What brands are US smokers under 25 choosing?

It is well known that the most heavily advertised brands tend to attract the younger smoker market. In the USA the most heavily advertised brands are Marlboro, Newport, and Camel. Few analyses have delved into the specific varieties popular among youth. Do “Lights” or “Full Flavors” predominate? To answer this question, data on the cigarette brand preferences of smokers in the 2002 US National Survey on Drug Use and Health were analysed.

Using the on-line analysis feature of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive, cigarette brand used in the last 30 days was cross tabulated with the type of cigarette (Full Flavor, Light, Ultra Light, self reported) used in the past 30 days. Separate analyses were conducted on three age groups: 12–17 years (n = 2290), 18–25 years (n = 5238), and 26+ years (n = 5238). Analyses accounted for survey design characteristics and percentages were weighted to the population.

Figure 1 shows the top five varieties in each age group. Marlboro Lights were the most popular brand style among younger smokers in the USA. Marlboro Full Flavor and Newport Full Flavor are quite popular, with Camel less so. Five of the top nine varieties in all three age categories are Lights or Ultra-Lights, though the specific varieties varied by age. Discounted brands (Doral and Basic) account for a sizable percentage of the adult market but a miniscule percentage of the youth market. The youth market in the USA appears dominated by brands of the major advertised brands; other products make up a more modest percentage of the market.

Conversely, the adult market is much more diffuse, with the major varieties commanding smaller overall percentages of the market. Light varieties appear to be popular choices for younger smokers. Similar investigations in other countries that have banned descriptive terms such as “Light” and “Mild” support this pattern.
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Cigarette taxes and their proposed uses: support among smokers and non-smokers in different income groups in Texas

The Texas Legislature is considering new taxes, including a proposed $1 per pack tax on cigarettes. In the past, various issues have been raised in debates on this topic. Proponents cite evidence that increased taxes deter young people from using tobacco and argue that additional revenues can be used to provide health care services for children and to support smoking prevention programmes. Opponents argue that higher tobacco taxes place an unfair burden on smokers in low income groups.

To gain insight into how Texans view new cigarette taxes, data from a statewide telephone survey (random digit dialling of working residential numbers) of 6345 adults were analysed. The survey was conducted between October and December 2004. Participants were asked whether they support a $1 per pack increase in cigarettes taxes. They were also asked about the use of these taxes to provide funds for children’s health care and programmes to prevent tobacco use among young people. To learn how views differed between those who use tobacco and those who do not, as well as between those in different income groups, participants were also asked about their own tobacco use and their household income.

About 6000 usable responses were available for different analyses. Current smokers made up 17% of the sample, and 35% of smokers reported household incomes below $25 000 per year. Among all respondents, 6% 5% favored a $1 per pack increase in cigarette taxes. Support for the $1 per pack increase grows when the taxes are to be used partly for preventing young people from smoking (77%) or to help provide health insurance for children in low income families (75%). Smokers and non-smokers differed notably in their opinions, and there were also significant differences between income groups, as shown in fig 1. Confidence intervals are ± 2% or less except in the low income group of smokers, where they are approximately ± 5% because of the smaller sample size.

Among non-smokers, support for the $1 tax was dramatically affected by its proposed use. When the tax was not specified, higher income non-smokers were more likely to favour the tax than low income non-smokers (71% vs 67%, p < 0.05). When a specified use is smoking prevention, the level of support is 82% among non-smokers in both income groups. However, when a specified use is health insurance for children in low income families, support is weaker among higher income non-smokers than among low income non-smokers (77% vs 83%, p < 0.01).

Among smokers, support for the $1 tax was significantly greater when the tax was tax was used to prevent smoking among children in low income families, support is weaker among higher income non-smokers than among low income non-smokers (77% vs 83%, p < 0.01).
We know that large numbers of Australian smokers continue to believe that “light” and “mild” cigarettes provide relative health benefits. Although product promotions are now tightly restricted, Australian smokers continue to be lured with what is probably the largest and most complex variety in the world of “milds” (the term Australian manufacturers prefer), all designed to create a compelling illusion of reduced harm.

