limit the advertisement's ability to promote association. The results of a recent pilot study (Johnson and Horne 1987), involving ads for a new soft-drink, support the potential for such an effect.

Our second hypothesis centers on this contextual prediction. First we assume that a relative market leader is generally associated with more distinctive features than a relative nonleader. (Johnson (1981; 1986) provides direct and indirect support for this assumption in the beer and soft-drink categories.) The prediction, then, is that comparative ads which focus

on nonleaders should foster the associative effect of a comparative ad while comparative ads which focus on relative leaders should temper any increased association.

H2: Comparative ads which focus on relative nonleaders will result in greater perceived association than comparative ads which focus attention on relative market leaders.

Naturally, individual differences in preference and/or associated features may also affect these perceptions. The experiments reported below test both of these general hypotheses. Experiment one uses forced exposure to actual ads. Experiment two embeds the print ads used in experiment one in text to provide a more natural exposure condition.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### Advertising Stimuli

All the advertisements used in the two experiments involved explicit comparisons of two product or service alternatives. The products compared in each ad were offerings from the same traditional or basic level categories. In contrast to Gorn and Weinberg's original study, which demonstrated the associative effects of comparative relative to noncomparative ads, we focus specifically on comparative advertising's effects on perceived proximity. Therefore, rather than comparing comparative versus non-comparative advertising, we compare ad-based perceptions to a control (nonexposure) group to test hypothesis one and we compare perceptions based on different versions of the same comparative ads to test hypothesis two.

Five different advertisements were used to test the hypotheses. Three of the five ads were actual comparative advertisements obtained with agency and client assistance. Actual print ads were obtained for two products, Republic Airlines and Budget Rent-a-car. An actual television ad was obtained for Lincoln Mercury. All of these actual ads were either taken from a

different region of the country (Budget) or were just breaking (Republic, Lincoln). This insured at least minimal prior exposure of the ads to the test subjects. Each of these ads involved the explicit comparison of a sponsored, lower share product with a relative market leader at the time of the study (i.e., American Airlines, Hertz Rent-a-car, and Cadillac). These particular ads were chosen because 1) they contained an implicit product focus (one of the two products served as an anchor or initial focus of comparison), and 2) they could be modified in order to reverse the product focus while holding the copy (information) content constant. Existing copy lines, pictures, and other information were professionally rearranged to produce the leader/nonleader focus manipulation. The intent was to hold as much constant as possible except for the initial product focus. In one version of each ad the sponsor's product (e.g. Budget) was the starting point or focus of the comparison while a relative market leader (e.g. Hertz) was the referent. The other version of each ad reversed the sequence with the relative market leader serving as the initial anchor or focus and the sponsor's (nonleader) product serving as the referent.

The final two ads were print ads involving the comparison of new, hypothetical products with market leaders. One ad involved the comparison of a hypothetical fast food restaurant, Hamburger Heaven, to McDonald's and the other involved the comparison of a hypothetical toothpaste, Dazzle, to Crest. An advertising agency finalized the ad layouts and the names for the hypothetical products. The agency also created two versions of the ads, one using the new product as the focus and one using the established leader as the focus of the ad (again holding information content constant). All of the ads used to test the hypotheses are described in Table 1. (A manipulation check, in which separate groups of thirty subjects were each shown one version of the

ads, revealed no significant differences in the attractiveness of the two versions as measured on a seven point scale from "unattractive" to "attractive".)

#### Proximity Measure and Instructions

Our dependent measure of interest is the perceived position of the sponsor's product, specifically the perceived similarity of this product relative to the target product of comparison. In the pilot study (Johnson and Horne 1987), subjects were shown comparative ads and then asked to make pairwise similarity judgments among all the relevant brands in the product category. Similarity scaling procedures were then used to analyze changes in product positions across ad conditions. Unfortunately, this requires subjects to answer a large number of questions per advertisement.

