Advil, and 96.4% chose Tylenol. On the other hand, those in the antacid category more often preferred the sponsor brand Zantac to Pepcid AC (61.2%) and Tagamet (65.7%). No other effect was statistically significant for any of the three categorical variables.

**Individual level analyses**

As in the previous study, individual level analyses were conducted in order to determine with greater accuracy the number of subjects who may have been deceived. Each subject’s response pattern to the ad communication questions was considered.

First, no inconsistencies in the subjects’ answers were found. Second, a series of specific response patterns were created to reflect various degrees of deception. Subjects who consistently reported that the sponsor was superior on speed of relief over the parity brand were classified as the highest on a four-point deception scale. Subjects were classified in the next level of deception if they expressed sponsor superiority over the parity brand on speed of relief in either of the open-ended questions. The lowest level of deception was defined by subjects’ choice of response to the close-ended question about the parity brand. Finally, when subjects expressed a parity comparison between the sponsor and the featured competitor to any of the open-ended questions, subjects were classified as *not deceived*, and received a negative score on the deception scale.

No subject was classified at the highest level of deception. The majority of subjects (55%) were classified at the lowest level of the deception scale. These subjects answered that the sponsor was superior over the parity brand to a close-ended question. Sixteen percent of subjects met the criteria to be classified at the second level of deception. They expressed sponsor superiority on speed of relief in their answers to the