MARKETING RESEARCH DEPARTMENT REPORT

MRD # : **79047**   **CONFIDENTIAL**   DATED: July 25, 1979

WRITTEN BY: Jeanne Bonhomme

Distribution: R. Fitzmaurice
T. Keim
J. Morgan

SUBJECT: Evaluation of low tar brand names

BACKGROUND

In order to evaluate five names for a new ultra-low tar cigarette entry, a central location test was conducted among low and ultra low tar smokers.

FINDINGS

1. Overall Ranking

In terms of interest in trying, the relative standing is as follows. The same general trend exists among men, as well as women.

	Interest in Trying Chose First or Second		
	Total %	Male %	Female %
Cambridge	53	58	50
Summit	45	43	48
Belmont	40	42	38
Mayfield	38	36	39
Sano	23	21	25

(See Table 1)

2. Attribute Ratings

Smokers were asked to rate each of the names on a "7" point scale for both product and smoker attributes.

For the most part the names, with the exception of Sano, elicited quite similar product and smoker profiles. Although the difference are slight the following directional trends exist.

Cambridge is visualized as a stylish brand for classy, older, educated white collar workers. Whereas Summit is perceived as a low tar brand which is smooth to the mouth and throat and slightly safer to smoke than the others. The Summit smoker, as imagined by respondents, would be:

> younger
> more modern, and
> one who prefers low tar brands

FILE: _____

The following menthol characteristics were associated more so with Summit than the other names:

> refreshing
> cool tasting, and
> for menthol smokers

(See Table 2 & 3)

3. Dislikes

Cambridge and Summit received the lowest level of criticisms. (Both 46%) A dislike was mentioned by 55% for both Belmont and Mayfield and by 71% for Sano.

The major dislikes for each name are:

	%
Cambridge	
Full flavor - too strong/harsh	14
Upscale - too high class/foreign	11
Summit	
Menthol/reminds me of menthol	15
Belmont	
Menthol/reminds me of menthol	14
Full flavor - too strong/harsh	13
Sounds like a racetrack	10
Mayfield	
Low tar - mild tasting/low in tar	10
Menthol/reminds me of menthol	9
Full flavor - too strong/harsh	9
Sano	
Full flavor - too strong/harsh	17
Foreign sounding name	11
Dislike the name/a poor name	11

(See Table 4)

4. Appropriateness of names for concepts

Respondents were asked to read two descriptions and then select the name which fit each description best and second best.

The descriptions read as follows:

> This is an ultra low tar product for those who prefer the milder taste of an ultra low tar cigarette.

"This is an ultra low tar cigarette that will
offer the lowest tar delivery of any product
on the market.

With the exception of Sano, the same pattern of strength emerged for both
concepts. With Summit being chosen more often than any other name and
Mayfield next. Since the patterns of response for four of the names was so
similar, the table below presents the concept data collapsed, (both concepts
combined) rather than individually. The individual numbers can be found in
Table 5.

Chose First or Second

| | Both concepts combined | | |
	Total	Male	Female
	%	%	%
Cambridge	33	35	31
Summit	51	52	51
Belmont	34	29	39
Mayfield	44	42	45

The Sano response was different for the two concepts. Sano was selected
more frequently for the "lowest tar" concept (43%) than for the "ultra low"
concept (34%). This high number of votes is due to the choices of men.

Chose First or Second

| | Sano | | |
	Total	Male	Female
	%	%	%
"Ultra low" concept	34	36	31
"Lowest tar" concept	43	49	36

(See Table 5)

METHOD

Who - Low and ultra low tar smokers, 18 years of age or older.