A more direct measure of the products' positions was collected in both of the experiments reported here. In order to facilitate the task for consumers, two-dimensional multidimensional scaling spaces involving the relevant brands in a particular market (e.g. fast food alternatives, rent-a-car agencies) were used to measure consumer perceptions. The spaces themselves were constructed using data obtained from separate groups of subjects. The sponsored products in the test ads were included in the original judgments and then removed from the representation for subsequent data collection purposes. If the sponsored product was a hypothetical brand, it was not originally included and no adjustment was necessary. A separate perceptual map was constructed for each advertised category in the study.

After exposure to a test ad, subjects were shown a space for the product category and then asked to place the advertised product where they felt the product belonged in the space. Subjects were instructed to place an "X" in the space to indicate the position of the product and then to label the X with

the product's name. To practice the procedure, subjects were first shown a space/ad combination from a category that was not being tested. The practice space was described as a "picture" or "product map" in which the distances in the "picture" corresponded to the perceived differences among the products in the minds of consumers ("the closer together two brands, the more similar they are; the further apart two brands, the more dissimilar"). To avoid disagreement on the subjective interpretation of the spaces, no axes were labeled. The resulting dependent measure using this technique was the distance in millimeters from their "X" to the relative market leader mentioned in the comparative ad. The main advantages of this direct perceptual measurement methodology are its intuitive appeal to the subjects, the straightforward nature and interpretation of the average distance, and the efficiency of data collection. However, it is important that each perceptual depiction be an acceptable representation of the subject's consideration set. We make the traditional assumption that while consumers differ in their preference, overall perceptions are reasonably homogeneous.

#### EXPERIMENT ONE: FORCED EXPOSURE

##### Procedure

Subjects in the experiment included both undergraduate students from a large midwestern university (n=313) and adult mall intercept subjects recruited in a suburban mall of a major metropolitan area (n=239). One group of both student and mall subjects (n=278) was shown the comparative ads for the existing products (print ads for Republic and Budget, television ad for Lincoln). A second group of student and mall subjects (n=191) was exposed to the new (hypothetical) product ads (print ads for Hamburger Heaven and Dazzle). A control group of student subjects (n=83) saw no ads. The students were administered in a classroom setting. The mall intercept subjects were

administered in small groups at a consumer testing facility in a regional mall.

The experimental procedure was identical for both ad exposure groups. After describing the product maps and the placement task, a soft-drink space and ad were given to the subjects so they could practice the procedure. Subjects were then shown the test ads one at a time. Ad/stimulus order was counterbalanced across all subjects. After viewing each ad, the subjects placed the sponsored product directly in the space using a paper and pencil format (ads and spaces were presented in separate booklets to control ad exposure). After placing an "X" in each space and labeling it with the name of the product, each subject was also asked to list his/her first, second, and third choice from among the products in the space. This information was used to operationalize a preference measure in case individual differences in preference may be affecting the perceptual results. Within each ad exposure group, half of the subjects saw one version of each ad and half saw the remaining version.

The control group was given the same description of the product maps and the placement task. They also used a soft-drink space to practice the procedure by placing an excluded, existing product (Mountain Dew) into the space. Then, with no advertising stimuli, these control subjects were presented with the category spaces, one at a time, and asked to place and label the nonleader brands in their respective spaces. This control group performed the task very comfortably even for the hypothetical products, apparently on the basis of the names alone. The first, second, and third choice preference data was also collected. In the short time between our gathering of the ad-based perceptions and the perceptions of the control group, the airline industry changed radically (Northwest buying Republic,

People's Express and Eastern acquired by Texas Air Corp). Therefore, no control group perceptions were collected for Republic and the airline category was excluded from the testing of hypothesis one.

### Analysis

Three different dependent measures were obtained from the subject's placement of a sponsored product in a space, an absolute distance, an X coordinate, and Y coordinate, all in millimeters and all measured from the relative leader mentioned in an ad. The coordinate measures were averaged across the control group for each existing, nonleader product and compared to the products' original positions in their respective spaces to check the validity of our dependent measure. The product moment correlations between the distances from the original MDS product positions to the other products in a space and the distances from the control group's average positions to the other products were .89 and .99 respectively for the two existing products (Budget and Lincoln) supporting the validity of the measure.

