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The Role of Advertising and Promotion in the Marketing of Tobacco Products

Introduction

Businesses use advertising and promotion to influence the marketplace—to prepare a place for their product by signaling how it meets an existing or newly perceived need of the consumer. In the following discussion of such tactics for the tobacco-product marketplace, "advertising" refers to company-funded advertisements that appear in paid media (e.g., broadcasts, magazines, newspapers, outdoor advertising, and transit advertising), whereas "promotion" includes all company-supported nonmedia activity (e.g., direct-mail promotions, allowances, coupons, premiums, point-of-purchase displays, and entertainment sponsorships).

The general role of advertising is to communicate accurate information and to influence attitudes and beliefs (Kotler 1991). The information that advertising communicates can be either factual (e.g., product ingredients or features) or suggestive (e.g., images of types of people who might use a product, or associations of a product with a certain setting or emotion). Much of the regulatory activity for advertising is directed at factual communication; most of the criticism of advertising is directed at suggestive communication—at the images it creates and at the potentially misleading implications of user benefits that can be drawn from those images (Kotler and Armstrong 1991).

Advertising can be used to create primary demand—that is, to bring new users of a product category into the marketplace (Ray 1982). These users are attracted by advertising that demonstrates how a particular product can satisfy a customer need, either physical or psychological. Users are also attracted by advertising that can help them feel a previously unrecognized or unmet need. Advertisers can use advertising to help consumers satisfy those needs. For example, advertising for smoking cessation programs or "no smoking" products can help people who have smoked for years but now want to stop smoking. This advertising can help people make the switch to a "healthier" product or a "healthier" lifestyle.

Advertising also can be used to create selective (or secondary) demand—that is, to convince consumers to switch from one specific brand of product to another (McCarthy and Perreault 1984). Creating selective demand calls for advertising that demonstrates a brand's superior performance, price, or value. Alternatively, advertising can create selective demand by projecting that a brand has a more desirable image than its competitors (such as Avis Rent A Car's well-known slogan, "We're number two but we try harder").

Consumers overestimate the effect of advertising on overall market factors, but underestimate its effect on them personally (Bauer and Greyser 1968). Thus, consumers may criticize advertising as being dishonest and manipulative, but they are unlikely to be able to provide examples of purchases they have made because of what they would consider advertising dishonesty or manipulation. In fact, they are unlikely to be able to identify any purchases they have made because of advertising. For most products, the role of advertising is to create in the consumer a structure of attitudes and beliefs about a product that will facilitate its purchase when the consumer is stimulated by a behavioral prod (Ray 1982). That prod can come from the social environment (for example, from another consumer's recommending the product), from a retailer, or from a promotional incentive, such as a coupon or a free sample.

The actual purchase of a product or service in a marketplace is often achieved by marketers' use of a specific promotion (Popper 1986, Davis and Jason 1988). Such activities are used to build on consumers' attitudinal predispositions and lead consumers to act. Promotion, in fact, is the fastest-growing category of all product marketing activity (Kotler 1991). This growth is partly a response to the proliferation of advertising as well as to the limited direct effect that advertising has been found to have on people's actions. Over the past few decades, the superabundance of advertising messages has made it increasingly difficult for a given ad to rise above the clutter of competing messages both in its own product category and in the plethora of advertisements in general. Thus, competition is particularly true for products with well-established images and reputations. Thus, profit return of even a successful advertising expenditure may eventually diminish. Accordingly, the best sales returns for most industries result from effective advertising and promotion working in concert.

Promotional activities can take many forms. Promotional expenditures can stimulate retailers to place and display products in ways that will maximize the opportunity for purchase (e.g., supplying retailers with point-of-purchase displays to locate products at...
Cigarette Advertising and Promotional Expenditures

In 1990, cigarette advertising and promotional expenditures grew to almost $4 billion (see Table 1), making cigarettes the second most promoted consumer products (after automobiles) in the United States. These expenditures occurred at a time when domestic sales of cigarettes and adult per-capita consumption were at relatively low levels although domestic revenues continued to increase (Table 2). Advertising and promotional expenditures account for 10 to 12 percent of the revenue generated by the tobacco industry in the United States. More than three quarters of these expenditures were for promotional activities, which had steadily increased to over $3 billion, while advertising expenditures for cigarettes dropped to $887 million (Federal Trade Commission [FTC] 1992). The decline in cigarette advertising was principally from reductions in print advertising (a 14 percent drop in magazine advertising and a 7 percent drop in newspaper advertising) to their lowest level (in constant 1990 dollars) since the ban on broadcast advertising came into effect in January 1971 and the tobacco industry focused advertising attention on print media.

In 1990, expenditures for outdoor advertising and transit posters for cigarettes were at an all-time high of $435 million (see Table 3). The largest category of cigarette promotion that year was that of coupon use and retail value-added promotions, which at $1.2 billion represented nearly 30 percent of all cigarette advertising and promotional expenditures. The cigarette companies spent just over $1 billion on promotional allowances, which included the money that cigarette companies paid to retailers for shelf space (slotting allowances), cooperative advertising allowances, and trade (wholesaler) allowances. Cigarette companies spent over $300 million on point-of-purchase materials in 1990. These expenditures for displays were roughly equivalent (within 10 percent) to cigarette company expenditures on magazine advertising. The substantial increases in retail-oriented expenditures reflect an aggressive cigarette marketplace in which companies vie for larger shares of decreasing numbers of cigarette smokers.

In 1990, the cigarette companies also expended over $125 million on public entertainment (including sponsorship of sporting events and concerts). Total advertising and promotional expenditures for cigarettes included over $108 million for sports and sporting events alone. The cigarette companies reported no expenditures in 1990 for endorsements or testimonials or for having their brand names or tobacco products appear in any motion picture or television shows (FTC 1992). In contrast, movies in the 1980s were sometimes used to promote specific brands of cigarettes and other products (Magnus 1985).

Cigarettes continue to be one of the most heavily advertised products in print media (Centers for Disease Control [CDC] 1990). In 1988, cigarettes ranked first among products advertised in outdoor media, second in magazines, and sixth in newspapers. When advertising expenditures for these three print media are combined, cigarettes were the second most heavily advertised product after passenger cars (CDC 1990). These expenditures for cigarette advertising represent a drop, however, from the total advertising expenditures in these media in 1985 and are consistent with the cigarette industry's shift in emphasis to promotional activities.

One of the indirect consequences of advertising and promotional spending is that the media, reluctant to jeopardize the income that accompanies cigarette advertising, are inhibited in their coverage of the health risks of smoking. Warner, Goldenhar, and McLaughlin (1992) examined 99 magazines published in the United States from 1959 through 1969 and from 1973 through 1986 to assess the probability that the number of articles a magazine published on the health consequences of smoking would reflect whether they carried cigarette advertisements and what proportion of their revenues were derived from cigarette advertisements. Magazines that did not carry cigarette advertisements were more than 40 percent more likely to cover the health consequences of smoking than were magazines that carried such advertising. For women's magazines, the likelihood increased to 230 percent; a 1 percent increase in the share of advertising revenue derived from cigarette advertisements was found to decrease by nearly 2 percent the probability of these magazines' carrying articles on the risks of smoking. Numerous other studies and reports on this aspect of cigarette advertising were discussed in the 1989 Surgeon General's report on smoking and health (US Department of Health and Human Services [USDHHS] 1989) and reinforce the general conclusion that despite...
Table 1. Domestic cigarette advertising and promotional expenditures, 1963–1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total advertising* dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Total promotional* dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Total advertising and promotional dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Advertising as percentage of total dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>228.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>249.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>240.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>261.3</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>242.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>263.0</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>272.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>297.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>285.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>311.9</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>283.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>310.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>283.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>305.9</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>296.6</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>361.0</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>220.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>257.6</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>247.5</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>266.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>306.8</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>330.8</td>
<td>160.4</td>
<td>491.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>425.9</td>
<td>213.2</td>
<td>639.1</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>505.8</td>
<td>273.6</td>
<td>779.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>543.1</td>
<td>331.9</td>
<td>875.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>682.8</td>
<td>400.6</td>
<td>1,083.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>790.1</td>
<td>452.2</td>
<td>1,242.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>899.3</td>
<td>648.3</td>
<td>1,547.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>923.2</td>
<td>870.6</td>
<td>1,793.8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>910.8</td>
<td>990.0</td>
<td>1,900.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>930.2</td>
<td>1,065.0</td>
<td>2,095.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>932.0</td>
<td>1,544.4</td>
<td>2,478.4</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>796.3</td>
<td>1,586.0</td>
<td>2,382.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>719.2</td>
<td>1,861.3</td>
<td>2,580.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>824.5</td>
<td>2,450.4</td>
<td>3,274.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>868.3</td>
<td>2,748.7</td>
<td>3,617.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>835.2</td>
<td>3,156.9</td>
<td>3,992.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes print advertising in newspapers, magazines, billboards, and public transit and (until ban effective January 1, 1971) on television and radio
*Includes promotional allowances, sampling distributions, specialty item distribution, public entertainment, direct mail, endorsements, testimonials, coupons, audio-visual, and retail value added; point-of-sale advertising, except for 1963–1974 and 1971–1974, for 1963–1969 and 1971–1974, only direct mail expenditures are included ("others" category not included)
Table 2. Domestic cigarette sales and per capita consumption, 1963–1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of cigarettes sold (in billions)</th>
<th>Cigarette consumption (per capita)</th>
<th>Cigarette sales revenue (in millions)</th>
<th>Total advertising and promotional dollars (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>516.5</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>249.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>505.0</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>261.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>521.1</td>
<td>4,196</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>263.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>529.9</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>297.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>525.8</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>311.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>540.3</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>310.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>527.9</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>305.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>534.2</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>361.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>547.2</td>
<td>3,982</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>251.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>561.7</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>257.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>584.7</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>247.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>594.5</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>306.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>603.2</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>491.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>609.9</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>639.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>612.6</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>15,594</td>
<td>779.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>615.3</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>16,856</td>
<td>875.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>621.8</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>17,668</td>
<td>1,083.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>628.2</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>19,035</td>
<td>1,242.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>636.5</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>20,822</td>
<td>1,547.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>632.5</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>22,093</td>
<td>1,793.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>603.6</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>25,724</td>
<td>1,900.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>608.4</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>27,370</td>
<td>2,095.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>599.3</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>28,918</td>
<td>2,476.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>586.4</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>30,293</td>
<td>2,382.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>575.4</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>32,145</td>
<td>2,580.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>560.7</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>33,042</td>
<td>3,274.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>525.6</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>37,048</td>
<td>3,617.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>523.7</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>39,616</td>
<td>3,992.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*NA = Not available.
Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People

decades of awareness of the dangers of tobacco use, media managers are reluctant to turn away the revenue enjoyed from cigarette advertising (Kessler 1989, Tye 1990).

Smokeless Tobacco Advertising and Promotional Expenditures

In 1986, a report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General concluded that use of smokeless tobacco represents a significant health risk, is not a safe substitute for cigarette smoking, can cause oral cancers, and can lead to nicotine addiction and dependence (USDHHS 1986). In the same year, Congress passed the Comprehensive Smokeless Tobacco Health Education Act (CSTHEA) of 1986 (Public Law 99-252). The act required that (1) the public be informed of any health dangers of smokeless tobacco use, (2) smokeless tobacco advertising and packaging include three rotated warning labels (except on outdoor billboards, which could bear any one of the three warning labels), and (3) smokeless tobacco advertising be restricted from radio and television. The CSTHEA also encouraged legislation to make age 18 the minimum age to purchase smokeless tobacco, as of 1993, all 50 states and the District of Columbia had passed such legislation (CDC, Office on Smoking and Health unpublished data).

The 1986 Advisory Committee Report to the Surgeon General and the 1986 CSTHEA were responses to increasing evidence that both smokeless tobacco use compromised health and that increasing numbers of Americans apparently perceived smokeless tobacco as a safe alternative to cigarette smoking. Annual U.S. consumption of smokeless tobacco had increased substantially between 1972 and 1985 (USDHHS 1986). Although the amount (in pounds) of smokeless tobacco sold declined from 1985 through 1988, amounts increased during the following three years (Table 4). By 1991, annual consumption of smokeless tobacco products in the United States had returned to its 1985 level of over 120 million pounds (FTC 1993).

The increases in the use of smokeless tobacco from the 1970s to the mid-1980s can be attributed to more aggressive marketing by the smokeless tobacco industry, new smokeless tobacco products, the teaming of smokeless tobacco with well-known sports and entertainment personalities, the increased accessibility of smokeless tobacco products, and a growing market of young males (Christen 1980, Glover, Christen, Henderson 1981, USDHHS 1992a, b). See “Environmental Factors in the Initiation of Smokeless Tobacco Use” in Chapter 4). One of the primary aims of advertising and promotional activities during the past two decades was to attract people to try smokeless tobacco (Glover, Christen, Henderson 1981, Tye, Warner, Glantz 1987). The strategy was evidently a success. In 1970, men over the age of 55 (presumably longtime users) were the heaviest users of moist snuff, by 1985, the usage rate was twice as high among males aged 16 through 19 than among older men (USDHHS 1992b).

In 1991, the United States Tobacco Company, one of five major tobacco companies that produce smokeless tobacco products in the United States, produced 87 percent of the moist snuff consumed (USDHHS 1992b). The company’s most popular products, Copenhagen and Skoal, were also the most popular among adolescent users. Advertisements for these products have stressed that smokeless tobacco is easy to use, that it is convenient “in places where you can’t light up,” and that “it pinches all it takes.” By providing explicit instructions for use (sometimes delivered by well-known professional athletes) and by suggesting that the product could be used without adult detection, smokeless tobacco advertisements have appeared to target male adolescents (Christen 1980, USDHHS 1992b).

Promotional activities for smokeless tobacco have gained increasing importance since the CSTHEA of 1986, in part because radio and television advertising were banned by the act. Advertising and promotional expenditures for smokeless tobacco decreased each year from 1985 through 1987, then increased yearly from 1988 through 1991, along with yearly smokeless tobacco sales figures (Table 4). Of these expenditures, public entertainment sponsorship was the largest single advertising expenditure and promotional spending category from 1986 through 1990, over $21 million was allocated in 1991 (FTC 1993). In 1991, expenditures to provide consumers with cents-off coupons and retail value-added promotions, such as buy one-get-one-free offers or specialty advertising gifts given at points of sale, became the largest spending category (over $23 million allocated). Public entertainment sponsorship and specialty advertising gifts appear to particularly appeal to male adolescents, even if the smokeless tobacco industry does not explicitly target teens (USDHHS 1992b).

Of particular note is the use of product sampling of smokeless tobacco products. In 1978, the United States Tobacco Company ran advertisements in *Sports Illustrated* for free samples of fruit-flavored, low-nicotine snuff products for beginners (Tye, Warner, Glantz 1987). The samples were accompanied by instructions on how to use smokeless tobacco. Currently, the smokeless tobacco industry’s voluntary code on sampling prohibits sampling to those under 18 years old (Davis and Jason 1988), this restriction nonetheless permits the marketing of smokeless tobacco on college campuses.
### Table 3. Domestic cigarette advertising and promotional expenditures,* 1986-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>1986 (in thousands)</th>
<th>1987 (in thousands)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>119,629</td>
<td>95,810</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>340,160</td>
<td>317,748</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>301,822</td>
<td>269,778</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34,725</td>
<td>35,822</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point-of-purchase</td>
<td>135,541</td>
<td>153,494</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional allowances</td>
<td>630,036</td>
<td>702,730</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling distribution</td>
<td>98,866</td>
<td>55,020</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty item distribution</td>
<td>210,128</td>
<td>391,351</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public entertainment</td>
<td>71,439</td>
<td>71,389</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail</td>
<td>187,057</td>
<td>187,931</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements and testimonials</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupons and retail value-added</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others*</td>
<td>252,570</td>
<td>299,355</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,382,357</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,580,504</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Expenditures for audio, visuals are included in the "all others" category to avoid disclosure of individual company data.