    1/2 men, 1/2 women
    1/2 18-34, 1/2 35 and over

What - Evaluated five alternative brand names. The order of exposure to the
    names was rotated from respondent to respondent to minimize positional
    bias. (See copy of packs Table 7)

How - In an identical manner to the methodology used in previously conducted
    name research. The procedure involved smokers viewing one name at a
    time on plain white packs, each of which had one brand name and nothing
    else printed on it. Then the smokers were asked to rate both the product
    and its' smoker on various characteristics using a "7" point semantic.
    differential scale. Subsequent questions included a ranking of the brands
    in terms of interest in trying and product dislikes for each name. After
    this, respondents were shown a description for an ultra low tar cigarette
    and asked to select the brand which was most and second most appropriate
    for it. They were then given another description, only this time for an
    ultra low tar product with the lowest tar delivery. Next, the appropriate-
    ness questions were re-asked. Furthermore, the order of exposure to the
    concepts was rotated to control for position bias. (See concept descriptions
    Table 6)

Where - Fort Worth, Chicago and suburban New York.

When - June, 1979

HOW TO READ THE DATA

    As a reminder, when reading average ratings obtained from 7 point scales
    (Table 2 and 3), it is important to read the ratings not only according to
    their position above or below the mean; that is better than average
    (greater than 4.0), poorer than average (less than 4.0) but also in terms
    of the range of scores actually obtained for all names. Because of this,
    the highest and lowest rating obtained for each characteristic is presented
    on these tables.

RANKING OF NAMES

(In Terms Of Which Would Like To Try)

	CAMBRIDGE			SUMMIT			BELMONT			MAYFIELD			SANO		
N =	Total (277) %	Male (134) %	Female (143) %	Total (277) %	Male (134) %	Female (143) %	Total (277) %	Male (134) %	Female (143) %	Total (277) %	Male (134) %	Female (143) %	Total (277) %	Male (134) %	Female (143) %
Ranked First	31	32	30	25	26	24	19	19	18	13	13	13	12	10	15
Second	22	26	20	20	17	24	21	23	20	25	23	26	11	11	10
First Or Second	53	58	50	45	43	48	40	42	38	38	36	39	23	21	25
Third	18	17	18	22	22	22	23	22	24	25	28	23	12	12	13
Fourth	16	14	18	23	26	20	24	21	27	21	19	22	16	19	13
Fifth	13	11	14	10	9	10	13	15	11	16	17	16	49	48	49
Fourth Or Fifth	29	25	32	33	35	30	37	36	38	37	36	38	65	67	62
Mean Ranking	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.2	2.2	2.3

QUESTION:

If I could give you a pack of only one of these five brands to try which one would you choose? (RECORD #1 NEXT TO THAT BRAND)

And, which would be your second choice? (RECORD #2 NEXT TO THAT BRAND)

And, which would be your third choice? (RECORD #3 NEXT TO THAT BRAND)

And, which would be your last choice, that is, the brand you'd least like to try? (RECORD #5 NEXT TO THAT BRAND)

TABLE 1

AVERAGE RATINGS ON PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES *

| | Range of All Names | | Cambridge | Summit | Belmont | Mayfield | Sano |
	Highest	Lowest					
N =	277	277	277	277	277	277	277
Good tasting (poor)	4.5	3.4	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.4
Strong tasting (weak)	4.3	3.8	4.3	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.0
Cool tasting (hot)	4.9	3.8	4.1	4.9	4.6	4.4	3.8
Refreshing (not)	4.7	3.5	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.1	3.5
Satisfying (not)	4.5	3.6	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.6
Low in tar and nicotine (high)	4.9	4.2	4.2	4.9	4.4	4.5	4.3
Safer to smoke (not)	4.1	3.6	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.6
Smooth to mouth & throat (harsh)	4.5	3.8	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.3	3.8
High quality (low)	4.7	3.6	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.6
Stylish (ordinary)	4.6	3.7	4.6	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.7
Good name for a cigarette (poor)	4.6	2.8	4.6	4.4	4.3	3.8	2.8

* Based on a 7 point scale. The low point (1) appears in parentheses.

4.0 = Average.