The absolute distance measures were used to test the hypotheses within each product category. The distance measures were also standardized within each category and then combined to perform across category tests of the hypotheses. The independent variables included ad exposure (two levels: yes or no), focal position (two levels: initial focus on the nonleader versus initial focus on the leader), and the product category involved (five levels: Airlines, Rent-a-cars, Luxury Autos, Fast Food, and Toothpaste). (The subjects' relative preference for the leader, as an independent variable, was tested separately and found to have no significant effects on perceived similarity either within or across categories. Preliminary analyses also revealed no difference between the student and mall intercept ad exposure subjects.)

Simple single factor analysis of variance models were estimated to test the research hypotheses within each category. Two mixed effects models, including the dependent variable of interest (e.g. exposure) and a category interaction term (e.g. exposure by category), were used to test the hypotheses across categories. (A category level main effect was not included due to the standardization of the distance measures in the across-category tests.) As noted above, the across category test of hypothesis one did not include the airline category. The mixed effects model for hypothesis two used only the ad-based perceptions. Again, hypothesis one predicts increased proximity of the leader and nonleader brands for those subjects exposed to the comparative ads. Hypothesis two predicts increased proximity for those ads focusing on the relative nonleader as opposed to the leader.

### Results

The within-category results for both hypotheses are presented in Table 2. For hypothesis one, three of the four within-category differences were significantly different in the predicted direction. Overall, the across-category ANOVA reveals a significant main effect for ad exposure on perceived similarity ( $F=52.46$ ,  $p=.000$ ). These results are consistent with earlier results reported by Gorn and Weinberg (1984) and by Walker et al. (1986). Comparative ads for products in the same basic category appear to promote association between the products. The across-category results also reveal a significant category by exposure interaction ( $F=11.75$ ,  $p=.000$ ). Driving this interaction was the nonsignificant exposure effect for the Lincoln ads. This may suggest that the association effect is greater the newer or less established the product. Any relative familiarity of Lincoln over the other nonleader products may have mitigated any increased association. However, at least two other factors may have contributed to this finding. First, the



perceived proximity of the two cars by the control group (mean=20.00) suggests a possible ceiling effect because these two products were already very similar in the consumers' minds. Second, the Lincoln ad was the only television ad used in the study.

For hypothesis two, all five within-category ad layout differences were in the predicted direction. Only one, however, was significant (airlines). Overall, the across-category ANOVA revealed a significant effect for ad layout ( $F=9.74$ ,  $p=.002$ ). As predicted, initial focusing on the leader presumably increased the emphasis placed on the leader's distinctive features and hindered the association. (The category by layout interaction was not significant.) This result supports the notion that a very controllable advertising variable (i.e. product focus) may either enhance or temper the associative effects of a comparative campaign.

#### EXPERIMENT TWO: EMBEDDED ADS

In order to test our hypotheses under more natural conditions, the advertising agency that constructed and manipulated the ads for experiment one was used to construct four versions of a "new" magazine. The print ads used in experiment one involving Rent-a-cars, Airlines, Fast Food, and Toothpaste were embedded in the magazine text. The editorial content consisted of seven neutral articles and two photo essays. Each magazine was 74 pages long and contained 53 pages of text and pictures and 21 pages of advertisements. As in experiment one, the test ads included one-page ads for Budget Rent-a-car, Hamburger Heaven, and Dazzle Toothpaste and one two-page ad for Republic Airlines. There were fourteen other ads in the magazine (from one to four pages long). Two of the test magazines contained the nonleader-focus version of an ad while the remaining two magazines contained the leader-focus version. Each magazine contained one hypothetical product as focus ad, one hypothetical

product as referent ad, one actual nonleader as focus ad, and one actual nonleader as referent ad (i.e., the use of both the real and hypothetical products as well as the ad layout manipulation were counter-balanced across the magazines). The positions of the ads in the magazines were also reversed in the two magazines that contained the same ads. The magazines were all black and white copies, but were center stapled to appear genuine.

### Procedure

Four groups of thirty-two mall intercept subjects were each run through one of the four magazine conditions (n=128). Each subject was instructed to review the magazine and judge the appeal of both the stories and the ads. Subject were then shown to a quiet room where they could sit and review the magazine for 15 minutes minimum time. Subjects were timed for the 15 minute minimum exposure time. The average viewing time across subjects was 16.3 minutes. After reviewing the magazine, subjects were then shown to a separate room where they were given the test questionnaire.