**Source:** Federal Trade Commission (1992)

### A History of Cigarette Advertising to the Young

**Ads Targeting Women**

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, cigarette firms demonstrated their ability to target and develop specific market segments. In the 1920s, cigarette smokers were predominately males, but the industry recognized females as a large and potentially lucrative market segment open to development. Encouraging the growth of smoking among women was an explicit goal of industry leaders and the focus of both advertising and major public relations efforts. The American Tobacco Company hired advertising expert A. D. Lasker of Lord & Thomas to work on Lucky Strike advertising. Previously, Lasker had successfully handled the delicate problem of advertising sanitary products (e.g., the Kotex brand). **
to women. His cigarette campaign began in the 1920s with an advertising budget of $400,000, which grew to $19 million by 1931. This budget supported a print advertising campaign that featured women and associated cigarettes with the attribute of bodily slenderness. The principal selling idea was that smoking was an aid to diet behavior and weight control—a notion explicitly communicated by the slogan, "Reach for a Lucky Instead of a Sweet" (Gunther 1960).

The American Tobacco Company viewed the prospect of reaching the potential female market as "opening a new gold mine right in our front yard" (Bernays 1965, p. 383). Through Edward Bernays, perhaps the nation's most famous public relations consultant, the American Tobacco Company hired A. A. Brill, a psychoanalyst who advised the company to promote cigarettes as "symbols of freedom" (Bernays 1965, p. 386). Bernays then organized women to smoke in public in the 1929 New York Easter Parade (Schudson 1984) and to carry placards identifying their cigarettes as "torches of liberty" (Bernays 1965, p. 197). Photos and articles were distributed to small-town newspapers across the nation (Schudson 1984). Bernays called this public relations activity "the engineering of consent" (Bernays 1965, p. 390).

Advertising for other firms and brands also increasingly featured women and aimed advertising at women. In 1926, the Chesterfield brand of Liggett & Myers displayed a young woman saying, "Blow Some My Way" (Howe 1984). This ad precipitated public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total pounds sold</th>
<th>Revenues (U.S. $)</th>
<th>Advertising and promotion expenditures (U.S. $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>121,449,115</td>
<td>730,618,970</td>
<td>80,068,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>118,778,334</td>
<td>797,777,885</td>
<td>76,676,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>114,435,233</td>
<td>901,654,382</td>
<td>68,223,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>116,437,890</td>
<td>981,637,304</td>
<td>81,200,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>117,415,326</td>
<td>1,091,170,201</td>
<td>90,101,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>120,110,686</td>
<td>1,237,961,670</td>
<td>104,004,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


outrage at the attempt to encourage women to smoke, yet prompted the envy and emulation of many other cigarette marketers (Wood 1958). Later, various cigarette campaigns targeted and featured women, including Hollywood movie stars, winners of the Miss America beauty pageant, women in heroic World War II roles, mothers (for Mother’s Day), and brides (Howe 1984, Emster 1985). Some of these campaigns explicitly portrayed cigarette smoking as appropriate for the young. For example, a Lorillard campaign that showed a woman running on the beach encouraged viewers to “Light an Old Gold for young ideas.”

Ads Targeting Young People

From the time of the earliest marketing campaigns, parents, educators, and policymakers worried about the exposure—intentional or not, it was inevitable—of young people to cigarette advertising. These concerns were not misplaced. For example, one variant of the American Tobacco Company’s campaign for Lucky Strike in the 1920s depicted a young woman and a very young man “breaking the chains of the past” to reach for opportunity and an open pack of cigarettes (Anderson 1929). In 1929, a Senate proponent of amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act declared, “Not since the days when the vendor of harmful nostrums was swept from our streets, has this country witnessed such an orgy of buncombe, quackery and downright falsehood and fraud as now marks the current campaign promoted by certain cigarette manufacturers to create a vast woman and child market” (Schudson 1984, pp 194–5).

Such protests had little effect on the tobacco industry’s marketing plans. Despite the increased overall number of smokers in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, the industry considered it strategically important to continue efforts to recruit more young consumers. In 1950, for example, a tobacco industry trade journal reported the following industry perception: “A massive potential market still exists among women and young adults, cigarette industry leaders agreed, acknowledging that recruitment of these millions of prospective smokers comprises the major objective for the immediate future and on a long-term basis as well” (United States Tobacco Journal [USTJ] 1950b, p 1). And at a 1955 press conference announcing redesigned brand packaging, the president of the Philip Morris Companies made it clear that appealing to the young was a deliberate, strategic focus for the company: “We wanted a new, bright package that would appeal to a younger market” (Tide 1955, p 31). The company’s ad director was even more explicit: “Our ads are now aimed at young people and emphasize gentleness” (i.e., ease of smoking) (Tide 1955, p 31). A few years later, Philip Morris launched a comic strip campaign featuring a “handsome, rough and ready” adventure hero, “Duke Handy.” The comic strip was placed in the Sunday color comic sections of 40 newspapers in a national network. Behind this comic strip was a “heavy promotional campaign” that included “stories and ads in major newspapers on the schedule, Duke Handy campaign buttons, truck posters, newspaper display cards, newsboy competitions and supporting publicity and promotional activities” (USTJ 1958a, p 7).

These youth-oriented marketing strategies prevailed even in the face of increasing reports from scientists warning of the health risks of smoking. In 1963, Fortune magazine observed that “several recent studies show that teenagers have not been much impressed by any anti-smoking campaigns” (Fortune 1963, p 101). In one of the studies discussed in this Fortune article, Gilbert Research, a firm specializing in research on the
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habits and interests of young people, reported that estimates of smoking rates among adolescents aged 13 through 19 had increased from 25 percent in 1961 to 35 percent in 1963. That study also found that 44 percent of graduating seniors smoked. The *Fortune* article linked this reported increase to advertising: “Cigarette ads often portray and seem to be pitched directly at young people” (p 120).

**Promotion Through Radio and Television**

Cigarette sellers were among the most enthusiastic pioneers in the use of radio network broadcasting for coast-to-coast advertising. By 1930, the American Tobacco Company, Brown & Williamson, Lorillard, and R J Reynolds were all buying network radio time (Dunlap 1931). The American Tobacco Company’s Lucky Strike brand sponsored many radio comedies and musical shows, such as *The Jack Benny Show*, *The Kay Kayser College of Musical Knowledge*, and the best-known and longest running of the popular music shows, *The Lucky Strike Hit Parade*. This radio show, which started in 1928 and ran into the 1950s on television, appealed to a young audience, it featured, for example, teen idol Frank Sinatra when he was launching his career (Cone 1969). So popular was this show in 1938 that when its producers introduced a sweeps promotion offering free cartons of “Luckies” for correctly guessing each week’s three most popular tunes, the promotion drew nearly seven million entries per week (Hettinger and Neff 1938).

By the early 1930s, R J Reynolds was sponsoring radio programs that were popular with youth, such as the *Camel Pleasure Hour*, *The All Star Radio Revue*, and the enduring *Camel Caravan*, which featured the swing music of Benny Goodman (Tilley 1985). In 1938, the Chesterfield brand of Liggett & Myers signed Glenn Miller and the Andrews Sisters to replace Paul Whiteman (Mann 1980). Artie Shaw appeared for Lorillard’s Old Gold cigarettes, and Tommy Dorsey appeared for Brown & Williamson’s Kool and Raleigh brands (Lewone 1970). The heavily commercial nature of these shows is hard to imagine by today’s standards. A single hour of the *Raleigh Review*, for example, contained 70 promotional references to Raleigh cigarettes (Fox 1984).

Market research studies guided the selection of musical shows and styles that appealed to young people of various ages. For example, the market research files of the J Walter Thompson Company, then advertising Old Golds for Lorillard, included the following market research studies for 1941 and 1942: Survey of Sales at Colleges, Survey of Dealers in 32 Colleges, Remembrance Check on “Apple” Campaign Among College Students, Report by Crossley on New York City Youth Interests in Radio Programs, and Radio Preferences Among Teenage Boys and Girls (Pollay 1988).

The successful use of radio led the cigarette industry to pioneer in television advertising. By 1950, more than seven hours per week were being sponsored by cigarette sellers. An editorial in that year’s *United States Tobacco Journal* pronounced cigarette companies “the dominant factor in television advertising sponsorship”—evidence of the companies’ faith that “it is an historically demonstrated certainty that the more people subjected to intelligent advertising, the more people will buy the product advertised” (UST) 1950a, p. 4). By the early 1960s, tobacco companies were spending the majority of their total promotional budget on television advertising (*Advertising Age* [AA] 1963m, n). Their trust in the efficacy of advertising in this medium led to record-setting promotional spending (AA 1963b, 1964b), corresponding sales growth (AA 1963k), and increased profits (AA 1963p, UST 1963c).

**Promotion Through Schools**

Promotional activities sometimes advanced into the nation’s schools. In 1948, Liggett & Myers Tobacco Company provided high schools with free football programs, a scoreboard at the center of the program was in effect a two-page advertisement for Chesterfield cigarettes. Public complaints apparently led to the cancellation of this particular campaign, despite the fact that cigarette advertisers had previously supplied such programs for football and other high school sports (*Time* 1948). In 1953, plastic-coated book covers featuring school logos on the front and cigarette ads on the back were being used to promote Old Gold cigarettes to students in most of the country’s 1,800 colleges and in more than a third of its 25,000 high schools (AA 1953b).

College students in particular held great marketing potential for the tobacco industry in the 1950s. As Philip Morris Public Relations Director James Bowling explained: “Research and experience proved that the consumer, at this age and experience level, is more susceptible to change, has far-reaching influence value, and is apt to retain brand habits for a longer period of time than the average consumer reached in the general market. Therefore, though the advertising cost per thousand in the college market is relatively high, the actual expenditure can be a great deal more efficient” (Gilbert 1957, p 184).

In the 1950s, the American Tobacco Company targeted college students with its largest ever Lucky Strike campaign, which used college newspapers, campus radio stations, football programs, and extensive campus sampling and tie-in promotions (AA 1953a). A research firm specializing in young people reported that cigarette firms were spending about $5 million per year on college promotions in the 1950s. It noted that most of these college students had started smoking at earlier ages, and that “continual exposure to advertising to adults through...
the different media has its effects on young people" (Gilbert 1957, p. 183).

Promotional efforts targeting college students were estimated by the President of the Student Marketing Institute to have doubled in the five years leading up to 1962. During those years, promotional tactics for the 20 brands active on college campuses included free samples distributed by student "representatives" paid by specific tobacco companies. Brown & Williamson, for example, employed 17 salesmen on college campuses (Neuberger 1964). Philip Morris paid 166 campus representatives $50 a month to distribute free cigarettes. Philip Morris also ran a college contest offering record players in exchange for collected empty packages. In New York's Cortland State College, Alpha Delta Delta (a sorority for physical education teachers in training) won several prizes by collecting packages accounting for 1,520,000 cigarettes (Neuberger 1964). College students were awarded cars as prizes in contests run by the Liggett & Myers Tobacco Company (USTJ 1963a). Cigarette ads accounted for an estimated 40 percent of the national advertising incomes of the 850 college newspapers in the National Advertising Service (Brecher et al. 1963).

**Sponsorship of Sports**

Sports sponsorships were another common means to promote specific brands. Professional sports teams were given financial support by tobacco companies. Liggett & Myers had long been associated with baseball, regularly sponsoring games and using athletes' testimonials (AA 1963b). In 1963, R.J. Reynolds sponsored eight different baseball teams, and the American Tobacco Company sponsored six more. Football was also used to reach large audiences and to associate cigarettes with athleticism. Phillip Morris, which used athletes' endorsements of its Marlboro brand primarily to appeal to blacks (Pollay, Lee, Carter-Whitney 1992), sponsored National Football League games on CBS (AA 1963b) and the league championship games on NBC (AA 1963e). Also in 1963, the American Tobacco Company used New York Giants star Frank Gifford in advertisements for Lucky Strikes (AA 1963g). Brown & Williamson sponsored football bowl games (AA 1963d), and Lorillard had signed to sponsor the Olympic Games of 1964 and was already broadcasting previews (AA 1963u).

**Criticism of Advertising and Promotional Activities**

During these early years of the 1960s, there were criticisms of these successful selling efforts of the cigarette advertisers, just as there are currently. The criticisms were a reaction to the continued increase in cigarette sales among teens despite the growing and still newsworthy concern among scientists that smoking caused cancer. Much of this criticism and concern, however, was muted in the public forum by the reluctance of the media to jeopardize its lucrative cigarette sponsorships (AA 1963a). On the other hand, some noncommercial media, like Reader's Digest, which does not accept income for advertising, questioned the propriety of media industry behavior. Such questions were also raised in the publication, The Consumers Union Report on Smoking and the Public Interest (AA 1963b; Brecher et al. 1963). The Surgeon General's first report on smoking and health was imminent at this time and was anticipated with widespread discussion of the legislative responses it might precipitate (AA 1963i; Cohen 1963). Much of this talk focused on the industry's sponsorship of sports, on its use of athletes' endorsements, and on advertising copy appealing to the young.

Tobacco companies' targeting of youth was debated both inside and outside the advertising community. From within, a leading trade magazine for the advertising industry, Advertising Age (AA 1963b), and a leading advertising industry executive, John Orr Young of Young & Rubicam (AA 1964a), saw effective marketing to the young as strategically important to maintaining the industry's size and fostering further growth. Other industry spokespersons judged that the use of athletes was problematic, not only because it implied a healthfulness that was unwarranted, but also because it was a means of focusing on the teenage market. One critic asserted that television commercials focused on teens "by means of allusions to athletic prowess, popularity, database and sexual allure... It is basically a narcotic dream with an inexcusable dosage of dishonesty" (AA 1963e, p. 12).

An editorial in Advertising Age counseled the industry to put less emphasis on youth and athletes in their ads (AA 1963b). The National Association of Broadcasters, working on the development of a self-regulatory process, declared that "tobacco advertising having an especial appeal to minors, expressed or implied, should be avoided" (AA 1963o, p. 85). At the same time, Reader's Digest (1963) condensed an article from Changing Times magazine that cited the American Tobacco Company, R.J. Reynolds, and Lorillard as companies whose advertising and promotional activities were aimed explicitly at young people. The article noted the on-campus efforts targeted at college students, the hiring of students to distribute cigarette samples, and the dominant presence of cigarette advertising in campus publications. "Nowhere in that bright wonderful world depicted in the ads," the article observed, "is there any hint to youngsters that cigarettes might be harmful" (Changing Times 1962, p. 35). The National Congress of Parents and Teachers (also known as the National Parent Teacher...
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The campaign that drew the most specific criticism for its advertising copy was the American Tobacco Company's 1963 Lucky Strike slogan: "Luckies separate the men from the boys, but not from the girls" (AA 1963c). The television schedule stipulated use of all three networks and spot commercials on 500 stations in 90 markets (USTJ 1963b). A typical print ad showed a young man looking longingly at an accomplished, mature man (such as a race car driver) who was enjoying a cigarette while receiving recognition for a feat (such as a trophy for winning a race) and being admired by an attractive woman. The President of the National Association of Broadcasters called the campaign a "brazen, cynical flouting of the concern of millions of American parents about their children starting the smoking habit.... They well know that every boy wants to be regarded as a man" (AA 1963g, p. 1). Advertising Age joined in editorial condemnation of the campaign by stating: "It is a too-clever, too-cynical attempt.... This is advertising we can do without" (AA 1963f, p. 20).

In the face of this criticism, the six major firms in the industry dropped virtually all advertising in college media, football programs, magazines, and newspapers, all of which they had been supporting with up to $1 million annually (AA 1963b). This action left in place, however, other teen-targeting practices, such as R.J. Reynolds's expenditure of nearly $2.5 million (about half of its spot radio commitment) on teen radio stations during after-school hours, a practice the company claimed it discontinued in 1964 (AA 1964b). Advertising Age noted the political and public relations dilemma that cigarette firms faced, since the companies were interested "in picking up new business from new, young smokers" yet did not want "to be seen reaching to the young market" (AA 1963f, p. 108).

