

cc file

Lorillard

MEMORANDUM

April 15, 1977

TO: File

FROM: B. Vila

SUBJECT: 30-Pack

This summarizes observations at 5 focus group sessions (2 male, 3 female) conducted in Ridgewood, New Jersey for creative guidance in our development work behind a 30 pack full flavored cigarette. The basis for interest in the product traces to concept testing in an array of other "economy" concepts, plus the judgement that this brand offers a unique opportunity to offer a full flavor cigarette at low T/N levels. Preliminary economics suggest the brand would cost +33% vs. ordinary cigarettes. At the sessions, consumers were exposed to both ads/product prototypes. Certain D.Q's were asked on a) spelling/presentation of the term 30's on the package, and b) alternative appearances. The summary includes discussion among observers as well as consumers in the groups.

1. Observations tend to confirm that the cigarette will more likely appeal most to female smokers than to men. Both male and female respondents agreed this would be a feminine cigarette. While the response changed somewhat in the direction of "neutral" in the ad showing a man smoking, reaction to both product and the balance of the ads showed a strong natural identification of the product with ladies. In any case, 2 of the 3 female groups expressed enthusiasm for the product; none of the male groups did.
2. Observations further suggest that to improve our chances of success, additional testing of separate product alternatives should be conducted.

91288490

April 15, 1977

-- All respondents indicated that the taste of the product was stronger than anticipated. To many, e.g., those drawn by lower T/N, this was definitely a positive. To others, however, the full flavor was a disappointing negative vis-a-vis their expectation of mild flavor. Some of these were women, particularly women already smoking thin cigarettes, who are probably our prime audience. Based on our LT Brown experience, it makes sense to test more than one alternative. *to a few true*

-- It is possible that the existing circumference may be too slim for general acceptance even relative to other slim cigarettes. Some respondents volunteered that they would prefer a combination of number per pack/circumference closer to where they are today. We know from 120's how serious this problem can be in generating broad acceptance. If we simply stick to where we are (30-19mm) we are running an important risk of losing a concept which might be more viable in a different configuration (e.g. 25-21mm or whatever).

3. Beyond testing the above to find the best combination, there seems to be a genuine problem with how fast the cigarettes burn. Consumers attributed this to the circumference. It is a particularly big problem in that it suggests "gimmickry" -- an underhanded way for a manufacturer to increase margin, or a situation which negates the perceived advantage that the user would cut down on the number of packs smoked per day.

Secondarily negatives were expressed on pressure drop and the appearance of the paper. Respondents expressed a desire for greater "substance" in the paper than in the one used in these cigarettes.

4. To the degree that the concept is valid, none of the preliminary ads provoked very much involvement. While we may be wrong to be guided totally by groups, respondents in these particular sessions expressed an interest in more imagery/personalization instead of the fairly unadorned presentations submitted to them. "Thanks" elicited cognitive dissonance (even if it was liked best by one of the groups). "News room" was manufacturer

91288491

April 15, 1977

conversation. "The only way" was much too complicated, argumentative and again manufacturer-oriented. "Most" and "Introducing" were the best, with a clear advantage towards the latter. None of the ads did a superior job capturing/conveying the essential idea.

*the ad was
was conveyed
but not
a
positive
way.*

5. T/N is an important benefit. Minimally, it's the "price of admission" into the category. Maximally, it presents the best context for justifying the firm/talking taste. However, it is a controversial subject in that it may provoke questions on the total T/N intake/pack, and it is "old hat" vs. all the recent new entries. None of the ads seemed to capture the "ideal" balance between the positive and negatives.

6. To the degree that we stay with the current product, it is important to communicate that this is a full-flavored cigarette. One consumer volunteered that a description of the product as a full flavored cigarette with low T/N, which, incidentally, comes packed 30's, might be clearer.

7. Most consumers found the "a few pennies more" disclosure misleading vis-a-vis the actual upcharge involved. The reaction to feeling misled was decidedly negative. We need a better disclosure. As we consider fewer cigarettes (25 vs. 30) this might just help economics sufficiently to spell the difference between success/failure.

8. The use of the numerical 30's designation was preferred by all groups vs. the word "thirties". The use of a tan tip (with/without gold bands) improved respondents reaction to appearance vs. an all-white cigarette.

9. We should review with sales/manufacturing how much latitude we have in outer pack dimensions. The use of a slightly larger package would greatly improve perceived value regardless of the number of units we finally select as providing the best combination. Mary Anne Kayiatos who provided this idea, indicated she had seen a European pack lmm longer/wider which looked significantly larger than standard.

91288492

April 15, 1977

10. The principal positives associated with the idea in most groups had to do with cutting down -- not economy. || Perhaps this is a rationalization, but it fits in well with the T/N study.

To summarize my overall reaction:

1. Consumers seem to indicate that we^{MAH} have a pretty viable product (subject to quantitative confirmation).
2. The product, as is, is probably a lot better than any of the copy.
3. It could be helpful to check out independent variables such as intensity of flavor and precise circumference/number combination.
4. The product needs work in the area of burning slower.
5. We should watch out for, and avoid, internal contradictions in developing the final bundle. (High flavor, certain types of box packaging, etc. can come across as too masculine for what is clearly a feminine product.)
6. Before deciding on copy we should look at alternative approaches stemming from this first consumer inter-face, even if, ultimately, we decide to return to one or more of the existing first cuts at copy.

also, consumers are skeptical

Next steps are:

1. Moderator presentation as quickly as possible with both Agency and R&D in attendance.
2. Development of R&D/MRD work plan to look at and evaluate product alternatives, as appropriate.
3. Development of new copy approaches for review with consumers in additional sessions.

*- 25 pack
- cork top
- 1 min. break in 1/2 hr package*

Benito Vila

cc: Mr. R. E. Smith
Mr. J. Greenleaf - deGarmo
Mr. W. Doyle ✓
Ms. M. Kayiatos

91288493