conducted after taking into account the pattern of responses for all the ad communication questions.

First, it was important to determine if there were any contradictions in the subjects' answers. For instance, subjects may have said the sponsor was superior in response to an open-ended question, but chosen a different response option to the aided recall questions. The subjects' unique identifying number allowed examination of their responses to all ad-communication questions. No inconsistencies in the subjects' answers were found.

Second, a series of specific response patterns were created to reflect various degrees of deception. That is, whether subjects in the key combined comparative condition (condition one) reported that the sponsor brand was superior on speed of relief. Subjects who consistently reported that the sponsor was superior on speed of relief, while also reporting the comparison brand was inferior, were classified as the highest on a four-point deception scale. Subjects were classified in the next level of deception when they provided sponsor superiority responses on speed of relief in answer to the unaided recall question, and to both aided recall questions. The lowest level of deception was defined by subjects' choice of responses to the close-ended questions. Subjects needed to have chosen superior for the sponsor and inferior for the comparison brand on speed of relief. Finally, when the subjects' pattern of responses consistently expressed a parity comparison between the sponsor and the featured competitor, subjects were classified as not deceived, and received a negative score on the deception scale.

As the previous results indicated, not a single subject met the criteria necessary to be considered not deceived. All 78 subjects who answered the ad-communication