Industry executives met in the summer of 1963 to discuss restrictions on television advertising, using the Tobacco Institute as a framework to avoid collusion charges (AA 1963v). One of the Tobacco Institute's suggestions was that programs "whose content is directed particularly at youthful audiences should not be sponsored or used. Thus, good judgment in program content, rather than arbitrary restriction of sponsorship to certain hours of the listening or viewing day, should be the determining factor" (AA 1963f, p. 1). Although the Tobacco Institute took pains to note that it did not monitor or regulate the advertising of its members, the chief executives of all of the major firms, save Brown & Williamson, instantly endorsed the suggestions, indicating that they would display the necessary judgment and self-regulatory restraint.

The suggestions of the Tobacco Institute drew scorn from Senator Maureen Neuberger, a leading Congressional critic of tobacco-marketing practices. The Senator felt that the suggestions and the entire self-regulatory process would prove to be an "exercise in futility" that was "motivated by a desire to head off government regulation" (AA 1963j, p. 8). Senator Warren Magnuson complained about sponsorship (for the Kent brand of cigarettes) of The Ed Sullivan Show for the Beatles' American debut, which exposed millions of teens to cigarette advertising (AA 1965).

In 1964, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) noted that both the messages and the media placement seemed destined to attract the young:

Whether through design or otherwise, cigarette advertising is so placed that its audience is substantially and not merely incidentally or insignificantly, composed of nonadults.... Whether or not the cigarette industry has deliberately attempted to exploit the large and vulnerable youth market, its advertising, in emphatically reiterating the pleasures and attractions of smoking without disclosing the dangers to health, has exercised an undue influence over the large class of youthful, immature consumers or potential consumers of cigarettes (FTC 1964, pp. 110–2).

An analysis of the television schedule sponsored by cigarette firms in 1963 indicated that almost all firms bought air time during a large number of shows that had audiences consisting of 30 percent or more youth (i.e., persons under 21 years old). The sponsors, the shows sponsored, and the percentages of youthful audiences for the shows included the American Tobacco Company—Combat (45 percent), The Jimmy Dean Show (32 percent), Monday Night Movie (30 percent), Saturday Night at the Movies (30 percent), and The Twilight Zone (30 percent); Liggett & Myers—The Outer Limits (46 percent), The Price Is Right (32 percent); Lorillard—The Joey Bishop Show (44 percent), Wide World of Sports (38 percent), Winter Olympics Preview (35 percent), The Dick Van Dyke Show (33 percent); Philip Morris—The Jackie Gleason Show (38 percent), The Red Skelton Show (37 percent), Route 66 (31 percent); and R.J. Reynolds—Glynis (44 percent), McHale's Navy (40 percent), The Beverly Hillbillies (38 percent), Sunset Strip (32 percent), and Saturday Night at the Movies (32 percent) (Pollay and Compton 1992).

All together, cigarette companies sponsored 55 shows for a total of 125 hours a week. On the assumption that the average half-hour television show involved two commercials, teenagers were exposed to more than 1,350 cigarette commercials during 1963, and younger children were exposed to over 845 commercials during that year. Analysis of the time slots most frequently
bought found that they were significantly correlated with the proportion of teenagers each time slot afforded (Pollay and Compton 1992).

A similar analysis in the FTC's annual report to Congress about cigarette advertising counted 73 television programs sponsored by cigarette companies; these programs appeared collectively 296 times during January 1968 and contained 501 advertisements. Not counting other sponsor identifications, this schedule likely exposed the average teenage viewer to over 60 full-length cigarette commercials per month (FTC 1968).

Self-Regulatory Cigarette Advertising Codes

In 1965, the tobacco industry began creating self-regulatory cigarette advertising and promotional codes (U.S. Congress 1965). The standards related primarily to four areas: advertising appealing to the young, advertising containing health representations, the provision of samples, and the distribution of promotional items to the young. The code prohibited cigarette advertising in school and college publications, testimonials from athletes or other celebrities perceived to appeal to the young, the use of advertising through comic books or newspaper comics, and the distribution of samples at schools. Also prohibited were representations that smoking was essential to social success, representations that the healthiness of models was due to cigarette smoking, the use of models who were participating in physical activity, or the use of models who were younger (or appeared younger) than 25 years of age.

As one observer (Baker 1968) noted, the tobacco industry did not seem to find its code particularly restrictive: Four months after the code was formulated, Vice-roy ads featured young tennis players lighting up after a hot game. Salem showed a young couple playing giggly games alongside a waterfall... A TV commercial producer admitted that it didn't matter how young the models looked, or how youthful were their actions, as long as they possessed 'over twenty-five' birth certificates. In fact, his quest was for older models who 'looked young' (p. 116; italics in original).

The code also prohibited cigarette advertising on shows whose audience was “primarily” underage—that is, 45 percent or more of a show's viewers were under 21 years old (AA 1966). This decision rule allowed considerable room for interpretation. For example, R.J. Reynolds continued to sponsor The Beverly Hillbillies even though the audiences for two selected individual shows exceeded the code requirement; a later interpretation by the tobacco industry held that the code would be applied to two successive months of audience analyses, rather than to selected specific shows (AA 1967b). Later that year, after monthly data showed high levels of minors, R.J. Reynolds ceased sponsoring the show (AA 1967c).

The National Association of Broadcasters Code Authority, which reviewed all advertisements under the self-regulatory process, noted that the volume and character of cigarette advertising were likely to influence the young and were therefore still problematic. In a confidential report, the association expressed its concern:

Despite changes which have been brought about in cigarette advertising on radio and television, the cumulative impression created by virtually all of the individual campaigns supports a finding that smoking is made to appear universally acceptable, attractive and desirable... The difficulty in cigarette advertising is that commercials which have an impact upon an adult cannot be assumed to leave unaffected a young viewer, smoker or otherwise. The adult world depicted in cigarette advertising very often is a world to which the adolescent aspires. The cowboy and the steelworker are symbols of a mature masculinity toward which he strives. Popularity, romantic attachment and success are also particularly desirable achievements for the young. To the young, smoking indeed may seem to be an important step towards, and a help in growth from adolescence to, maturity (National Association of Broadcasters 1966, pp. 30-1).

Candy Cigarettes

In 1967, the FTC complained to the tobacco industry that the industry's self-regulatory code permitting the sale of candy and bubble gum in packages that resembled those of actual cigarette brands amounted to "an indirect form of advertising aimed at children" (AA 1967a, p. 191). At least five U.S. candy manufacturers distributed candy cigarettes that imitated existing cigarette brands. The brands imitated (some by more than one candy company) were Camel, Lucky Strike, L&M, Marlboro, Pall Mall, Salem, Winston, Chesterfield, Oasis, Lark, and Viceroy. One type of candy cigarette came from a European source and appeared in packages stating, "Made under license of Philip Morris Inc., New York, NY, USA." The domestic candy cigarettes bore no such overt evidence of links to the tobacco industry, but one U.S. candy maker interviewed in Advertising Age stated that "no [candy] company had ever suggested that it might take action" for unauthorized use of trademarks (AA 1967d, p. 97). Another said, "The companies don't object. That's the point. We've been doing it for many years. They don't care" (p. 97).

The tobacco companies disclaimed any intent to lure children with candy cigarettes, but would not say...
what action, if any, would be taken. Candy cigarettes imitating Camel, Lucky Strike, L&M, Marlboro, Pall Mall, Salem, Winston, and Viceroy were still available in the United States into the late 1970s (Blum 1980). Such candy has since become less widely available, but it has not been banned by law.

A recent study of the role candy cigarettes play in the development of smoking behaviors used focus groups, student surveys, and a distributional analysis to find that most children knew where to obtain candy cigarettes, even though they were available at only some convenience stores. The study also observed that repeated candy cigarette purchases were significantly correlated with experimental tobacco use, even when the analysis controlled for parents’ smoking status (Klein et al. 1992).

Changes in the Style of Cigarette Advertising

Before reports in the early 1950s began linking cancer and smoking, cigarette advertising characteristically had used explicit health claims, assertions, and reassurances, such as “Not a Cough in a Carload,” “No Throat Irritation,” “More Doctors Smoke Camels Than Any Other Cigarette,” “Smoking’s More Fun When You’re Not Worried by Throat Irritation or ‘Smoker’s Cough’” (Calfee 1985). With greater public concern about cancer, however, these explicit health claims, although intended to reassure consumers, were likely increasing consumer awareness of the suspected health risks of smoking. Ad slogans like Philip Morris’s “The cigarette that takes the fear out of smoking” were thus judged by a Business Week article (1953b) to be “strange somersaults. . . . The company comes as close as is possible to the word ‘cancer’ without actually using it” (p. 54).

Similarly, an article in Fortune called industry attention to the fact that many campaigns were so “riddled with warnings and appeals to fear” that “the present cigarette turmoil could be considered an inside job. . . . [The] industry may be promoting itself toward a dead end” (Fortune 1953, p. 164). A Business Week article pointed out that the manufacturers’ explicit health claims were exacerbating consumer concern. Although the industry could attribute its impressive growth to advertising, “the cigarette companies achieved much of this remarkable result by screaming at the top of their lungs about nicotine, cigarette hangovers, smoker’s cough, mildness and kindred subjects. . . . From the early 1930s on, this meant almost solely one thing—sell health” (Business Week 1953a, pp. 66, 68). The leading trade journal for the tobacco industry, the United States Tobacco Journal, pointed out that the industry had been “warned editorially on many occasions that the ‘health’ theme was a risky one” and counseled selling “pleasure” instead of health (UST 1958b, p. 4).

Motivation Research and the Image Era

Market motivation researchers were likewise advising the industry to create positive images of cigarettes. The researchers pointed out that “the differences between the taste of different cigarette brands are much more imagined than real” (Dichter 1964, p. 345) and that “logic does not play a major role in marketing cigarettes” (Cheskin 1967, p. 135). Leo Burnett, the advertising expert who led the agency that repositioned the Marlboro campaign from a distinctly feminine to a distinctly masculine image, noted that “those who do smoke do so for various conscious or unconscious reasons” (Burnett 1958, p. 43).

Social Research Inc. did motivation research on the psychology of smokers (Day 1955) and concluded that “advertising makes cigarettes respectable, and is thus reassuring” (Neuberger 1964, p. 38). Young & Rubicam also did a series of deep motivational interviews of smokers to extract social meanings, conflicted feelings, attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs about health aspects (Smith 1954). The results showed the importance of the themes of freedom and escape to smokers. Motivation researchers concluded that people were “really interested in the properties from a psychological point of view. . . . Is it an exotic cigarette? . . . [Is it] masculine? . . . [Does it] alleviate my health worries?” (Martineau 1957, p. 61). They pointed out that health appeals may capture momentary competitive advantages, and they may offer some reassurance to the inveterate smoker. But they do nothing to widen the market, to tap the driving force of the real psychological satisfactions of smoking.

According to these researchers, “the psychological satisfactions are . . . the best material for advertising themes and appeals, because they carry their own reassurance. They are emotional supports which have developed in American society to make smoking seem reasonable, justifiable, and highly desirable. They obviously cannot be thrown in people’s faces in their bare essence; but when they are implied, when they are communicated, they are understandable and satisfying” (Martineau 1957, p. 65).

Put simply, the recommendations were to use reassuring pictures, not words; images, not information. This tactic of employing visual imagery, lifestyle portrayals, and drama to create mood and attitude, rather than words, facts, and data to create knowledge and comprehension, is now known as “transformational” or “image” advertising, which stands in contrast with “informational” advertising (Puto and Wells 1983).

A leading text on advertising (Wells, Burnett, Moriarty 1989) uses the Marlboro repositioning campaign (discussed in detail later in this chapter) as the prototype example of this strategy. Martineau (1957)
described a typical Marlboro ad and noted that "the significant meanings are coming from the illustration. The copy logic is strictly after-the-fact" (p. 19). He disputed the conventional wisdom that the illustrations are merely attention-getting devices: "This is nonsense. The other meanings [from the visuals] can be totally unrelated to copy logic—and far more important" (p. 19).

Consequences of Image Advertising

As an article in the trade journal Printers' Ink observed, the "grim messages ... from the health-scare days [of the early 1950s] gave way to pleasant, almost Pollyanna prose. ... The 1955 comeback ... [taught advertising to] stick to cajoling the smoker with soft, 'gentle' phrases and oh-so-gay jingles" (Day 1955, p. 15). A few years later, the same journal noted that "once more the industry is back to its traditional and usually successful course — advertising flavor, taste and pleasure against a backdrop of beaches, ski slopes and languid lakes. It is a formula that works, as all-time high sales show" (Printers' Ink 1960, p. 37). As Fortune (1963) summarized, "Nowadays, all allusions to the health question are models of indirection" (p. 125).

In 1981, the FTC reviewed the changes that had occurred in cigarette advertising since the 1964 Surgeon General's report and noted the continuing glamorization of cigarette smoking. The FTC noted that in the last sixteen years:

There has been little change.... Ads have continued to attempt to allay anxieties about the hazards of smoking and to associate smoking with good health, youthful vigor, social and professional success. Therefore, the cigarette is portrayed as an integral part of youth, happiness, attractiveness, personal success and an active, vigorous, strenuous lifestyle. ... The ads are] rich in thematic imagery associating smoking with, among other things, outdoor activities, athletics, individualism and achievement. They are frequently filled with rugged, vigorous, attractive, healthy-looking people living energetic lives full of success and athletic achievement, free from any health hazards" (FTC 1981, pp. 2-2, 2-8).

Conveying Male and Female Images

One of the early consequences of motivation research was to help the industry give brands of cigarettes distinctly male or female identities (Burnett 1958; Cheskin 1967). Probably no brand more dramatically demonstrated this strategy than Marlboro, which in 1956 was converted, through an enormously successful advertising campaign, from a previous, stereotypically "female" advertising image to a stereotypically "male" image that culminated in the Marlboro cowboy. (The particulars of this marketing transformation are discussed later in this chapter.) Leo Burnett (1961), the man who created the Marlboro cowboy, described how the campaign touched a motivational chord in consumers: "We have been able to get under [the consumers'] skins a bit and find out what they really think about a product or the presentation of it and can't or won't express in words" (p. 63). Research for the campaign was done, in part, by the Home Testing Institute and the Color Research Institute for association testing (Cheskin 1967). Intensive field interviews were used to pretest the selling promotion and advertising techniques (Weissman 1955).

Large advertising spending in all media brought the campaign to a vast audience. Leo Burnett (1961) described outdoor advertising as a vital factor in the success of Marlboro; the medium's low cost per exposure allowed for the use of enough signs to achieve what Burnett called "the No. 1 factor in building confidence ... the plain old fashioned matter of friendly familiarity" (p. 217; italics in original). This success with advertising the Marlboro brand led Philip Morris to launch another brand, Virginia Slims, with stereotyped female characteristics (Weinstein 1970). The success and durability of both these campaigns evidence the power of nonverbal imagery to communicate subjective values such as independence, masculinity, and femininity and to attract and retain consumers.

Historical Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Cigarette Advertising

The role of cigarette advertising in attracting new smokers was easier to recognize in the days when the rate of recruitment exceeded the rate of death and quitting so that total cigarette sales grew. Comments from diverse sources credited cigarette advertising for expanding sales and accelerating market-broadening social trends, such as smoking among women. This acknowledgment of cigarette advertising's effects on demand and onset was commented on in articles by academic analysts, advertising agents and journals, the tobacco trade press, and tobacco executives themselves.