Major Australian brand families typically have six notional strength variants, based on Commonwealth labelling regulations: “1 mg or less”, “2 mg or less”, “4 mg or less”, “8 mg or less”, “12 mg or less”, and “16 mg or less”. Government mandated information on the side of each pack includes notional tar, nicotine, and carbon monoxide yields in these six “tar bands”. This is scheduled for replacement by qualitative information in March 2006, when new Commonwealth labelling regulations come into force. The industry also differentiates variants with various “mild” descriptors and/or more prominent use of the “tar band” figure. It is unclear whether the industry will be able to use notional tar figures once “light” and “mild” descriptors are prohibited.

Current industry conduct demonstrates that tar yields are very important to it. The most recent Australian Retail Tobacco Association has a cover advertisement for leading “budget” brand, Horizon, informing retailers:

Now your Horizon customers can get their favourite brand in an exciting new look pack. With new descriptors and clearer numbers all our packs are much easier to identify. Research proves that your customers will find the new pack more appealing and a lot easier to recognize.2

Moreover, a number of brands are labelled with notional tar yields not listed in the labelling regulations. For example, Marlboro Lights and Winfield Special Mild 6 are both labelled as “6 mg or less”. Trade promotional material for Winfield Special Mild 6 indicated that the “6 mg or less” notional tar yield was intended to attract smokers of the “8 mg or less” variant of Winfield interested in switching to a lower yield brand.

The new Peter Jackson Select Blend varieties push the envelope by combining innovative verbal descriptors with non-prescribed notional tar yields. “Full flavour” is labelled “9 mg or less”, “smooth flavour” is labelled “6 mg or less”, and “fine flavour” is labelled “3 mg or less”. The backs of the packs describe the varieties as respectively delivering a “rich, full flavoured smoking experience”, “an extra smooth smoking experience”, and “a more refined smoking experience”. This language does not suggest gradation in risk as clearly as the “mild”, “extra mild”, and “ultra mild”, but linking these terms and visual imagery suggesting differential experience to tar yields will build belief that “smooth” and “fine” mean “safer”.

If the industry can make “smooth” and “fine” effective replacements for “light” and “mild”, we will lose some of the potential public health benefit from prohibiting the latter descriptors and removing ISO tar yields. There is a strong need for improved monitoring of industry responses to efforts to end the “lights” and “milds” deception, as well as for increased political will to prevent
responses which amount to continuing the deception by new means.
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BOOK REVIEW

Smoke-free: how one city successfully banned smoking in all indoor public places


Banning smoking in public places

This book is simultaneously depressing and reassuring for people involved in the battle to remove environmental tobacco smoke from public places. The tactics used to oppose a bylaw requiring all public places, including bars, to be smoke-free in Greater Victoria in Canada in the late 1990s are depressingly familiar to those currently fighting for smoke-free bars in Australia. On the other hand, it is reassuring that the opposition does not seem to have developed any new strategies, their moves becoming increasingly predictable.

For that reason, this is an excellent tool for people trying to bring about tobacco control through legislation and public policy and will provide a good insight for people working in other areas of public health. While the players in this story are very specific to Greater Victoria, Canada, the logistics of the campaign strategy are almost universally applicable. The tactics used to oppose tobacco control are global and the lessons learned from this campaign are worth sharing with the international tobacco control community.

Smoke-free has been written by a journalist, Barbara McIntock, so it is a comfortable, easy to read story. Those who want more academic details of the campaign, with statistics, evaluation, and analysis, can find that in journal articles published elsewhere. The value of this book is the insight into the power struggles and spheres of influence which are the hidden drivers of legislative change.

It also puts a human face on the battle and reinforces the need to support staff given the unenviable job of enforcing tobacco control policies among people who do not want them. I have to admit that I found the description of the aggressive hostility against the Capital Health Region staff, orchestrated by some of the bar owners, confronting and wondered what provision has been made in Australia to deal with the possibility of such tactics.

But it is those details which make the book a very powerful blueprint for what is needed to bring about effective policy change. The growing acceptance of anti-smoking strategies by the general community has not removed all the heat from the issue and the battle does not end with the passing of legislation. The need for strong leadership and a commitment to resources to enforce the legislation once it is in place may well continue for a number of years.
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