Subjects were presented with four response options. The first three were comparative statements (i.e., the brand is superior, the same, or inferior), and the last was a *no opinion* option. As with the ad-communication questions, analyses were conducted to identify differences between those subjects who chose the first three response options and respondents who answered *no opinion*. There were no statistically significant differences between these groups. Cumulative multinomial logit analyses focused on the comparative statements.

There were statistically significant differences in the opinions of respondents based on the product category condition. When the question referred to the brand depicted as inferior on speed of relief, 57.7% of subjects in the antacid category said the sponsor (Zantac) was superior to Tagamet. Only 35.4% of those in the pain reliever category said the sponsor (Aleve) was superior to Tylenol (ChiSq.=6.04, p.<.01). When the question was asked about the parity brand, 58% of those in the antacid category said Zantac was superior to Pepcid on speed of relief, but only 30% said Aleve was superior to Advil (ChiSq.=4.66, p.<.03). On the other hand, 53.8% said Aleve and Advil were similar on speed of relief, but only 38.7% said that Zantac and Pepcid were similar.

**Brand Preference**

In order to assess brand preference, subjects were presented with the following scenario:

Imagine that you need to purchase a [TARGET CATEGORY] today… You have 20 points to allocate between brands. Indicate how likely you would be to purchase each of the following brands by assigning some of those 20 points to each of them. More points indicate a greater chance that you would purchase that brand. You must not exceed 20 points, so add up the points at the end to make sure you have assigned only 20 points between all brands. You may change the number of points you assign to each brand until you feel comfortable that they reflect your intended choice.