



CONFIDENTIAL

September 9, 1970

Mr. R. A. Blevins, Jr.
Mr. T. P. Haller

Re: TRIP REPORT TO CHICAGO SEPTEMBER 2, 1970

PURPOSE: To take our Winchester pack to Louis Cheskin Associates for ocular testing and to evaluate Cheskin's techniques as well as those of Container Corporation of America.

LOUIS CHESKIN

I spent Tuesday morning with Louis Cheskin and his associate, Vivian Martin, discussing their techniques. They intend to test our Winchester pack basically three ways--(1) visibility, (2) readability, and (3) eye-movement. All three tests will show the pack in a vertical position and then the last two tests will be repeated with the pack at a 45 degree angle. Visibility and readability are done by having the pack out of focus and then gradually bringing it in to focus and then determining at what point the respondent can identify the pack.

It is my understanding the pack will be presented in two settings--(1) on the counter of a store and (2) in a vending machine. I didn't see the laboratory facilities but in my opinion, Cheskin was unnecessarily vague about what they intended to do. After my discussions with him, I doubt very seriously we will learn very much from this study.

Other than his ocular tests, Cheskin has one test and he uses this for everything--themes, logos, packages, names, etc. He calls it a Controlled Association Test and it's done among 800 respondents in four cities. It is a simple one page self-administered questionnaire that uses polar adjectives in a check list format. He then compares the number of favorable associations to the number of unfavorable associations.

I found Louis Cheskin to be extremely cocky and self-centered. While he was a successful innovator in his day, he seems to be resting on the laurels of his past work and I doubt seriously that his basic technique has changed in the last 15 years. He's an interesting individual, but very definitely a name dropper and prone to ramble about his successes.

Although there is nothing magical about Cheskin's Controlled Association Test, I do think it would have some merit. On the other hand, I question his ocular tests. In these he uses a sample of only three people, although it can range as high as nine people, depending on "the vision of the respondents". Container Corporation uses a sample of at least 25 people for the same type tests and they were fairly emphatic that they considered three people to be too small a sample. On judgement, it does seem a sample of 25 people is more reasonable.

50081 0054

Mr. R. A. Blevins, Jr.
Mr. T. P. Haller

-2-

September 9, 1970

One interesting side light of my conversation with Cheskin concerned the use of eye-movement tests in evaluating print advertising. Cheskin had done a series of eye-movement tests on various print ads in the July 14 edition of Look magazine. The respondents were asked to thumb through the magazine and he tracked their eye-movement over the pages. It was interesting to note that certain print ads had no eye-movement at all. I asked Cheskin if eye-movement could be correlated with recall or at least those with no eye-movement correlated with low recall scores. He said this had been done in thousands of cases and the correlation proved (between the number of focus points and recall), but when pressed he became vague about documentation. He did however, suggest that we send him six of our print ads that we have previously tested for recall and that he would do eye-movement on them. He seemed certain that he could predict which one pulled the best and which one pulled least well. While it's not the ultimate answer, I feel that this area should be explored as it's possible that the attention-getting ability of the print ad could be measured by eye-movement; at least it may prove a good initial screening of a print ad. I propose that we continue to look into this on a low-cost low-priority basis.

CONTAINER CORPORATION OF AMERICA

I spent the afternoon of September 2 with Frank Tobolski, Joe Palka and Walter Langhammer of Container Corporation exploring the types of research that they do with special emphasis on packaging research. Their attitudinal type research made use of a semantic differential, generally on a seven point scale with none of the points labeled. Like Cheskin, they asked no open-end questions. I'm still looking into their technique and I am expecting more details in the mail.

Their main strength seems to be in the more quantitative type work. Here they use several techniques--(1) a T scope - this is a machine that flashes a picture of the package on a screen in fractions of a second. They show it to ten to 15 respondents at a time and generally use a sample of 100 to 150 people. The respondents are asked to write or draw what they saw and they determine how long it takes them to identify the package. (2) a machine to measure angles at which a name can be read. This is especially good for packages with a curved surface. This machine rotates the package clockwise and counter-clockwise until the name can be read. The angle is determined and projected onto an eight foot store aisle to determine the viewing area. (3) Variable diffuser. This machine brings into focus a package and they measure the number of clicks on a dial needed for the respondents to identify the pack. (4) Perceptometer. This used gray scales to determine the light that is needed to see something. It looks something like a set of binoculars and the respondent holds it up looking at a pack and gradually turns a dial until she can read the name. One of its uses is to determine how well subsidiary information on a pack stands out. They mentioned a pizza company that was interested in seeing how well the type of pizza stood out on the package. (5) Pupilometer. This,

50081 0055

September 9, 1970


of course, measures the contraction or dilation of pupil when responding to a stimulus. Surprisingly, they were very high on this machine and said that it had been especially useful in ranking the pull of various direct mail material. They said they would be interested in sharing the cost with us and they would attempt to rank the Camel Filter premium promotion that just recently was on the market, and for which we have results. I think this area should be explored.

It's interesting to note that they gave away their eye-movement machine ten years ago as they found the results to be unreadable. They mention that it can measure dis-interest and well as interest.

I think Container has something to offer us especially in the areas of point of sale and possibly in premium offers. They should be fairly cheap as they don't try to make a profit, but function as a service to Container's clients. They seem to be easy to work with and would probably be much better than Cheskin in terms of maintaining confidentiality.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. While I think Container Corporation and Cheskin have something to offer, I'm not completely satisfied with either of the two.
2. We should get more involved in ocular tests, especially for point of sale materials. Container would be the best of the two for this type of work.
3. We should, on an experimental, cost share basis, work with Container in the area of pupil dilation as a way to measure the attraction of various premium offers. The first test should be on our recent Camel Filter premium offer.
4. We should explore the possibility of using eye-movement tests as an initial screening of the attention-getting ability of a print ad. The first step is to look for existing documentation and to get other research houses' opinions in this area.
5. We should encourage more trips to research houses. I found my own trip to be very thought provoking and informative.


J. H. Sherrill, Jr.
Marketing Research Department

JHSh:pd

50081 0056