Academic and Industry Analyses

"In the 1920s," a recent analyst noted, "advertising sold the cigarette habit to the American Public—surely the industry's most regrettable achievement of the decade" (Fox 1984, p. 114). Commenting during the 1940s on the diminution of the medical, moral, and religious reservations about smoking previously held by consumers, a Harvard Business School professor wrote, 'The campaigns of testimonials featuring well-known personages and the picturing of the 'right' kind of people..."
smoking have undoubtedly had an influence in breaking down such prejudices. Advertising undoubtedly has played a part in speeding up social acceptance of women's smoking" (Borden 1942, pp 223, 227)

One analyst who annually evaluated the cigarette industry noted that the industry is a "glowing testimonial to the power of advertising". These particular companies have not only out-spent but also have out-earned any other [s] [The tobacco tycoons . . . are loudest in their praise for the part that advertising has played] (Wooden 1941, p 5). Business Week (1953a) commented that cigarettes offer the classic case of how a mass-production industry is built on advertising (p 66)

Advertising Professionals

Printers' Ink, the leading advertising trade journal of its day, noted in 1930 that sales success already demonstrated "the one feature which has contributed more than any other single factor to the enormous growth of the cigarette industry—advertising" (Tennon 1971, p 137) This opinion was upheld by the sales performance of cigarettes during the Great Depression. "The growth of cigarette consumption has, itself, been due largely to heavy advertising expenditure. It would be hard to find an industry that better illustrates the economic value of advertising in increasing consumption of a commodity. There can be no doubt but that steady advertising pressure has been a dominating force in increasing cigarette consumption among both men and women" (Weld 1937, pp 70-2)

John Orr Young's agency, Young & Rubicam, who had previously done work for the tobacco industry, observed in 1964 that cigarette makers had continued to use "attractive boys and girls" to serve as decoys in cigarette advertisements. Advertising agencies are retained by cigarette manufacturers to create demand for cigarettes among both adults and eager youngsters. The earlier the teenage boy or girl gets the habit, the bigger the national sales volume" (AA 1964c, p 3) Another leading advertising executive, the President of McManus, Johns & Adams, stated, "There is no doubt that all forms of advertising played a part in popularizing the cigarette" (AA 1964e, p 107)

One of the agency executives who had worked on the Marlboro account with Leo Burnett later wrote. "I don't think cigarettes ought to be advertised [When all the garbage is stripped away, successful cigarette advertising involves showing the kind of people most people would like to be, doing the things most people would like to do, and smoking up a storm. I don't know any way of doing this that doesn't tempt young people to smoke, and, in view of my present knowledge, this is something I prefer not to do]" (Daniels 1974 p 245)

More recently, the late Emerson Foote, a founder of Foote, Cone and Belding and more recently a member of McCann-Erickson, ridiculed the industry claims that its advertising only affects brand switching and has no effect whatsoever on recruitment. "I don't think anyone really believes this . . . I suspect that creating a positive climate of social acceptability for smoking, which encourages new smokers to join the market, is of greater importance to the industry. In recent years, the cigarette industry has been artfully maintaining that cigarette advertising has nothing to do with total sales. Take my word for it, this is complete and utter nonsense" (Foote 1981, pp 167-8).

Because of their conviction that cigarette advertising played a role in recruiting the young, many advertising professionals refused to work with the cigarette companies. Just before the first Surgeon General's report was published in 1964, Advertising Age (1963) stated emphatically, "It seems safe enough to say that no advertiser, no agency man, and no media man would want to continue advertising cigarettes if it were clear that they pose a serious and positive danger to the health of the ordinary smoker. . . . [L]et's not have any more sidestepping" (p 22) When the Surgeon General's report was issued, several advertising industry leaders publicly avowed that their ad agencies would cease or refuse cigarette advertising accounts on moral grounds—a position that clearly acknowledged advertising's role in building and sustaining demand. Those who refused included several who were highly visible and prominent—Bill Bernbach of Doyle, Dane, Bernbach (AA 1964b), David Ogilvy of Ogilvy and Mather (AA 1964a), Nelson Foote of Foote, Cone and Belding (O'Gara 1964), and John Orr Young of Young & Rubicam (AA 1964a)

The United States Tobacco Journal

The United States Tobacco Journal's frequent and unabashed comments on the power of advertising became something of an editorial litany during the 1950s and early 1960s. In 1953 the journal observed that "advertising, in the hands of manufacturers of tobacco products, has become a powerful tool for the construction of the massive edifice of this industry" (USTJ 1953, p 4) After the industry rebounded from the reports during the early 1950s of a tobacco-cancer link, the journal stated, "There is no obstacle to large-scale sales of tobacco products that cannot be surmounted by aggressive selling" (USTJ 1955a, p 4) and elsewhere noted "the pivotal importance of advertising" (USTJ 1955b, p 4) A year later, the journal could claim that "the effectiveness of current advertising by tobacco products manufacturers has been demonstrated repeatedly by the upward trend in sales volume that results there from" (USTJ 1956, p 4)
In 1959, the journal anticipated the launch of multiple new brands and the associated intense advertising drives to "increase sharply the trend toward greater volume in the whole tobacco industry" (USTJ 1959, p. 3). "The purpose of advertising has a simple answer to sell goods," the journal declared in 1960 (USTJ 1960a, p. 4), later pointing out that "steady increases in sales of cigarettes offer the classic example of what advertising can do—advertising pays off" (USTJ 1960b, p. 4). By 1963, the ever increasing spending on cigarette advertising and promotion led the journal to declare: "The money invested by the tobacco industry in various forms of advertising and promotion essentially reflects the industry's faith in the effectiveness of advertising as a vital sales-building tool. This faith appears justified by the continued annual rise in sales of cigarettes in this country" (USTJ 1963c, p. 4). These observations from the tobacco industry's chief trade journal testify to the tobacco industry's view of advertising as an increasingly necessary and proven means of selling cigarettes. From a perspective two decades after the 1964 Surgeon General's report, the official history of the R J Reynolds Company comments that "the company's advertising expenditures and those of its major rivals were extraordinary, reflecting the apparent agreement on the necessity of large-scale advertising to fuel expansion" (Tilley 1985, p. 330). The view was shared throughout the industry, which embraced increasingly sophisticated advertising strategies in an almost concerted effort. George Washington Hill, proud of his role in building the modern tobacco industry, said, "The impact of those great advertising campaigns not only built this for ourselves, but built the cigarette business as well, because—'you help the whole industry if you do a good job'" (Tennant 1971, p. 137).

The "Maturity" of the Cigarette Market

As a spokesperson for the cigarette industry has argued in a congressional hearing (Ward 1989), the industry considers itself to be operating in a "mature" market—mature because the growth in this market has slowed over the past two decades and because the product being marketed is well known to consumers. This theoretical concept of a mature market is illustrated by an analogy to the stages of biological development from birth to death. The application of this theory to the cigarette industry hinges on the belief that markets develop in predictable stages and that these stages govern the intent of corporate behaviors, such as advertising and promotion. It has been asserted before congressional hearings, for example, that in 'mature' markets such as the one for tobacco products, awareness of the product is universal. The function of advertising in a 'mature' market is to promote brand loyalty or brand switching" (Ward 1989, p. 304). The argument continues that the tobacco industry has no strategic interest in youthful nontobacco-users because "advertising cannot influence a nonuser to begin using the product category" (Ward 1989, p. 306).

Few studies have specifically examined how the product life cycle applies to the cigarette industry. One early study written in support of the concept defined three substages of market maturity. Of 33 cigarette brands examined, only 36 percent of them were classified into any of the three mature stages, in contrast with 56 percent of health care and personal care products and 60 percent of food products (Polls and Cook 1969). A few years later, two research directors from the J Walter Thompson advertising agency reviewed this study and others and counseled readers of the Harvard Business Review: "Most writers present the [product life cycle] concept in qualitative terms, in the form of idealization without empirical backing. Also, they fail to draw a clear distinction between product class (e.g., cigarettes), product form (e.g., filter cigarettes), and brand (e.g., Winston). But, for our purposes, this does not matter. We shall see that it is not possible to validate the model at any of these levels of aggregation" (Dhalla and Yuspeh 1976, p. 103).

Advertising textbooks counselled that even when faced with so-called mature markets, advertising firms can and often should attempt both to increase usage among existing customers and to address potential new users. For example, one leading textbook makes it clear that product maturity by no means rules out the capacity—or the need—to attract new users.

Product class maturity is typified by a slowdown of growth and a fairly constant level of sales. This means that competition may become very intense because any brand can only increase its sales by taking them from a competitor or by developing new uses, users, or changing the product. The brand's objectives during maturity are to defend its position, take share from the competition, promote new uses and users, and support the retailer. In addition, the advertising should stress new uses, new users, and new usage occasions in an attempt to increase overall sales of the product class (Rothschild 1987, p. 105).

It appears that no matter what the appropriate classification of the product, different classes of potential consumers will still exist as market segments with different and particular circumstances. Marketing will thus have to address these individual segments—including that of young people for whom the product and brands are less well known, and for whom appeal must be created, since cigarettes are not a necessity of life.
Perhaps the strongest indicator that cigarette manufacturers, despite their assertions about encouraging brand switching and fostering brand loyalty, must seek out large numbers of new consumers stems from a striking feature of this mature market. The noted "slowdown" over the past two decades reflects the substantial attention that has occurred among the industry's consumers since 1964, about 44 million Americans have quit smoking (CDC, 1993), and approximately 9 million more have died of tobacco-related disease (Tye, Warner, Glantz 1987). For the cigarette industry to preserve its mature status, it must attract some two million new smokers each year to replace these lost consumers. To reach this market of potential new smokers, the industry must earmark a large proportion of the $4 billion annually spent on advertising and promotional activities. As is shown through epidemiologic data in Chapters 3 (see "Age or Grade When Smoking Begins") and 4 (see "Sociodemographic Factors in the Initiation of Smoking") of this report, these new smokers will primarily be adolescents. These potential young consumers have been shown to become aware of cigarettes, in part, through cigarette advertising (Chapman and Fitzgerald 1982; Atkien, Leathar, O'Hagan 1985); moreover, young people appear to develop brand loyalty early on (O'Connell et al 1981), and because of the addictive properties of nicotine (discussed in Chapter 2), these young smokers are likely to continue into adulthood as cigarette consumers.

Contemporary Strategies of the Tobacco Industry

Tobacco companies have used multiple research resources and perspectives even for a single brand. Most of this research is not accessible. However, recent disclosures of corporate documents examined during a trial contesting Canada's cigarette advertising ban, which became effective on January 1, 1989, provide evidence that at least some tobacco companies (in this instance, both plaintiffs) had explicitly targeted youth as recently as the 1980s. These documents, which have been cited and discussed in Polley and Lavack (1992), were disclosed in proceedings assessing the constitutionality of Canada's Tobacco Products Control Act (Imperial Tobacco Limited & R J Reynolds-MacDonald Inc. v. LeProcurer General du Canada, Quebec Superior Court, 1990). This litigation provided a unique opportunity to examine contemporary internal industry documents regarding the industry's strategic interest in youth.

Researching the Young

Documents produced during the Canadian trial revealed information about projects that support the interest of the tobacco industry in the youth market. Imperial Tobacco Limited's Project Huron, for example, evaluated the feasibility of a flavored cigarette targeted primarily at males aged 15 through 25 years old. The project was the subject of at least 33 different market research reports supplied by at least six external research sources over the space of just four years. Research documents discussed the behavior of 11-, 12-, and 13-year-olds and the nature of the process of beginning to smoke (Pollay and Lavack 1992). Both Imperial Tobacco Limited and R J. Reynolds-MacDonald generated several research studies focused on beginning smokers; some of these studies identified the perceived risks and rationalizations of preteens and teens at smoking onset. Imperial Tobacco Limited's Project 16 (AG-216) revealed that "the adolescent seeks to display his new urge for independence with a symbol, and cigarettes are such a symbol...Serious efforts to learn to smoke occur between ages 12 and 13 in most cases..." However intriguing smoking was at 11, 12 or 13, by the age of 16 or 17 many regretted their use of cigarettes for health reasons and because they feel unable to stop smoking when they want to" (p i-vi). The follow-up Project Plus/Minus (AG-217) revealed to Imperial Tobacco Limited that "starters no longer disbelieve the dangers of smoking, but they almost universally assume these risks will not apply to themselves because they will not become addicted. Once addiction does take place, it becomes necessary for the smoker to make peace with the accepted hazard..." This is done by a wide range of rationalizations. The desire to quit seems to come earlier now than before, even prior to the end of high school" (p vi).

The other plaintiff in the trial, R J Reynolds-MacDonald, had also researched the young, studying in great depth 1,022 subjects from ages 15 through 24 in Youth Target Study '87 (RJR-M-6). To determine whether young people who had never smoked came from particular family and social environments, the study considered the possible factors of adult smoking, family pressures about starting, and smoking by teenage peers. Personality and attitude were assessed through 15 character dimensions, such as "laissez-faire," "workaholic," "wimpishness," or "dropout". Attitudes and knowledge about the association between smoking and health risk were closely studied. The images of smokers, ex-smokers, and never smokers were measured along 17 dimensions. Data on the image of tobacco products were gathered on 25 scales. Advocacy issues were inferred by measuring...
awareness of antismoking campaigns and the relative credibility of various sources of information, such as doctors, teachers, government employees, and manufacturers. Perhaps the most striking component of this massive research effort, however, was the measurement of personality traits using a clinical psychometric instrument, Cattell’s 16 Personality Factors. Scales of this instrument measure elements of personality defined as ranging from tough-minded to tender-minded, trusting to suspicious, or shy to adventurous, among others.

Youth Target Study ’87 used cluster analysis to divide the youth market into seven psychographic groups: “Big City Independents,” “Tomorrow’s Leaders,” “ Transitional Adults,” “ Quiet Conformers,” “ T.G.I.F’s,” “ Insecure Moralisers,” and “Small Town Traditionalists.” (RJR-M-6, pp 8-10) The T.G.I.F (Thank God It’s Friday) segment was the largest, containing about 30 percent of this population of 15- through 24-year-olds. Since 62 percent of the T.G.I.F group were reported to be smokers, they were considered an important segment. The T.G.I.F group primarily comprised underachievers who were “rooted in the present. They live for the moment and tend to be self-indulgent. Achievement and leadership is not a goal for this group compared to others. Societal issues are relative nonissues. They are the most prominent supporters of smoking... “They do read newspapers and some magazines, including Playboy and Penthouse. Heavy metal and hard rock are common music choices” (RJR-M-6, pp 8, 21).

Portraying Youthful Behavior

As a matter of policy, “positive lifestyle images” were used by Imperial Tobacco Limited to suggest the continued social acceptability of smoking. The company chose models and activities to facilitate young people’s identification with the company’s products. Creative guidelines for the Player’s brand, for example, specified that the target market would “emphasize the under-20-year-old group in its imagery reflection of lifestyle (activity) tastes” (AG-35, p 42). The models used in Player’s advertising were to be “25 years or older, but should appear to be between 18 and 25 years of age” (AG-35, p 52).

R. J. Reynolds-MacDonald, however, learned that models can be too young appearing for the young consumer’s taste. When the Tempo brand cigarette was test-marketed in selected cities, most of its media budget was allotted to out-of-home media, targeting key youth locations and meeting places close to youth-frequented sites, such as theaters, record stores, and video arcades. To target the young, who were perceived to be “extremely influenced by their peer group,” the J. Walter Thompson advertising recommendations called for “imagery which portrays the social appeal of peer group acceptance—where acceptance by the group provides a sense of belonging and security” (AG-16, p. 4). The media featured young-looking models arm-in-arm, wearing casual clothes perceived as trendy by the young. The brand met with mixed results in the test market, however, in part because it was too explicitly young in character. Few teenagers, it seems, wanted an explicitly teen product, instead preferring to use products associated with adulthood.

Conveying Pictures of Health

The images used in many of Canada’s cigarette ads were carefully crafted to feature attainable activities that appealed to youth but were not so intense as to be unbelievable in the context of smoking. The Player’s Filter ‘81, Creative Guideline (AG-222) required that ads feature activities that “should not require undue physical exertion. They should not be representative of an elitist’s sport nor should they be seen as a physical conditioner. The activity shown should be one which is practiced by young people 16 to 20 years old or one that these people can reasonably aspire to in the near future” (AG-222, pp 1–2).

These images were tested to ensure that they elicited minimal counterargument from viewers. For example, in the Project Stereo Advertising Evaluation (AG-220), a windsurfing ad for the Player’s brand received the following evaluation:

The reaction to windsurfing as an activity is neutral with regard to whether or not the people who engage in it are likely to be smokers or not. However, the more physically fit and healthy-looking the protagonists, the stronger the no-smoking classification elicited. The same person sitting on the beach—perceived by most as resting after surfing—or shown carrying a surfboard—whether getting out of the water or walking toward the ocean—evokes different reactions regarding smoking. Respondents are willing to accept the man smoking while resting but are reluctant to think of him as a smoker while his well-built body is in full view (AG-220, p 6).

