Two categorical dependent variables were created based on the points allocated to the brands. The first variable indicated whether the sponsor brand was preferred over the comparison brand and the filler, the second variable indicated whether the comparison brand was preferred over the sponsor and the filler. A conditional logit analysis was conducted for respondents who were not indifferent (i.e., did not allocate points equally to the three brands).

The analyses revealed two statistically significant main effects on the likelihood of choosing the sponsor over the other brands. As in the analysis of variance, the product category effect was statistically significant (ChiSq.=11.20, p<.008). Subjects in the pain reliever condition were more likely to choose the comparison brand Advil, than the sponsor Aleve. On the other hand, those in the antacid category chose the sponsor brand Zantac, over the comparison brand Pepcid AC. The second main effect was the order in which subjects answered the opinion questions (ChiSq.=7.98, p<.004). Subjects were more likely to choose the sponsor brand when they answered the ad-communication questions before they gave their opinion.

**Individual level analyses**

In copy tests for litigation, evidence of deception is generally presented in terms of the percentage of responses that replay the deceptive claim, after deducting the percentage of responses to a series of control questions. While this type of broad assessment of deception has satisfied the courts, it does not address whether individual consumers were or were not deceived by a specific ad. In order to determine with greater accuracy the number of subjects who may have been deceived, additional analyses were