The questionnaire contained, in order, a page with six questions regarding the attractiveness of six of the stories, a page containing instructions for obtaining the product placements (as in Experiment 1) as well as a sample space (for credit cards), five pages containing one practice space (a placement task for Sear's Discover card which had been advertised), the four test spaces (order rotated), and a last page containing two overall questions about the price and purchase likelihood of the magazine. The pages containing both the practice and test spaces first asked subjects to recall whether or not they remembered seeing the advertisement for the target product on a five-point scale (1 = definitely yes, 2 = I think so, 3 = not certain, 4 = I don't think so, 5 = definitely no). This recall measure, treated as an indicator of exposure, was used to test hypothesis one. The space for the

category was then presented and subjects were instructed to place an "X" where the sponsor belonged and label the product. At the bottom of each page, subjects were again asked for their first, second, and third choice from among the products in the space.

Given the nature of experiment two, subjects self-administered the questionnaire while an experimenter was near by to answer any questions. Overall, 114 of the 128 respondents (89%) filled out the questionnaires as instructed. Only these subjects' data were used in the analysis. The actual number of respondents providing usable data were 28, 26, 30, and 30 for magazines one through four respectively. There were a total of 452 usable observations.

### Analysis

The analysis for experiment two was identical to that for experiment one with the exception of recall replacing overt exposure as a means of testing hypothesis one. Given sample size restrictions at lower levels of recall, the five point recall scale was collapsed into a recall/no recall measure similar to the exposure/nonexposure variable in experiment one. Those subjects who reported definitely seeing or thinking they saw an ad (i.e., recall=1 or 2) were included in the recall group and those reporting they were not certain, did not think they saw, or definitely did not see an ad (i.e., recall=3, 4, or 5) were included in the no recall group. Hypothesis two was tested by comparing perceptions across the ad layout conditions for those subjects who reported definitely seeing the ads (i.e., recall=1). A validity check of our dependent measure, identical to that performed in experiment one, was performed using those consumers who reported not seeing or thinking they did not see the Budget and Republic ads. The correlations between the MDS and low recall subject distances were again quite high (.69 and .99 respectively for

Budget and Republic) again supporting the validity of the dependent measure. (The effect of individual level consumer preference was again checked and had no overall effect on perceptions.)

### Results

The within-category results for experiment two are reported in Table 2. Consistent with experiment one, experiment two strongly supports hypothesis one both within and across categories. Three of the four within-category differences between the recall and no recall groups were significant in the predicted direction. The across-category ANOVA reveals a significant overall main effect for recall ( $F=16.98$ ,  $p=.000$ ) and no category by recall interaction. The perceived similarity between the advertised products increased directly with the subjects' ability to recall the comparative ads.

Unlike experiment one, experiment two failed to support hypothesis two. Three of the four within-category differences between the ad layouts (see Table 2) were in the opposite direction from that predicted, although not significantly. The across-category ANOVA revealed no overall difference for ad layout and no ad layout by category interaction.

### DISCUSSION

Combined with the results of two previously reported studies (Gorn and Weinberg 1984; and Walker, Swasy, and Rethans 1986), the results reported here strongly support a general association effect for comparative ads involving similar products. Brands from the same category have more common than distinctive features and an explicit comparative ad appears to reinforce those commonalities. This empirical finding strengthens an industry view that comparative advertising is especially useful for low share or new market entries attempting to associate themselves with existing products, including market leaders (Phillips 1983). As alluded to earlier, this association may

occur even though an ad, on the surface, appears to be differentiating brands on one or more attributes (see Table 1). Anecdotal evidence supports this contention. When discussing the experimental results with the practitioners who provided the original Republic Airlines ad, the practitioners argued that their overall strategy was to associate Republic with the market leaders, even though the ad in question clearly differentiates Republic and American Airlines on flight schedules.