Projecting Images of Independence

The brands most successful with teenagers seem to be those that offer adult imagery rich with connotations of independence, freedom from authority, and/or self-reliance. Imperial Tobacco Limited’s Project Sting tested “overtly masculine imagery, targeted at young males” (Pollay 1989b, p 241). Young males were seen as “going through a stage where they are seeking to express their independence and individuality under constant...
Appeal for young Canadian teens and preteens, as the company recognized in its Export Family Strategy Document of 1982 (AG-222): "Very young starter smokers choose Export A because it provides them with an instant badge of masculinity, appeals to their rebellious nature and establishes their position amongst their peers" (AG-222, p. 7299).

Imperial Tobacco Limited's Project Stereo (1985) provided creative guidelines for the effective display of freedom and independence in advertising imagery designed to appeal to a young market. Its Final Report (AG-27) made recommendations for designing advertisements for the Player's brand that showed someone "free to choose friends, music, clothes, own activities, to be alone if he wishes"; who "can manage alone" and be "close to nature" with "nobody to interfere, no boss/parents"; someone self-reliant enough to experience solitude without loneliness (AG-27, p. 60).

Project Stereo also described how Player's and its closest rival for young males, Export A, both used images, not words, to convey the critical concepts of independence, self-reliance, autonomy, and freedom from authority. Both brands used advertisements that featured strong, masculine, hardy men who were typically alone in the fresh air of the outdoors. But as is shown in the chart below, the two competitors conveyed their respective images with relatively small yet important differences.

---

### Player's Smoker's Image vs. Export A Smoker's Image

**Player's Smoker's Image**
- Chooses to be alone.
- Conveys masculinity but also gentleness.
- Can show feelings.
- Can include women.
- Has a good job, is a good worker.
- Is adventurous.
- Is independent and strong willed.

**Export A Smoker's Image**
- Is a loner.
- Conveys machismo and ruggedness.
- Does not show feelings.
- Excludes women.
- Is working-class.
- Is a daredevil.
- Isn't concerned about society.

(AG-27, p. 18)

The more subtle, less excluding Player's image proved far more successful than the uncompromising Export A image.

---

### Images of the American Ideal

United States advertisers, too, have long thought that individualism and the stimulating notions of independence, self-reliance, and autonomy are important strategic concepts in ad development. The Marlboro cowboy (also known as the Marlboro man) epitomizes this stereotype of American independence. Usually depicted alone, he interacts with no one; he is strikingly free of interference from authority figures such as parents, older brothers, bosses, and bullies. Indeed, the Marlboro man is burdened by no one whose authority he must respect or even consider (see Figure 1).

One account (Meyers 1984) describes the success of Philip Morris's George Weissman and Jack Landry, who were instrumental in making Marlboro the best-selling cigarette brand in the United States. Marlboro had long been sold as a woman's cigarette, with lipstick-colored filters and a "Mild as May" slogan (see Figure 1). The first attempt to reposition the brand as "male" featured the breathy, sensual singing of Julie London and male models with tattooed hands. But when Weissman, then head of marketing for Philip Morris, assumed responsibility for the campaign in the late 1950s, his research informed him that postadolescents in search of an identity were beginning to smoke as a way of declaring independence from their parents. Jack Landry, the advertising executive for Philip Morris, coordinated with the Leo Burnett agency and came up with "commercials that would turn rookie smokers on to Marlboro...[that would convey] the right image to capture the youth market's fancy...[and project] a perfect symbol of independence and individualistic rebellion"—in other words, the Marlboro cowboy (Meyers 1984, p. 70). The power of the associative psychological style of advertising was demonstrated by the Marlboro brand's capture of a significant market share of starters every year, until it soon became the best-selling brand. This success has proved long-lived. In 1993, Marlboro commanded 21 percent of the domestic market share—by far the largest share (Maxwell 1993). As Philip Morris's president and CEO, R.W. Murray observed, the Marlboro man still has a powerful attraction. The "cowboy has appeal to people as a personality. There are elements of adventure, freedom, being in charge of your destiny." (Trachtenberg 1987, p. 109)

Marlboro's success led to much imitation and competition in the industry. The FTC reported that one of the popular advertising strategies of the late 1960s was the use of associative themes, where an image portrayed "one or more personality characteristics which the advertiser hopes will appeal to the audience of existing and potential cigarette smokers...the classic example of this approach is the Marlboro cowboy—ruggedly masculine, self-sufficient. The theme of masculine independence has been used by several other advertisers" (FTC 1970, p. 8). Advertisements for Camel, Newport, and Old Gold were named as examples.
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In a parallel manner, advertisements for brands such as Virginia Slims appealed to feminine independence. An ad executive who headed the account for a leading female brand, and who requested anonymity, was quoted by the Wall Street Journal as stating, "We try to tap the emerging independence and self-fulfillment of women, to make smoking a badge to express that" (Waldman 1989, p. B1).

Over the past few decades, many advertising campaigns have featured race car drivers, and many brands (such as Camel, Marlboro, and Winston) continue to sponsor racing events and teams. A commercial study of three different executions of a 1976 Viceroy advertisement with close-ups of "a young man in auto racing garb" found that subtle visual differences caused by the model's appearance, positioning, or other visual staging devices could greatly affect consumer reactions. Despite identical verbal copy and layout in all three advertisements, one of them more strongly suggested that smokers of Viceroy had the desirable "positive personality characteristics including courageou..."
Historical Content Analyses of Cigarette Advertising

Introduction

The social sciences afford a variety of approaches for describing and analyzing the content of communications of all kinds, whether in the form of speeches, conversations, newspaper articles, signs, or advertisements. Specific communications, such as a single ad or the coherent set of ads that constitutes a campaign, can be examined in detail. Typically, in-depth approaches, such as semiotics, are discursive descriptions that deconstruct the message and its meaning through detailed consideration of the elements of the ad (e.g., words, symbols, images), their structure (e.g., layout and prominence of visuals, rhetorical devices, and emphasis), and the cultural context in which these appear (e.g., the meanings traditionally attached to the ad elements, alone or in combination). These methods describe in sophisticated, analytical terms the probable meaning of the message to the average audience member.

The term “content analysis” is also used to describe a formal set of sampling and coding techniques, whose intent is to produce objective numerical data descriptive of a set of communications, such as a collection of ads. These systematic methods code and count both the overt and latent content of ads by observing the verbal and visual elements within a set of predetermined definitions. The definitions can be coded for events at various levels of observation, from broad themes to specific minutiae. These definitions are employed by trained coders, who apply them to a systematically drawn sample of ads. The reliability of this coding task is usually measured and reported and depends upon how clear are the communications under study, how complex the definitions of interest, how difficult the coding task, how attentive the coders, and other factors. The sample can be either cross-sectional (representing many brands’ advertising), longitudinal (tracing evolution of advertising over time), or both. Like other sampling, the representativeness of the sample studied and the resulting potential to generalize from the results are a function of the sampling strategy (e.g., drawn from certain sources, seasonally or randomly determined, a complete census).

The simultaneous pursuit of objectivity in content-analysis coding and meaningful observation often involves methodological judgment to weigh the various trade-offs and compromises. Some analysts (e.g., Ringgold and Calfee 1989) deliberately limit their efforts primarily to the verbal content of the ads, analyzing the words in painstaking detail. The limitations of this careful but restricted focus and the inferences that can be appropriately drawn from it have been the subject of a sustained debate (Cohen 1989, 1992, Riggall and Calfee 1989).

The next sections of this chapter discuss the more formal content analyses of historical samples of cigarette ads and focus on the more fundamental results, general tendencies, and broader conclusions. Within the limits of the noted sampling for each study, these analyses describe the universe of cigarette advertising for multiple brands, or of cigarette advertising in general, rather than for specific brands and their campaigns. In some studies, the content analysis data descriptive of cigarette advertising are related to other information, such as product features, market shares, audience characteristics, or historical events.

Increase in Visual and Vivid Advertising

The first published report analyzing the content of cigarette advertising (Weinberger, Campbell, DuGrenier 1981) studied 251 cigarette ads found in the issues of Newsweek, Sports Illustrated, and the Ladies Home Journal during the years 1957, 1967, and 1977. The report noted an eightfold increase in the volume of cigarette magazine ads between 1957 and 1977, as the industry left broadcast media. The investigators found significant increases, as well, in the proportion of ads in color, at premium locations (e.g., on the back or inside covers of magazines), and with multiple pages. Both explicit and implied health claims were also found to have increased significantly almost all ads for lower tar products advertised in 1977 were “tombstone” ads (i.e., consisting of text and package display only)—no models, nature
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independence, adventurousness and aggressiveness” (Schwartz 1976, p. 75)

The sponsorship of racing car events by Marlboro (see Figure 1) may seem inconsistent with the cowboy character, but it is not. The company’s Vice President of Marketing Services, Ellen Merlo, explained “We perceive Formula One and Indy car racing as adding, if you will, a modern-day dimension to the Marlboro Man. The image of Marlboro is very rugged, individualistic, heroic. And so is this style of auto racing. From an image standpoint, the fit is good” (Business of Racing 1989, p. 5A).
Becoming Pictures of Health

Verbally explicit health claims, a prominent feature of early cigarette advertising, have been replaced by claims about filter effectiveness, mildness, and the mandatory warnings and disclosures. As scientific evidence of the health risks of smoking became increasingly known to the general public in the 1950s and 1960s, the pseudoscientific claims made by cigarette advertising in earlier decades (claims that using a given brand, for instance, would protect against "smoker's cough") were replaced by unadorned statements of filter effectiveness against tar and nicotine. These later health claims tacitly allowed that smoking was harmful, but they strongly suggested that smoking a particular brand was significantly less harmful. Such health claims thus have the primary purpose of promoting sales for a separate product category: that of "low-tar, low-nicotine" cigarettes. Verbal health claims in advertising have otherwise been replaced by visual, connotative imagery—what can be called pictures of health.

Ringold (1987) reported on the verbal content of 211 cigarette ads drawn primarily from Time magazine from 1926 to 1985, partially supplementing the sample, as needed, with ads drawn from the New Yorker, the Saturday Evening Post, and Life, in that order. Although inexplicably omitting any Philip Morris brands, this sample sought one ad each for six brands: Camel, Chesterfield, Kent, Lucky Strike, Old Gold, and Viceroy. Detailed coding was done on the verbal content in headlines, subheads, and body copy. Even though all "mildness" assertions were treated as taste claims only, health claims were the most frequently made type of claim for the period before 1954. For the overall 1926–1985 study period, health claims were the third most frequent type of claim, representing 18 percent of all claims. This finding was true for five out of the six brands studied, and there was "little to distinguish the various brands in terms of the health claims frequently used" (Ringold 1987).

A study of the words and images of all 567 ads from 108 issues of Life (1938–1983) and Look (1962–1971) included the ads for 57 brands (Pollay 1991). Four major brands accounted for 75 percent of the total sample. Multiple judges coded these ads for 12 major and independent thematic dimensions. Three of these dimensions were postulated to communicate healthiness: (1) "health/safety" made verbal claims about positive physical effects, medical use or endorsements, or reduced symptoms and risks, including filter-effectiveness claims (unless the text linked effectiveness to product taste); (2) "bold/lively behavior" provided images of active, athletic, or risk-taking behavior; and (3) "pure scenes" provided images of nature associated with wholesomeness, cleanliness, and purity, such as glaciers, mountain streams, or new-fallen snow. Other themes measured included "well made" (product quality), "good deal" (value for money), "enjoy" (pleasure and satisfaction), "female, male, glamour/luxury" (celebrities, status, wealth), "relax" (peace of mind), and "official" (tested or endorsed by authorities).

Judges found one or more of the healthiness themes in 60 percent of the studied ads, images of bold and lively behavior in 20 percent, and pure scenes in 30 percent. Some stereotypical differentiation of men and women was evident: ads featuring men were significantly more likely to use images of bold and lively behavior, whereas the ads featuring women were significantly more likely to use images of glamour and luxury.

Warner (1985b) studied 716 cigarette ads from Time for selected years from 1929 through 1984. Various visual, verbal, and thematic elements of the ads were coded: the presence or absence of smoke, the manner in which cigarettes were held, the nature of models employed, the degree of prominence given to health messages, and the types of themes not focused on health, such as humor, rugged individualism, and romance. Data were not reported for individualism, emancipation, or other themes of independence. Data were grouped according to their proximity to periods of intense public consideration of the health consequences of smoking—such as the health concerns raised in the early 1950s (particularly since increased promotion and supply of cigarettes during World War II had contributed to a larger population of young adult smokers [Blake 1985]), the first (1964) Surgeon General's report on smoking and health, and the Fairness Doctrine that required broadcast cigarette ads to carry health-risk messages during the period 1967–1970. Results show evidence of the dramatic growth in magazine advertising over the 56-year study period: the average number of cigarette ads per issue rose steadily from less than one per issue for the 1929–1952 period to over eight per issue for 1974–1981 (after the ban on radio and television had gone into effect). During the last two decades studied, the images in these ads had the notable characteristic of showing virtually no smoke. Although visible smoke appeared in half of the ads before 1964, after 1964 only 5 percent of lit cigarettes appeared to emit...
visible smoke, and after 1976 not a single instance of smoke was found in this sample. The imagery in those ads was increasingly, and apparently deliberately, becoming more pristine by eliminating smoke from ads.

The balance between the verbal and visual elements of the ads was measured in this study, as was the degree of health focus. Ads that relied more heavily on words than on pictorial images were judged as trying to convey a health message. Both the health focus and the balance between verbal and visual elements were found to be episodic; ads tended to verbally emphasize health themes during the years of major smoking and health events. Such ads often emphasized a health-related product innovation, such as scientifically designed filters. This general pattern seemed to end in 1964, the year of the first Surgeon General's report, during and after which ads became more visual. Warner (1985b) notes, "Industry advertising directors may have concluded that the most effective contemporary response to health concerns is an indirect one—conveying visual images of vibrant, physically fit, successful, sociable, and sexy people in physically active or glamorous settings, in other words, associating smoking with people who are the proverbial 'picture of health'" (p. 125). Similar observations were made by Rogers and Gopal (1987), who studied an unspecified number of ads from three issues of Time and Life magazines each year, at five-year intervals from 1938 to 1986. They noted that over time, positive health appeals were displaced by claims of having "less harmful" products, and that these in turn were displaced by "more and more lifestyle advertising...brand image...using more poster style layouts and color spreads...with very little body copy" (pp. 262, 266).

Other researchers have noted the episodic nature of cigarette advertising history but attribute the changes not to industry strategy or sophistication, but to the effects of regulation and self-regulation, such as FTC activity or industry self-regulatory codes. Ringold and Calfee (1989) report on the verbal content of 568 ads drawn primarily from Time magazine from 1926 through 1986. This sample is both longitudinal (N = 348), expanding on the sample of one ad per year for various brands reported earlier (Ringold, 1987), and cross-sectional, using a sample of 25 ads each for the seven mid-decade years (1926, 1936, 1946, 1956, 1966, 1976, and 1986). The ads were coded along 27 general ad characteristics and 51 claim categories. The coding, described by the authors as conservative, treated all mildness claims as claims about taste that were irrelevant to health and treated all claims about filter innovations as claims about product quality, not about health. Nonetheless, results of the longitudinal sample show that 27 percent of all claims were health claims, making it the most common category, primarily because ads since 1965 were required to carry tar and nicotine disclosures (See "Warning Labels on Tobacco Products" in Chapter 5). Voluntary health claims were anywhere from 17 percent to 29 percent of total claims before 1954 but had nearly disappeared after that year.

In the longitudinal analysis, action-oriented ads—those depicting competitive sports, adventurous pursuits, or leisure behaviors—were more than twice as common (42 percent of all ads) as those showing all other types of activity, such as working, eating, or shopping (17 percent of all ads). Almost identical results were found for the cross-sectional sample of 220 ads. No data were reported for how the frequencies of these images of activities changed over time.