TABLE 2

2040260791

AVERAGE RATINGS ON SMOKER ATTRIBUTES *

	Range of All Names		Cambridge	Summit	Belmont	Mayfield	Sano
N =	Highest 277	Lowest 277	277	277	277	277	277
For smokers of low tar brands (high tar)	4.9	4.2	4.3	4.9	4.4	4.4	4.2
For menthol smokers (non-menthol)	4.6	3.6	3.6	4.6	4.4	3.8	3.8
For heavy smokers (light)	4.3	3.8	4.3	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.3
For men (women)	4.4	3.9	4.4	4.1	4.3	3.9	4.3
For younger smokers (older)	4.3	3.7	3.7	4.3	3.8	3.9	3.9
For educated people (uneducated)	4.5	3.9	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9
For white collar workers (blue)	4.2	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7
For health conscious people (not especially health conscious)	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9
For city people (country)	4.8	3.9	4.7	4.3	4.5	3.9	4.8
For modern people (old-fashioned)	4.6	3.9	4.4	4.6	4.3	3.9	4.3
For classy people (ordinary)	4.5	3.8	4.5	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8
For friendly people (cold and distant)	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0
For people like me (not)	4.1	3.2	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.2

* Based on a 7 point scale. The low point (1) appears in parentheses.

4.0 = Average

TABLE 3

DISLIKES BASED ON NAMES

	Cambridge 277 %	Summit 277 %	Belmont 277 %	Mayfield 277 %	Sano 277 %
N =					
Mentioned A "Dislike"	46	46	55	55	71
Full-Flavor (Net)	14	8	13	9	17
Strong taste	6	4	7	6	7
Harsh taste	6	3	4	3	10
High in tar	4	1	1	2	2
High in nicotine	3	1	-	1	1
Upscale Image (Net)	11	1	3	2	11
Too high class a name	6	1	2	1	-
Foreign sounding name	4	-	1	1	11
Sounds like a school	2	-	-	-	-
Low Tar (Net)	3	5	5	10	7
Mild/weak tasting	3	3	4	8	5
No taste	-	1	-	1	2
Low in tar/nicotine	1	2	2	2	2
Menthol/reminds me of menthol	3	15	14	9	4
Low quality	2	2	3	2	6
Sounds like a city	4	3	4	3	-
Not appropriate for a cigarette	3	3	3	6	4
Not menthol	2	1	2	3	1
Name has no class	1	1	1	1	4
Sounds dull	1	1	1	2	4
Sounds like a detergent/cleaning product	-	-	-	-	7
Sounds like a racetrack	-	-	10	-	-
Common/ordinary	-	1	7	-	1
Dislike the name	1	4	2	4	11
Similar to others on the market	-	2	3	2	2

Question: What, if anything, do you think you might dislike about (Brand)?

TABLE 4

NAME SELECTED AS FIRST OR SECOND
MOST APPROPRIATE FOR CONCEPT

	CAMBRIDGE			SUMMIT			BELMONT			MAYFIELD			SANO		
N =	Total 277 %	Male 134 %	Female 143 %	Total 277 %	Male 134 %	Female 143 %	Total 277 %	Male 134 %	Female 143 %	Total 277 %	Male 134 %	Female 143 %	Total 277 %	Male 134 %	Female 143 %
This is an ultra low-tar product for those who prefer the milder taste of an ultra low tar cigarette															
First Choice	16	18	15	27	28	27	13	10	17	23	22	24	21	23	18
Second Choice	16	19	14	25	23	27	21	22	21	24	23	24	13	13	13
First or Second Choice	32	37	29	52	51	54	34	32	38	47	45	48	34	36	31
This is an ultra low-tar cigarette that will offer the lowest tar delivery of any product on the market															
First Choice	15	13	16	23	26	20	16	10	20	19	17	20	28	33	23
Second Choice	18	19	16	27	27	28	18	16	20	22	21	22	15	16	13
First or Second Choice	33	32	32	50	53	48	34	26	40	41	38	42	43	49	36

Question: This (SHOW CONCEPT CARD P) is a description of one of the cigarettes we have been talking about. Which of the five brands do you think it is?

What other brand do you think it is?

This (SHOW CONCEPT CARD Q) is another description of the cigarettes we have been talking about. It could be the same name you mentioned before or a different one. Which of the five brands do you think it is?.

TABLE 5

This is an ultra low-tar product for those who prefer the milder taste of an ultra low-tar cigarette.

This is an ultra low-tar cigarette that will offer the lowest tar delivery of any product on the market.

TABLE 6

REPRODUCTION OF PACKS

TABLE 7