Our second hypothesis received only very limited support across the two experiments. There may be several reasons why the ad layout had a small, predictable effect on perceptions only under forced exposure. Consider the differences between the two experimental exposure conditions - forced and embedded in text. First, we do not know whether subjects in the more natural exposure condition had the same "level" of exposure as those in the forced exposure condition. A second possible explanation is that forced exposure advertising testing techniques allow the experimenter particular control over the consumers' attention allocation. The more controlled the procedure in terms of exposure, the more closely a contextual manipulation, such as focal position, may be maintained. A final explanation may be that focal position was not adequately or uniformly operationalized in the test ads.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTIONS OF ADVERTISEMENTS

Product Category	NonLeader Focus	Leader Focus
Rent-a-Cars	<p>Budget R at Top</p> <p>[Picture of 4-Door Lincoln]</p> <p>Headline: A BIG LINCOLN AT BUDGET COSTS LESS THAN A COMPACT CAR AT HERTZ</p> <p>[Outline of a small car]</p> <p>ONLY \$39.95</p> <p>For a Lincoln at Budget</p> <p>[Text with rate comparison + 800 phone number]</p>	<p>[Outline of a small car]</p> <p>Headline: A COMPACT CAR AT HERTZ COSTS MORE THAN A BIG LINCOLN AT BUDGET</p> <p>[Picture of 4-Door Lincoln]</p> <p>Only \$39.95</p> <p>For a Lincoln at Budget</p> <p>[Text with rate comparison + 800 number]</p>
Airlines	<p>Page 1: Republic takes delight in showing you our schedule</p> <p>[8 columns of airplanes each one with destination and time and Republic logo]</p> <p>Page 2: Republic takes even more delight in showing you Americans</p> <p>[1 column of airplanes each one with destination and time]</p>	<p>Page 1: Republic takes delight showing your American's schedule</p> <p>[1 column of airplanes each one with destination and time]</p> <p>Page 2: Republic takes even more delight in showing you our schedule</p>
Luxury Automobiles	<p>[Hotel valet parking - man and woman]</p> <p>Man: Lincoln Town Car, please</p> <p>[Shows three different Lincolns but no confusion]</p> <p>[Hotel valet parking - man and woman]</p> <p>Man: Black Cadillac, please</p> <p>[Confusions: which is which]</p> <p>Man: No, No, this is the Cadillac Lincoln TM</p>	<p>[8 columns of airplanes each one with destination and time and Republic logo]</p> <p>[Hotel valet parking - man and woman]</p> <p>Man: Black Cadillac, please</p> <p>[Confusion, which is which]</p> <p>Man: No, No, this is the Cadillac</p> <p>[Hotel valet parking - man and woman]</p> <p>Man: Lincoln town car, please</p> <p>[Show 3 Lincolns, but no confusion]</p> <p>Lincoln TM</p>
Fact Food Restaurants	<p>Headline: Send yourself to Hamburger Heaven</p> <p>[Halo next to copy]</p> <p>Subheadline: When the golden arches begin to fade</p> <p>[Fading arches]</p> <p>Tag line: Our Burgers are devine</p>	<p>Headline: When McDonald's golden arches begin to fade</p> <p>[Fading arches next to copy]</p> <p>Subheadline: Send yourself to Hamburger Heaven</p>
Toothpastes	<p>Headline: Get Dazzled</p> <p>[Hand by sink with tube of Dazzle]</p> <p>[Hand by sink with tube of Crest]</p> <p>Subheadline: When Crest Gets Dull</p> <p>Dazzle Fluoride Toothpaste</p>	<p>[Halo next to copy]</p> <p>Tag line: Our burgers are devine</p> <p>Headline: When Crest Gets Dull....</p> <p>[Hand by sink with Crest tube]</p> <p>[Hand by sink with Dazzle tube]</p> <p>Subheadline: Get Dazzled!</p> <p>Dazzle Fluoride Toothpaste</p>

TABLE 2  
PERCEIVED DISTANCES BETWEEN ADVERTISED PRODUCTS

EXPERIMENT ONE

Hypothesis One: Ad Exposure

	Ad Group	Control Group	F (sign.)
1. Budget v. Hertz	77.91 (276)	97.87 (83)	14.45 (.000)
2. Lincoln v. Cadillac	23.64 (274)	20.00 (83)	2.46 (.117)
3. Hamb. Heaven v. McDonalds	34.57 (191)	47.15 (83)	21.53 (.000)
4. Dazzle v. Crest	66.65 (191)	105.83 (83)	59.38 (.000)