Advertising That Targets Youthful Audiences

Albright et al. (1988) studied cigarette ads in magazines that reach young readers (Rolling Stone, Cycle World), female readers (Ladies Home Journal, Mademoiselle), or general adult readers (Time, TV Guide, Ebony, Popular Science). All cigarette ads in one issue for every year from the 1960s through 1985 were coded, yielding 776 ads for analysis. Like other analysts, Albright et al. found that the volume of magazine advertisements increased dramatically during this period, stabilizing after 1977 at six to seven ads per issue. Within this study sample, the proportion of total ads appearing in the magazines reaching younger audiences grew significantly over time to become 36 percent of the total. The analysts concluded that although these data may not fully represent the overall market trends, "women and adolescent magazine readers are exposed to a large quantity of cigarette ads, regardless of the advertisers' intent" (Albright et al. 1988, p. 232).

Altman et al. (1987) analyzed the themes and images employed in this same sample of magazines. The study focused on the ads (78 percent of the total sample) that showed a setting or had a model present. These were coded for elements of the act of smoking, the presence of a low-tar or low-nicotine theme, and suggestions of the "vitality of smoking." The latter concept was measured with subcategories of adventure/risk (e.g., rock climbing, sailing, racing cars), recreation (e.g., playing tennis, surfing), and romantic/erotic appeal (e.g., scantily dressed models, moonlight settings).

Images of risk and adventure, recreation, and erotic or romantic display in youth magazines increased significantly over this period (1960s to 1985). Ads in youth magazines were significantly more likely than ads in other magazines to depict images of adventure or risk,
were more likely to display recreation, and were some-
what less likely to depict erotic imagery. Tombstone ads
were less likely to appear in youth magazines, or con-
versely, youth magazines were more likely to feature
image-based ads.1 Like Warner (1985a), Altman et al.
found a decline in the evidence of visible smoke and the
act of smoking.

The database of Altman et al. (1987) was extended
by Basil et al. (1991), who examined differential target-
ing, or how cigarette advertising strategies varied de-
pending on the characteristics of the primary readership.
These researchers added two magazines with a primar-
ily black readership (Jet and Essence) and updated the
sample to include magazines from the 1960s through
July 1989 for an enlarged sample of 1,171 ads. These
investigators also delineated three subcategories of ro-
mantic/erotic themes—(1) horseplay—males and females
cavorting, (2) erotic content—romantic or sexy situations,
innuendo, and (3) seductive poses—wanton looks or
suggestive glances or poses.

From 1984 through July 1989, the number of ads
per magazine issue declined in general in men's and
women's magazines but was relatively stable in those
magazines reaching black and youth audiences. The
most common type of ads in men's and youth maga-
zines showed models engaged in lower-intensity sports,
such as water skiing or volleyball. Analysis of variance
between magazine types found that ads depicting inci-
dents of horseplay and romantic contact were most preva-
lent in black-and youth-oriented publications. A separate
analysis found that incidents of horseplay had grown
significantly more frequent over time and were signifi-
cantly related to the average age of a magazine's readers.
magazines with a younger readership were more likely
to run ads featuring horseplay. Comparing results for all
consumer segments, the researchers concluded that these
ad strategies appear to depend on the segment's current rate of smok-
ing... Readers with high smoking rates are often
pitched to choose certain brands with appeals based
on some aspect of the brand rather than on the
models depicted in the ad. However, readers with
low smoking rates appear to be given appeals that
focus on models, suggesting that smoking is fun,
helps you make friends, and will make you desirable.
Groups with lower smoking rates are more frequently
given appeals that appear to be attempting to recruit new smokers (Basil et al. 1991, p 88).

1Research (such as Fischer et al. 1989) that has examined
the effect that health warning labels in cigarette
advertising have on young people is discussed in
Chapter 6.

The work of King et al. (1991) partially contradicts
and partially replicates findings from the previously
described studies. King et al. followed a similar sampling
strategy, drawing ads from one issue for each available
year, between 1954 and 1986, for each of eight magazines
representing five distinct audience orientations: general
interest (Time), older women (Ladies Home Journal
and Redbook), younger women (Vogue), older men (Popular
Mechanics and Esquire) and younger men (Sports Illustrated
and Playboy). This sampling yielded 1,100 cigarette ads for
an analysis that focused on visually oriented content.

Like other studies, King et al. noted a large increase
in magazine advertising: the number of ads per issue
was more than ten times greater for the period 1971–1983
than for the period 1954–1970. Playboy had both the
largest number of cigarette ads per average issue and the
lowest median audience age. Unlike earlier studies,
however, King et al. found no systematic relationship
between the median age of a magazine's audience and
the average number of ads published.

As was found in previous multiyear studies, cigare-
ette ads in general relied more and more on visual
imagery and became increasingly larger (e.g., more ads
were multipaged), more photographic, more colorful,
and more visual than verbal. The volume of cigarette ads
varied significantly over time; the greatest changes were
a decline in the proportional importance of general-inter-
est magazines, a relative stability for both older and
younger men's magazines, and a growth in both older
and younger women's magazines. The ads in the younger
men's and women's magazines together constituted 39
percent of the total cigarette ad volume in this sample of
magazines during 1954 through 1970, 33 percent during
1971 through 1983, and 45 percent during 1984 through
1986. Similarly, Warner and Goldenhar's (1992) analysis
of the use of 92 magazines as cigarette advertising ve-
cules from 1959 through 1986 found the largest increase
in women's magazines and in magazines reaching pre-
dominately blue-collar readers.

Imaging Individualism, Independence, and
Self-Reliance

In King and colleagues' (1991) analysis, the activi-
ties of the models fall into six categories: adventure (op-
erating a speedboat), recreation (playing ball), erotic (be-
ing romantic with another), sociability (talking with peers),
working (ranching), and individualistic/solitary (read-
ing a book, watching a sunset). The study defined indi-
vidualism solely in terms of restful behaviors; this decision
and the resulting classification of the Marlboro cowboy
as "working" rather than "individualistic solitary" are
debatable elements of this study, but the results none-
thless indicate the importance of the independence theme.
For example, the most frequently cited categories of ads that reached younger women were individualism (29 percent), recreation (26 percent), and sociability (20 percent). The most frequently pictured activities in ads that reached younger men were individualism (21 percent), work (21 percent), recreation (20 percent), and adventure (14 percent). The authors noted that “portrayals of individualism were more likely to appear in cigarette ads placed in younger men's and younger women's magazines.” Despite this and other noted differences between ads in various types of media, “this study found a striking universality of theme, regardless of audience orientation. Individualistic/solitary and recreational themes were most frequently portrayed in virtually all magazine types” (King et al. 1991, p. 77).

Schooler and Basil (1990) studied all types of billboard ads in San Francisco neighborhoods. Billboard advertising is held to be important because it allows neighborhood-level targeting and ethnic segmentation. Like point-of-sale store signage, billboard advertising has more permanence than magazine ads, allowing multiple incidental exposures for all ages of persons who are on the neighborhood street regularly, going to work, stores, or schools. Of the 901 billboards photographed between May 1985 and September 1987 in 210 commercial districts, tobacco ads were the most frequent (19 percent), closely followed by alcohol (17 percent). Black and Hispanic neighborhoods had significantly more tobacco and alcohol ads than white or Asian neighborhoods. Billboards of any type were 1.7 times more common in black neighborhoods (2.2 per 1,000 people) than in a citywide sampling (1.3 per 1,000). Tobacco billboard ads were even more common in black neighborhoods, appearing at 2.4 times the citywide rate.

The content of these ads was coded for several social cues—sex, ethnicity, apparent social “class” of the models, reward cues (e.g., romance, sociability, recreation, sportiness and active lifestyle, and adventure/risk), and attractiveness cues (e.g., rugged individualism, machismo, fashionableness, sex appeal, fame/expertise, and friendliness). The most prevalent reward cue images associated with smoking were sportiness and active lifestyle, recreation, and adventure/risk. The most prevalent attractiveness cue on tobacco billboards was rugged individualism or machismo. The statistically significant results indicated how important social cues are to these tobacco products. The study suggests that people are more likely to be portrayed in cigarette and alcohol ads (59 percent) than in advertising generally (16 percent), and cigarette and alcohol ads were more likely than others to use models that matched the ethnicity of the neighborhoods. When advertising for smoking and for alcohol were compared, the study concluded that alcohol ads use modeling cues that suggest that product consumption will enhance one's social life, whereas tobacco billboards emphasize rewards that are more individualistically oriented. “Rugged individualism,” the study observed, “was the most prevalent attractiveness cue on tobacco billboards. The epitome of these ads is the Marlboro man” (Schooler and Basil 1990, p. 15). These research results are reported in brief elsewhere (Altman, Schooler, Basil 1991), and additional statistical analyses of the same database reach the same conclusions (Schooler, Basil, Altman 1991).

Altman and colleagues' (1987) analysis of 778 magazine ads from the 1960s through 1985 also found that images of adventure and risk had become more prevalent across all magazine types. Youth magazines were even more likely than other types to depict images of adventure/risk and recreation.

Other Related Research

Perceptions of Models' Ages

Mazis et al. (1992) studied the perceived age of the models used in cigarette ads appearing in 97 magazines in October 1987. In the 101 issues (some magazines were published more often than once a month) that contained cigarette ads, 393 cigarette ads for 22 brands were found, of which 119 were unique (i.e., did not appear in another of the 97 magazines that month). Narrowing the sample to ads with models whose faces were “clearly visible” (i.e., their faces were at least two-thirds exposed and were depicted close enough to discern approximate age) yielded 50 unique ads with 65 models. Two samples of 280 and 281 judges were recruited from a racially and economically diverse shopping mall, with quotas that guaranteed a cross-section of gender and age (13 years old and older).

Each participant was asked to estimate the age and assess the attractiveness of the models in a random sample of 25 ads. These data were compared to data on the median age of the audiences of the magazines used as sources. A positive and statistically significant correlation was found between perceived model age and median audience age. For example, young-looking models tended to appear in media read by young audiences—a correlation advantageous to the advertisers, since young viewers proved more likely than older viewers to perceive that attractiveness declined with advancing perceived age.

Fourteen (22 percent) of the 65 models were judged, on average, to be less than 25 years old, and eleven (17 percent) were attributed a mean perceived age far enough below 25 years old to be statistically significant. Nine of these young-looking models were women, four of them in various Virginia Slims ads. "Some cigarette..."
ads," the authors concluded, "are clearly violating the industry's voluntary code that requires models not to 'appear to be less than twenty-five years of age'" (Mazis et al. 1992, p. 35)

Ads That Target Women

The history of campaigns that target women has been reviewed by discussing specific campaigns and generating data for advertising intensities (i.e., the numbers of ads appearing in each magazine) for 1971 through 1984 (Ernster 1985). Tabulation of the number of ads in Better Homes and Gardens, Ladies Home Journal, and McCall's revealed that ad intensity grew steadily during the 1970s, peaked in 1979, and declined thereafter. Nonetheless, in 1984, an average of more than 10 cigarette ads appeared in each issue of these magazines and of Cosmopolitan, Family Circle, Glamour, Harper's Bazaar, Mademoiselle, Redbook, Vogue, and Woman's Day.

A similar report (Howe 1984) on the history of women and cigarette advertising included graphs of the frequency of cigarette ads showing women smoking that appeared in Life (for the period 1936-1972) and Ebony (for 1945-1980). These ads peaked in the mid-1960s, and again in the early 1970s. The report observed that in these peak years, the ads generally focused on "women jogging, biking, backpacking and playing tennis, all while smoking a cigarette, too." It would be difficult to argue that these positive images are not influential on young, image-conscious teenagers" (p. 8).

Ads That Target Blacks

The cigarette ads targeting blacks in Ebony from 1950 through 1965 were studied by Pollay, Lee, and Carter-Whitney (1992). When the full census of cigarette ads from Ebony (N = 540) were compared with cigarette ads from a matching sample of Life issues, the investigators found that the ads targeting blacks were significantly more likely to use athletes and were two to three years tardy in announcing to black consumers new products with tar- and nicotine-reducing filters. Furthermore, cigarette advertising was initially more prevalent in Life than in Ebony, but after 1960, Ebony issues carried more cigarette ads.

The cigarette industry's greater intensity in targeting blacks through advertising has also been observed in more contemporary studies. In 1985, a comparison of advertising in selected magazines directed at white and black audiences (Cummins, Giovmo, Mendicino 1987) found that the magazines targeting blacks had significantly more cigarette advertising and more ads for menthol brands, which are preferred by a much higher proportion of blacks than whites (see "Cigarette Brand Preference" in Chapter 3). This racial disparity may mark the cigarette industry's reaction to the notable decline in black adolescent smokers during the past decade (see "Trends in Cigarette Smoking" in Chapter 3). A review of cigarette promotional practices in 1985 noted the diversity of methods for reaching black audiences, including the growing use of sponsorships of athletic, cultural, civic, fashion, and entertainment events. Especially noteworthy was the intensive use of smaller billboards in black communities; these ads accounted for 37 percent of all billboards, and most featured menthol brands. In contrast to the larger highway billboards, smaller billboards are usually placed low and close to the street—and thus visible to passersby of all ages.

Recently, R. J. Reynolds attempted to introduce a new brand of cigarettes, Uptown, to the black community in Philadelphia (Robinson et al. 1992). Through the efforts of black leaders, who mobilized their communities, the Uptown Coalition emerged. The Philadelphia community created the agenda rather than allowing the tobacco industry to dictate it. Media messages were carefully framed, and Uptown Coalition spokespersons were given clearly prescribed roles. In 1990, R. J. Reynolds abruptly canceled the launch of Uptown. The Uptown Coalition was historic because it represented the first community-based initiative that succeeded in getting the tobacco industry to take a cigarette out of production.
Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People

Promotional Efforts of the Tobacco Industry

Introduction

Whereas the role of advertising is primarily cognitive and affective (affecting consumers' knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes), the role of promotional efforts includes a substantial cognitive (action-affecting) component (Koehler 1991). A cigarette advertisement, regardless of how compelling, is unable to put a cigarette into a consumer's hand—best it can create desire or an interest in smoking. Cigarette promotion, however, can use sampling to put a cigarette into a consumer's hand—along with, in some instances, the lighter to ignite it. Promotion can also target a product to those specific consumers most likely to respond to a manufacturer's appeals (Rossiter and Percy 1987).

Cigarette marketers use several of the major categories of promotion to facilitate both the entrance of new smokers to the market and their development of brand loyalty. Because of the rapid growth in cigarette promotional expenditures (FTC 1992) and the importance of these expenditures in potentially recruiting new smokers, the following discussion will analyze each of these major categories of cigarette promotion. The recency of this growth, however, limits the amount of research this report can draw upon.

Public Entertainment

The cigarette industry uses the sponsorship of public entertainment events to bypass broadcast advertising bans and self-regulatory constraints. Sponsorship is an efficient way for an advertiser to have its brand name and logo achieve the equivalent effect of broadcast advertising without having to include any government-mandated warnings. Thus, cigarette manufacturers sponsor a wide array of sporting events (e.g., the Virginia Slims Tennis Tournament, the Winston Cup series, and auto racing in general through sponsoring particular cars and drivers) and other forms of public entertainment (e.g., the Kool Jazz Concert). The association of the brand name with the event is an advertising association for the brand. For example, through racing events and race cars bearing the Winston and Camel brand names, R.J. Reynolds has become the leading sponsor of automobile and motorcycle racing in the United States (Blum 1991). The association between events and cigarettes is so clear that in some markets, when ads selling tickets for a sponsored event (such as the Virginia Slims Tennis Tournament in Newport, Rhode Island) are run in local newspapers, the ads carry the mandated cigarette health warnings. Sponsorship can also preempt opposition to cigarettes among those who view sponsorship as necessary for the funding of an event. Despite the stated health threat, the association of the cigarette brand name with the event continues unabated on broadcast media, and event programming continues to feature cigarette brand logos. In the 1989 Marlboro Grand Prix telecast, for example, the Marlboro logo could be seen for over 46 of the 94 total minutes of broadcast time (Blum 1991). Such sponsorship is clearly viewed as delining a brand message by the marketer.

Event sponsorship also provides access to youth markets of potential smokers (Buchanan and Lev 1990). Because youth do not predominantly compose the attendance or viewership of such sponsored events, however, cigarette advertisers can argue that they are not actively targeting youth. Yet given the heavy concentrations of young people in these audiences, and given the limited venues available to cigarette advertisers to present their images to children, sponsored events may be among the most cost-effective promotional mechanisms.

Two studies conducted with children and adolescents support the observations that cigarette industry sponsorship reaches young people. Aitken, Leathar, and Squair (1986) conducted a study to determine children's awareness of cigarette brand sponsorship of sports and games in the United Kingdom. Young people from ages 10 through 17 years old were asked how they understood the term "sponsorship" and whether they could recall any cigarette brands that sponsored sports. The authors found that 13 percent of 10- and 11-year-old children and 43 percent of 16- and 17-year-olds mentioned that sports sponsorship entailed both a company's financial sponsorship of sporting events and its opportunity to advertise its products; 80 percent of 16- and 17-year-olds mentioned at least one of these two components of sponsorship. More than half of those 12 years old and older correctly associated at least one sponsored sport and the brand of the sponsoring cigarette company. Even children younger than age 11 identified the sponsored sports as activities linked with excitement. These findings supported those of Ledwith (1984), who also found that many 12- through 17-year-old schoolchildren were able to correctly identify sponsored sports and the sponsoring cigarette brand.

A secondary effect of sponsoring sports events is that the brand names become closely associated with the
sports they sponsor. Ledwith (1984), for example, found that the likelihood of linking a sport with a brand of cigarette was directly related to the time spent watching that sport. The study also found that brand awareness increased substantially following the televised broadcast of a major sporting event sponsored by that brand. Thus, Marlboro and Winston have become associated with auto and sports car racing, and Virginia Slims has become associated with tennis; both brands also have become associated with the self-image messages these sports convey. Cigarette smoking may thus appear to receive an implied endorsement from race car drivers, whose expertise is associated with their ability to thoughtfully assess risks, and from tennis players, whose success partly depends on their physical endurance—a trait medically proven to be undermined by cigarette smoking.

Tobacco company sponsorship has not been limited to cigarettes. Connolly, Orleans, and Blum (1992) reported that in 1991, Skoal and Copenhagen, the two smokeless tobacco brands preferred by adolescents, were promoted on national television through their sponsorship of professional rodeo, hunting, formula car racing, “monster” truck racing, drag racing, sprint car racing, and stock car racing. The investigators concluded that “the harmful effects of tobacco are camouflaged against the backdrop and thrill of athletic victory” (p. 353).

Sponsored athletic and entertainment events also provide a venue for product sampling. In areas in which cigarette sampling is legal, free cigarettes and other specialty items can be distributed at these events.

Sampling and Specialty Items

Distribution of free samples is one of the most powerful devices available to marketers. It allows a company to put its product into the hands of possible consumers in circumstances where consumers are more likely to try it (e.g., outside of work or school). In the case of cigarettes, the power of sampling may be especially great (Popper 1986), because these are free samples of an addictive product. Although the cigarette manufacturers argue that samples are not intended for nonusers or minors, there is little evidence of distribution control (U.S. Congress 1986; Davis and Jason 1988).

The power of sampling in the cigarette marketplace is reflected by industry growth. Expenses for distributing samples increased from just under $25 million in 1975 to over $100 million in 1990 (FTC 1992). The tobacco industry agrees, however, that samples should not be given to anyone under age 21 or on school, college, or university campuses (Tobacco Institute 1986). Even more notable is the growth (from $10 million in 1975 to over $300 million in 1990) in the distribution of specialty or premium items (FTC 1992). These items are not simply related to tobacco products by bearing a brand name. Cigarette lighters, for example, are frequently provided with a sample cigarette. The lighter both facilitates trial of the cigarette sample and provides a brand-name reminder once the sample has been consumed.

Premium items also convey an advertising message without an appropriate associated warning. Figure 2 displays two pages of a 1993 Camel Cash Catalog. Premium and specialty items from this catalog can be obtained by sending in the listed number of “C-notes,” which can be collected from packs of Camel cigarettes. Although a promotional package will often include a health warning along with a specialty item (such as a T-shirt or thong sandal), the warning does not appear on the item (Slade 1992). Since many specialty items include the imaginative content of the cigarette brand’s advertising campaign, they provide ongoing advertising without any required health warnings. In a recent George H. Gallup International Institute survey of 1,125 adolescents nationwide, about half of the adolescent smokers reported that they had received promotional items from tobacco companies, as had one in four nonsmoking adolescents (Gallup 1992).

Other Promotional Expenditures

In 1990, three out of every four advertising and promotional dollars spent by the cigarette industry were devoted to promotional allowances, amounting to a total of over $3 billion. Though this amount includes cooperative advertising and payments to wholesalers, its primary function is to pay retailers to continue to display and vend cigarettes from prominent locations in their store.

The over $300 million spent by the tobacco industry on point-of-sale advertising in 1990 (only 10 percent less than the $328 million spent on cigarette advertising in magazines that year) is intended to bring the images of cigarette enjoyment to consumers at the store. For a brand-loyal smoker, the reminder value of a point-of-sale display is low. Therefore, to the extent that these displays focus on brand image, they may not only encourage experienced smokers to switch brands but also encourage new smokers to experiment with a particular brand (and with its associated brand image). The $1.3 billion spent on promotional allowances and point-of-sale displays combined are thus funds potentially directed at new, youthful smokers.

Retail value-added promotion consists of those activities (coupons, special price offers, 25-cigarette packs, etc.) that effectively reduce the cost of cigarettes. The industry argues that this promotion is clearly interbrand
competition. Although this is undoubtedly the case for some price offers, value-added promotion has two other effects. The first is to reduce the cost of entering the market—a notable effect, since some research studies indicate that the cigarette market is price sensitive (see “Effects of Excise Taxes on Tobacco Use” in Chapter 6). Any money-saving action that facilitates market trial and adoption may disproportionately affect youth, who usually have slim financial reserves and low earning power. Recently, Philip Morris began aggressive price-cutting promotions using coupons for Marlboro (Levin 1993), the predominant brand used by teenagers (CDC 1992). The second effect of coupons and other retail value-added devices is to encourage repeat purchases. Often coupons are enclosed with sample or trial packs and are included with other brand-trial devices. In using these coupons, the smoker moves toward habitually purchasing and using a particular brand and identifying with that brand’s image. Moreover, coupons can encourage new users to progress from a trial stage of smoking to regular, addicted use of cigarettes.
Research on the Effects of Cigarette Advertising and Promotional Activities on Young People

Introduction

A substantial and growing body of scientific literature has reported on young people’s awareness of, and attitudes about, cigarette advertising and promotional activities. Research has also focused on the effects of these activities on psychosocial risk factors for beginning to smoke. Considered together, these studies offer a compelling argument for the mediated relationship of cigarette advertising and adolescent smoking. To date, however, no longitudinal study of the direct relationship of cigarette advertising to smoking initiation has been reported in the literature. This lack of definitive literature does not imply that a causal relationship does not exist, rather, better quantification of exposure, effect, and etiology is needed. Important data from research conducted for the tobacco industry are not available, such information would add considerably to our knowledge. A definitive study, such as a randomized control trial with young people exposed and not exposed to cigarette advertising, is both practically and ethically impossible. What is possible and needed is research that is longitudinal and multivariate, that takes advantage of recent statistical modeling methods, and that uses large samples of children and young adolescents who have not tried smoking and who have had relatively little exposure to cigarette advertising.

The issue of causality is addressed in this section by examining the effect of cigarette advertising and promotional activities on the known psychosocial risk factors (discussed in detail in Chapter 4) for the initiation of smoking. If advertising and promotional activities consistently affect these factors—factors such as self-image, the functional meanings of smoking, normative expectations, and intentions to smoke—then these activities may also affect smoking onset. This mechanism is especially plausible in the United States, where cigarette advertising and promotional activities are pervasive.

During an unusual historical period, July 1, 1967, through December 31, 1970, antismoking messages were widely aired on television and radio as part of the FTC’s Fairness Doctrine. These messages were aired until a complete ban on prosmoking advertising on radio and television took effect on January 1, 1971. For those three and one-half years, the American public was exposed to both prosmoking and antismoking messages on radio and television. A carefully designed study of nearly 7,000 adolescents (Lewit, Coate, Grossman, 1981) found that having both sets of messages on radio and television had the effect of reducing adolescent smoking rates, the impact was strongest during the first year of the antismoking messages. These study findings suggest that a nationwide, well-funded antismoking campaign could effectively counter the effects of cigarette advertising in its currently permitted media forms.

Young People’s Exposure to Cigarette Advertising

Several research studies show that young people are aware of, and respond to, cigarette advertising. In a recent Gallup (1992) study, 87 percent of the 1,125 adolescents surveyed nationwide could recall recently seeing one or more tobacco company advertisements. Similarly, Pierce et al. (1993) found in their study of nearly 7,000 California adolescents that over 90 percent of the 12- and 13-year-olds could name a brand they had seen advertised. Half of the adolescents in the Gallup survey could identify the cigarette brand name associated with at least one of four cigarette slogans (Gallup, 1992).

Chapman and Fitzgerald (1982) tried to determine the level of awareness of cigarette advertisements among 11- through 14-year-olds in Australia and the possibility of a relationship between awareness of advertisements and smoking behavior. Data were collected on smoking prevalence and preferred brands. Participants were asked to identify the cigarette brands advertised in photographs of eight print-media cigarette advertisements that had been edited to remove any identifying writing. The children were also asked to complete edited advertising slogans. Children who reported smoking in the last four weeks were almost two times more likely to correctly identify the advertisements and complete the slogans than were children who reported that they had not smoked during that period. Smokers’ preferred brands generally corresponded with the advertisements and slogans most often correctly recognized. Of the 130 brands of cigarettes available on the market at the time of the study (1981), just four brands accounted for cigarettes smoked by nearly 80 percent of these adolescent smokers.
In the United Kingdom, Aitken, Leathar, and O'Hagan (1985) followed a procedure similar to that used by Chapman and Fitzgerald. They showed cigarette advertisements, interspersed among advertisements for other products, to groups of male and female schoolchildren (aged 6 through 16 years) from Glasgow's inner-city areas (most of whose residents were of lower socioeconomic status) and suburban areas (most of whose residents were of higher socioeconomic status). Chapman and Fitzgerald's findings that large proportions of children were aware of cigarette advertisements were supported in this study and were extended to include younger children. Among some of the 12-year-olds and most of the 14- and 16-year-olds in the Glasgow study, the advertising images elicited comments that indicated the young people's perceiving implicit, supposedly adult themes, such as independence, sex appeal, and success.

In a separate study, Aitken et al. (1987) showed nine color photographs of different cigarette advertisements to 12- through 17-year-olds. When the young people were asked if they had seen any of the advertisements before, 83 percent of the 6- and 7-year-olds and 91 percent of the 16- and 17-year-olds recalled seeing the same ad. When asked to match the various ads to brief verbal descriptions of the ads, the study subjects in the three oldest age groups (those 12 through 17 years old) succeeded at a level greater than chance.

Together, the results from these studies show that even relatively young children are aware of cigarette advertising and are able to recall particular advertisements. Older adolescents are moreover capable of interpreting the advertisements in imagistic terms related to attractive features of adult life.

Opinions on Cigarette Advertising and Smoking Behaviors

O'Connell et al. (1981) surveyed more than 6,000 students aged 10 through 12 who were drawn from a sample of 88 primary schools in New South Wales, Australia. Logistic regression was used to determine the relative importance of various personal and social environmental factors in relation to the proportion of children who reported smoking one or more times per week. The factors included friends' smoking, approval of tobacco advertising, siblings' smoking, the amount of money available to spend weekly, gender, age, and parents' smoking. As part of the same study, Alexander et al. (1983) identified factors associated with change in smoking status (both beginning and ceasing to smoke) over the 12 months between the baseline and follow-up surveys. Of the children who reported not smoking during the month preceding the baseline survey, significantly more of those who at baseline approved of cigarette advertising reported smoking during the month preceding the follow-up survey than did those who disapproved of cigarette advertising. Similar results were found for the children who reported smoking during the month preceding the baseline survey. The study thus found a positive relationship between approving of advertising and subsequently taking up smoking, and between disapproving of advertising and quitting smoking.

Armstrong et al. (1990) conducted a large randomized trial among seventh-grade students (13 years old) in Western Australia in which peer-led and teacher-led programs concerning social influences were evaluated. When the students were resurveyed one year and two years after the intervention, the results identified factors associated with beginning to smoke. Both boys and girls who at baseline reported that cigarette advertisements made them think they would like to smoke a cigarette were significantly more likely to have adopted smoking at the one-year and two-year follow-up surveys than those who did not report feeling this way.

Aitken and Eade (1990) examined whether the awareness and appreciation of cigarette advertisements were independent of other predictors of adolescent smoking. In this study, 868 Glasgow adolescents between the ages of 11 and 14 years were selected at random and interviewed privately in their homes. Older adolescents, boys, and current smokers in the sample tended to approve of cigarette advertisements and were also more likely to correctly identify cigarette advertisements that carried no brand identification. In general, smokers were more successful than nonsmokers at identifying cigarette advertisements, were more likely to have siblings who smoked, tended to be more approving of cigarette advertisements, and were less likely to perceive that their parents strongly opposed smoking. These findings suggest that advertising may reinforce the habit of smoking, even among young smokers.

Young People's Responses to Different Types of Cigarette Advertisements

Huang et al. (1992) reported on the preferences of seventh- and eighth-grade children (average age 14) concerning three categories of cigarette advertisement ads with cartoons, those picturing human models, and those with only the cigarette package and words (tombstone ads). The study was a cross-sectional survey conducted in April 1991 among 243 students in two junior high schools in Chicago. Seventy percent of the students were black, 22 percent white, 3 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Native American, 1 percent Asian, and 2 percent from other races. Analyses were limited to responses of the black and white subjects. The subjects first were
asked to use five-point scales to rate how much they would like to embody the following 19 characteristics: athletic, good-looking, kind, slim, macho, smart, sexy, average, fun, special, independent, cool, afraid, overweight, underweight, tough, important, mature, and immature. They were then shown slides of 13 current cigarette ads representing nine brands taken from nine magazines obtained at a local supermarket newsstand. The students were asked to indicate how much they liked each ad and how likely they would be to buy the brand of cigarettes advertised. For each ad with either cartoon or human models, students were asked to rate the models on the same 19 characteristics used to describe their ideal self-image.

Students preferred advertisements with cartoons, ads with human models were the next most popular, and tombstone ads were liked least. Specifically, both black and white students ranked the two advertisements featuring Camel cigarettes' cartoon camel mascot Old Joe first and second; this preference was more marked among white students. Advertisements with black models were more appealing to black students than to whites, and ads featuring the Marlboro man (who is white) were more appealing to white students than to blacks. Among students who smoked, the buying preferences for all brands closely paralleled the reported ad appeal.

A factor analysis based on the 19 rated attributes identified five groupings of the advertisements. Female models were seen as predominantly "slim" and "good-looking." Joe Camel was "cool" and "fun," as were the two black models in a Salem ad. The Marlboro man was perceived as "tough" and "macho." On the other hand, a Montclair model was ascribed no positive attributes, but was predominantly rated as "not sexy" and "not good-looking." All of the positive attributes reported for the cigarette ad images were also described as positive attributes for the students' ideal self-images.

Uutela et al. (unpublished data) compared how children in Los Angeles and Helsinki perceived advertisements for cigarettes, beer, liquor, and cars. Although Finland does not permit advertising for either tobacco or liquor, the authors noted that Camel boot ads were allowed in the country, as were ads for the Philip Morris Company depicting the Marlboro cowboy. A total of 592 Los Angeles students and 660 Helsinki students between the ages of 8 and 17 years were asked the open-ended question, "What kind of pictures come to your mind when you think of a cigarette/beer/liquor/car ad?" Their responses were coded into 11 categories.