Hypothesis Two: Ad Layout

	Nonleader Focus	Leader Focus	F (sign.)
1. Budget v. Hertz	75.28 (131)	80.29 (145)	0.98 (.334)
2. Republic v. American	30.89 (132)	37.87 (145)	4.24 (.040)
3. Lincoln v. Cadillac	22.06 (130)	24.73 (144)	1.37 (.243)
4. Hamb. Heaven v. McDonalds	32.34 (99)	36.96 (92)	2.21 (.138)
5. Dazzle v. Crest	62.61 (92)	70.40 (99)	1.74 (.189)

TABLE 2 (cont.)

## EXPERIMENT TWO

## Hypothesis One: Ad Recall (Exposure)

	Recall Group	No Recall Group	F (sign.)
1. Budget v. Hertz	75.86 (71)	89.50 (42)	1.80 (.182)
2. Republic v. American	29.58 (77)	42.58 (36)	3.98 (.048)
3. Hamb. Heaven v. McDonalds	29.42 (88)	42.29 (24)	4.73 (.032)
4. Dazzle v. Crest	55.04 (77)	78.27 (37)	7.69 (.006)

## Hypothesis Two: Ad Layout

	Nonleader Focus	Leader Focus	F (sign.)
1. Budget v. Hertz	86.40 (30)	67.65 (26)	1.94 (.170)
2. Republic v. American	27.31 (32)	29.08 (36)	0.06 (.814)
3. Hamb. Heaven v. McDonalds	30.02 (41)	28.88 (42)	0.05 (.829)
4. Dazzle v. Crest	60.24 (33)	49.00 (36)	1.16 (.285)

---

Cell sizes in parentheses.



## REFERENCES

- Ash, Stephen B. and Chow-Hou Wee (1983), "Comparative Advertising: A Review With Implications for Further Research," in R. Bagozzi and A. Tybout (eds.), Advances in Consumer Research, Association for Consumer Research, 10, 370-376.
- Belch, George E. (1981), "An Examination of Comparative and Noncomparative Television Commercials: The Effects of Claim Variation and Repetition on Cognitive Response and Message Acceptance," Journal of Marketing Research, 18 (August), 333-349.
- Demirdjian, Z. S. (1983), "Sales Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising: An Experimental Field Investigation," Journal of Consumer Research, 10 (December), 362-364.
- Etgar, Michael and Stephen A. Goodwin (1982), "One-Sided Versus Two-Sided Comparative Message Appeals for New Brand Introductions," Journal of Consumer Research, 8 (March), 460-465.
- Gati, Itamar and Amos Tversky (1982), "Representations of Qualitative and Quantitative Dimensions," Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perceptions and Performance, 8 (2), 325-340.
- Golden, Linda L. (1979), "Consumer Reactions to Explicit Brand Comparisons in Advertisements," Journal of Marketing Research, 16 (November), 517-532.
- Goodwin, Stephen A. and Michael Etgar (1980), "An Experimental Investigation of Comparative Advertising: Impact of Message Appeal, Information Load, and Utility of Product Class," Journal of Marketing Research, 17 (May), 187-202.
- Gorn, Gerald J. and Charles B. Weinberg (1984), "The Impact of Comparative Advertising on Perception and Attitude: Some Positive Findings," Journal of Consumer Research, 11 (September), 719-727.
- Hisrich, Robert D. (1983), "Executive Advertisers' Views of Comparative Advertising," Sloan Management Review, (Fall), 39-50.
- Johnson, Michael D. (1981), "Context Effects in Product Perception," in K. Monroe (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, Association for Consumer Research, 8, 112-115.
- Johnson, Michael D. (1986), "Consumer Similarity Judgments: A Test of the Contrast Model," Psychology and Marketing, 3 (1), 47-60.
- Johnson, Michael D. and David A. Horne (1987), "Subject/Referent Positioning in Comparative Advertising: A Pilot Study," in M. Wallendorf and P. Anderson (eds.), Advances in Consumer Research, 14, 164-167.
- Johnson, Michael D. and Claes Fornell (1987), "The Nature and Methodological Implications of the Cognitive Representative of Products," Journal of Consumer Research, forthcoming.