In Los Angeles, the dominant ad images reported for cigarettes and for beer were "tough/macho," for liquor, "rich/status/success," and for cars, "glamorous/sexy/attractive." The authors concluded that young people in Helsinki perceived cigarette advertising as portraying themes that represent the "traditional man's role," whereas the perceived themes in Los Angeles were less gender specific. Finland is one of the few western countries where smoking continues to be significantly higher among boys than among girls.

**Humor in Advertising**

Nelson and White (1992) provided evidence for the role of humor in advertisements that appealed to youth in a study of 7,047 students aged 11 through 16 years old from 10 schools in the north, south, and midlands of England. Students first were asked two open-ended questions: "What is your favorite advertisement?" and "Why do you like it?" Ninety-one percent of the students reported a favorite ad, 53 percent of these students reported that humor was their main reason for liking their favorite advertisements. Boys (especially those 13 through 16 years old) were significantly more likely than girls to choose an ad because of its humor. Girls (especially those 15 and 16 years old) were more likely than boys to say they liked the personality appearing in their favorite ad. Children who chose ads for alcohol and tobacco products as their favorites were more likely than other respondents to cite humor as their reason for preferring these ads. Several research studies have demonstrated that adults, as well as children, prefer advertisements with humor (Gelb and Pickett 1983). Nonetheless, cartoons with talking animals are generally considered to appeal more to children than to adults. Joe Camel and Willy Penguin (the cartoon mascot for Kool) would be highly atypical examples of advertising humor if the ads that feature them were meant only for an adult audience.

**Responses to Advertisements for the Camel and Marlboro Brands**

A few recent studies (DiFranza et al. 1991, Pierce et al. 1991, McCan 1992) have compared the responses of children and adults to Camel cigarettes' Old Joe campaign. The subjects in the DiFranza et al. (1991) study were 1,055 high school students in grades 9 through 12 from five regions of the United States and 345 subjects 21 years of age and older from Massachusetts. The adult subjects were recruited from drivers renewing their licenses at the department of motor vehicles office. Seven different advertisements from Camel's Old Joe campaign were used as stimuli. In the first ad, clues to the product...
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and brand were masked, and subjects were asked whether they had ever seen the ad and what product and brand were being advertised. They were then shown six other Old Joe ads, one at a time, and asked to rate the appeal of these ads.

The high school students were more likely than adults to recognize and correctly identify Old Joe (98 vs 73 percent), to think the ads looked “cool” (58 vs 40 percent), to think the ads were interesting (74 vs 55 percent), to think that Old Joe is cool (43 vs 26 percent), and to report that they would like to have Old Joe as a friend (35 vs 14 percent). Data on brand preference collected from the high school students who smoked were compared with corresponding data from seven surveys completed before the kick-off of the Old Joe campaign early in 1988. The authors reported that in the three-year duration of the Old Joe campaign, the proportion of smokers under 18 years old who preferred Camel cigarettes over other brands rose from 0.5 percent to 33 percent.

Pierce et al. (1991) analyzed data from the California Tobacco Survey, a 1990 random-digit-dialed telephone survey of 24,296 adults aged 18 and over and 5,040 adolescents aged 12 through 17. Respondents were asked to think back to the cigarette advertisements recently seen on billboards or in magazines. What brand of cigarette was advertised the most? Thirty-four percent of the adults named Marlboro as the most advertised brand, 14 percent of the adults named Camel cigarettes. Among the adolescents, 42 percent identified Marlboro and 30 percent identified Camel as the most advertised brand. No more than 3 percent of either the adult or teenage respondents named any other single brand.

The percentage of respondents who named Marlboro increased with age among the adolescents, peaking at 48 percent among 16- and 17-year-olds before declining among adults. The percentage of respondents who named Camel was inversely related to age, ranging from 23 percent for 16- and 17-year-olds, to 20 percent for 18- through 24-year-olds, to 10 percent for respondents aged 45 years and older. Similar results were found by Pierce et al. (1993) and by a Gallup (1992) survey, although Camel advertisements were identified as the most pervasive ads according to McCam’s (1992) analysis of the 1992 California Tobacco Survey. It is not surprising, given these results, that Marlboro and Camel cigarettes are used by up to 70 percent of adolescent smokers (Gallup 1992, CDC 1992).

A study conducted by Fischer et al. (1991) suggested that even very young children were aware of the Joe Camel campaign. In this study, three-through six-year-old children were asked to match each of 22 brand logos on cards to one of 12 products pictured on a game board. Ten of the logos were from children’s products, seven from adult products, and five from cigarette brands. The recognition rate for Old Joe ranged from 30 percent for three-year-olds to 91 percent for six-year-olds. By the age of six, the face of Old Joe and the silhouette of Mickey Mouse (the logo for the Disney Channel on cable television) were equally well recognized.

Young People’s Self-Image and Implications for Tobacco Use

Intention to smoke is one of the strongest predictors of trying cigarettes and of becoming a smoker (Conrad, Flay, Hill 1992). Chassin et al. (1981) found that 9th- and 10th-grade students whose reported image of smokers correlated with their reported self-image, ideal-date image, and certain attributes of ideal self-image were likely to report that they intended to smoke. The attributes of ideal self-image that correlated with attributes of smokers’ image were “tough,” “foolish,” “act big,” “disobedient,” and “interested in the opposite sex.” A positive relationship of self-image and ideal-date image with smokers’ image was also found to differentiate students who were already smokers from nonsmokers. Boven et al. (1991) found that even among preadolescent, fifth-grade boys, reported images of smokers were more likely to match advertising images of smokers among those who had tried a cigarette than among those who had never tried cigarettes.

Barton et al. (1982) asked 6th- and 10th-grade students to evaluate slides of peer models posed with and without cigarettes. Children in both age groups rated smoking models as being less healthy, more foolish, tougher, poorer at schoolwork, more sociable, more ostentatious, and more disobedient than nonsmoking models. Grube et al. (1984) subsequently reported that both smokers and youth who intended to smoke were more likely than nonsmokers to have self-images like the images they attributed to smokers. McCarthy and Gritz (1984) found that among 6th-, 9th-, and 12th grade boys and among 12th-grade girls, a correlation of ideal self-image to advertising images of smokers was associated with intentions to smoke.

Students in 11 seventh-grade classes in a working-class area of Pasadena participated in a study (Burton et al. 1989) that investigated attributes of four categories of images: self, ideal self, smoker, and cigarette ad. A random sample of 122 students were asked to use a six-point scale to rate four attributes (healthy, wise, tough, and interested in the opposite sex) in responding to four questions: (1) “What sort of person are you?” (2) “What sort of person would you like to be?” (3) “What sort of person is a smoker?” and (4) “In billboards, magazines, and other advertisements, smokers are made out to be...
what?" Intention to smoke was assessed by the question, "Do you think you will ever smoke cigarettes in the future?" to which there were six possible responses.

Subjects who had small differences between their self-image and their image of smokers, and those who had large differences between their self-image and their ideal self-image, were found to have greater intentions to smoke. These findings can bear closer scrutiny. Smokers' images received relatively low scores from all students, but to a lesser extent among students who had greater intentions to smoke. Since these students had also assigned themselves lower self-images than their peers, they were that much closer to the image scores they assigned to smokers. Also worth elaborating is the observed relationship between greater intention to smoke and greater disparity between self-image and ideal self-image: students intending to smoke assigned themselves lower scores for both images than did their peers. The authors conclude that youth with relatively low self-concepts who do not perceive themselves as being particularly healthy, wise, tough, or interested in the opposite sex may be drawn to smoking as a way of enhancing their low self-image, especially since smoking has been consistently associated with these attributes in advertising.

In a study conducted in 1991 (Burton, Moinuddin, Grenier, unpublished data), 239 black and white seventh- and eighth-grade students in Chicago were asked to rate on a five-point scale their self-image and their ideal self-image according to 13 attributes. Some attributes (such as "special" and "important") were prominent in both scales; other attributes that were highly rated in one image scale were much lower in the other. The attributes that revealed the largest discrepancies between ideal self-image and self-image were "good-looking," "sexy," "tough," and "athletic." The same students were also asked to indicate on a three-point scale how much they would want to buy a given product. When responses to the two sets of questions were compared, having "sexy" as an ideal self-image attribute was associated with expressing an intention to purchase Camel cigarettes, and having "tough" as an ideal self-image attribute was associated with expressing an intention to purchase Marlboro cigarettes.

The image attributions of adolescents described in this set of studies suggests a mechanism of smoking initiation (Figure 3). The visual images in advertisements may thus serve to shape the ideal self-image of this impressionable audience, since the ads may portray attributes that children and adolescents would like to have. The greater the discrepancy between their self-images and their ideal self-images, the more likely these young people are to try to make their self-images more like their ideal self-images (e.g., by "buying into" an improved self-image through responding with the purchase invited by the ads).

In commercial advertising theory, this notion informs imagery-advertising conceptualization, which presumes that the need for consistency or balance will motivate an individual to try to close the gap between self-image and ideal self-image (McGuire 1989). This conceptualization entails an active striving to make the self-image more like the ideal self-image, and not the other way around. Imagery-advertising conceptualization is most compatible with identification theories (e.g., role theories, reference-group theories, and self-presentation theories) that stress the need to expand identity by adopting distinctive thoughts, feelings, or actions (McGuire 1989). Thus, the teenaged girl who responds to a Virginia Slims advertisement that portrays independence is motivated to buy and use the product in order to enhance her sense of independence.

**Young People's Misperceptions of Smoking Prevalence and Implications for Tobacco Use**

In contrast to the image-advertising model described above, the model in Figure 4 is not concerned with the content of cigarette advertisements, but instead with the pervasiveness of the ads. According to this conceptualization, the pervasiveness of cigarette ads leads youth to overestimate the prevalence of smoking and to consider smoking as normative. Studies have consistently reported that adolescents overestimate the prevalence of cigarette smoking (Johnson 1982; Chassin et al. 1984); moreover, those who smoke overestimate smoking prevalence to a greater extent than do nonsmokers (Sherman et al. 1983; McCarthy and Gritz 1984). Overestimating smoking prevalence has been found to be among the strongest predictors of smoking initiation and acquisition (Chassin et al. 1984; Collins et al. 1987; Sussman et al. 1988; see "Perceived Environmental Factors" for smoking in Chapter 4).

Burton et al. (unpublished data) examined the relationships among cigarette advertising, estimates of smoking prevalence, and intentions to smoke. Children in Helsinki, Finland, where there has been a total tobacco advertising ban since 1978, were compared with children in Los Angeles, where tobacco is advertised in various print media and through promotional activities. Because the Finnish children may have been exposed to tobacco advertising through foreign magazines or through traveling to other countries, the study is characterized as comparing pervasive vs. occasional exposure to advertising. Classroom samples of 477 Helsinki students and 453 Los Angeles students—aged 8 through 14 years in both samples—whoce lifetime cigarette use consisted of...
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Figure 3. A model of smoking initiation: cigarette advertising as a shaping force of an adolescent's ideal self-image

Cigarette advertising

Images of smokers

Ideal self-image

If ideal = self-image

No change in behavior

Less risk of initiation of smoking

If ideal ≠ self-image

Alter behavior to be more like ideal self-image

Greater risk of initiation of smoking

Source: Burton, Moinuddin, Grenier (unpublished data)

no more than a puff of a cigarette were asked how many of their peers and how many adults smoked. Respondents were also asked whether they had ever seen a cigarette ad and when an ad was last seen.

Los Angeles youth were more likely than Helsinki youth to overestimate the prevalence of peer smoking (a 417 percent overestimate vs. a 150 percent one) and of adult smoking (319 percent vs. 173 percent). Both between countries and within the Los Angeles respondents, reported cigarette advertising exposure was positively related to the amount of overestimation of both adult and peer smoking prevalence. Overestimates of smoking prevalence were found to be positively related to intentions to smoke. Interestingly, self-reported exposure to cigarette advertising and intentions to smoke had a direct relationship beyond that mediated by misperceptions of smoking prevalence.

In a recently published study of seventh- and eighth-graders, Botvin et al. (1993) found that exposure to cigarette advertising in periodicals and newspapers was predictive of current smoking status. Adolescents with high exposure to cigarette advertising were significantly
more likely to be current, past-day, past-week, or past-month smokers than were those with low exposure to cigarette advertising. Significant associations were also found between exposure to cigarette advertising and students' estimates of smoking prevalence among their peers and among adults.

Studies have been equivocal concerning the relative importance of overestimates of peer smoking compared with overestimates of adult smoking. The general interpretation is that normative influences are operative in both cases; that is, smoking is more or less misperceived to be a usual and appropriate behavior. It also has been suggested that overestimates of adult smoking serve to increase the symbolism of smoking as a desired, adult behavior; smoking therefore acquires greater meaning to an adolescent in transition to adulthood.

Discussion

Even though the tobacco industry asserts that the sole purpose of advertising and promotional activities is to maintain and potentially increase market shares of adult consumers, it appears that some young people are recruited to smoking by brand advertising. Two sources of epidemiologic data support this assertion. Adolescents consistently smoke the most advertised brands of cigarettes, both in the United States and elsewhere (McCarthy and Gritz 1984; Baker et al. 1987; DiFranza et al. 1991). Moreover, following the introduction of advertisements that appeal to young people, the prevalence of use of those brands—or even the prevalence of smoking altogether—increases. This association was seen among adolescent females after the 1968 introduction of the Virginia Slims brand; smoking prevalence among adolescent females nearly doubled between 1968 (8 percent) and 1974 (15 percent) (USDHHS 1980). A similar associated increase was seen for smokeless tobacco use among adolescent males after a major advertising and promotional campaign in the 1970s focused on "beginners" (Tye, Warner, Glantz 1987). More recently, Camel's Old Joe advertising campaign appears to have substantially increased the brand's market share among persons less than 18 years old (DiFranza et al. 1991).

Advertising and promotional activities also appear to influence risk factors for adolescent tobacco use, even if this is not the intention of the tobacco industry. These
psychosocial risk factors—having a low self-image, attributing positive meanings or benefits to smoking, and perceiving smoking as prevalent and normative—strongly predict smoking intentions and smoking onset.

In several countries, concern about the health consequences of smoking and the potential influence of advertising on consumption has prompted a nationwide ban on tobacco advertising (UK Department of Health 1992). In 1975, Norway banned all tobacco advertising, sponsorship, and indirect tobacco advertising. In 1977, Finland banned all forms of tobacco advertising. Canada introduced a ban in 1989 on all tobacco advertising, sponsorship, and indirect advertising of Canadian origin. New Zealand introduced a ban in December 1990 on advertising in print media originating in New Zealand, on advertising in posters, and on sponsorship of sports. Although the bans in Canada and New Zealand have been relatively recent, the current evidence indicates that these actions have had a significant effect on consumption in each of the four countries (UK Department of Health 1992). In each case, the banning of advertising was followed by a decrease in smoking rates that persisted even when controlled by changes in other factors, such as price. These studies focused on total cigarette consumption; although the bans appear to have influenced smoking rates among young people in Canada and Norway, more specific data concerning young people are forthcoming.

Conclusions

1. Young people continue to be a strategically important market for the tobacco industry.
2. Young people are currently exposed to cigarette messages through print media (including outdoor billboards) and through promotional activities, such as sponsorship of sporting events and public entertainment, point-of-sale displays, and distribution of specialty items.
3. Cigarette advertising uses images rather than information to portray the attractiveness and function of smoking. Human models and cartoon characters in cigarette advertising convey independence, healthfulness, adventure-seeking, and youthful activities—themes correlated with psychosocial factors that appeal to young people.
4. Cigarette advertisements capitalize on the disparity between an ideal and actual self-image and imply that smoking may close the gap.
5. Cigarette advertising appears to affect young people's perceptions of the pervasiveness, image, and function of smoking. Since misperceptions in these areas constitute psychosocial risk factors for the initiation of smoking, cigarette advertising appears to increase young people's risk of smoking.
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