- Levine, Philip (1976), "Commercials That Name Competing Brands," Journal of Advertising Research, 16, No. 6 (December), 7-14.
- Lincoln, Douglas J. and A. Cockun Salmi (1979), "Empirical Evidence of Comparative Advertising's Effects: A Review and Synthesis," Proceedings: Educators' Conference, American Marketing Association, 367-372.
- McDougall, Gordon H. G. (1978), "Comparative Advertising: The Effect of Claim Type and Brand Loyalty," Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 39-52.
- Murphy, John H. II and Mary S. Amundsen (1981), "The Communications-Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising For a New Brand on Users of the Dominant Brand," Journal of Advertising, 10, No. 1, 14-20 & 48.
- Murphy, George L., and Edward E. Smith (1982), "Basic-Level Superiority in Picture Categorization," Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 21 (1), 1-20.
- Philips, Graham (1983), "Naming the Competition in Advertising. Is It Effective and When Do You Do It?" Viewpoint, Fall, 32-38.
- Prasad, V. Kanti (1976). "Communications Effectiveness Comparative Advertising: A Laboratory Analysis," Journal of Marketing Research, 13 (May), 128-137.
- Pride, William M., Charles W. Lamb, Jr., and Barbara A. Pletcher (1977), "Are Comparative Advertisements More Informative for Owners of the Mentioned Competing Brand Than for Nonowners?" Proceedings: Educators' Conference, American Marketing Association (August), 298-301.
- Rosch, Eleanor (1975), "Cognitive Representation of Semantic Categories," Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 104, 192-133.
- Rosch, Eleanor, Carolyn B. Mervis, Wayne D. Gray, David M. Johnson, and Penny Boyes-Braem (1976), "Basic Objects in Natural Categories," Cognitive Psychology, 8, 382-439.
- Sheluga, David A. and Jacob Jacoby (1978), "Do Comparative Claims Encourage Comparison Shopping?" Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 23-37.
- Shimp, Terence A. and David D. Dyer (1978), "The Effects of Comparative Advertising Mediated by Market Position of Sponsoring Brand," Journal of Advertising, 3, 13-19.
- Sujan, Mita (1985), "Consumer Knowledge: Effects on Evaluation Strategies Mediating Consumer Judgments," Journal of Consumer Research, 12 (June), 31-46.
- Swinyard, William R. (1981), "The Interaction Between Comparative Advertising and Copy Claim Variation," Journal of Marketing Research, 18 (May), 175-186.

- Taschian, Roobina O. and Mark E. Slama (1984), "Involvement and The Effectiveness of Comparative Advertising," Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 79-92.
- Tversky, Amos (1977), "Features of Similarity," Psychological Review, 84 (4), 327-352.
- Tversky, Amos and Itamar Gati (1978), "Studies of Similarity," in Rosch and Lloyd (eds.), Cognition and Categorization, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey, Chapter 4, 79-98.
- Tversky, Amos and Itamar Gati (1982), "Similarity, Separability, and the Triangle Inequality," Psychological Review, 89 (2), 123-154.
- Tversky, Barbara and Kathleen Hemenway (1984), "Objects, Parts, and Categories," Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 113 (2), 169-193.
- Walker, Beth A., John L. Swasy, and Arno J. Rethans (1986), "The Impact of Comparative Advertising or Perception Formation in New Product Introductions," in R. Lutz (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, 13, 121-125.
- Wilkie, William L. and Paul W. Farris (1975), "Comparison Advertising: Problems and Potential," Journal of Marketing, 39 (October), 7-15.
- Wilson, R. Dale (1976), "An Empirical Evaluation of Comparative Advertising Messages: Subjects' Responses on Perceptual Dimensions," in B. Anderson (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, 3, 53-57.
- Wilson, R. Dale and Aydin Muderrisoglu (1980), "An Analysis of Cognitive Responses to Comparative Advertising," in J. Olson (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, 7, 566-571.