

1030303

BER



ENVIRONICS
RESEARCH GROUP

**Consumer Interest in
Potential Reduced Exposure Products:
Results of a Focus Group Study**

Final Report
PN5153

POR-02-112

Prepared for: Health Canada

Prepared by: Environics Research Group

March 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	SUMMARY	4
3.0	HARM FROM TOBACCO	5
4.0	INTEREST IN "HARM REDUCED" PRODUCTS	8
4.1	Awareness of "Harm Reduced" Products.....	8
4.2	General Interest in "Harm Reduced" Products.....	9
4.3	Cigarettes with Lower Tar Levels.....	12
4.4	Cigarettes with Less Nicotine	13
4.5	Cigarettes with Fewer/Less Chemicals	14
4.6	Cigarettes with Different Filters	15
4.7	Effect of Brand on Interest in "Harm Reduced" Products	16
5.0	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC PRODUCTS.....	17
5.1	Accord.....	18
5.2	Eclipse	20
5.3	Omni	22
6.0	IMPACT OF HARM REDUCED PRODUCTS ON BEHAVIOUR	25
7.0	DESCRIPTORS.....	26
7.1	Written Exercise	26
7.2	Removal of Descriptors	27

APPENDICES

Summary of Written Exercise

Discussion Agendas

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In March 2002, Environics Research Group Limited was retained by Health Canada to conduct qualitative research involving a series of focus groups with adult smokers to better understand consumer interest in potential reduced exposure products (PREPs).

Recently tobacco and cigarette-like products have been introduced that result in decreased emissions of some toxins. These include cigarette-like products that deliver nicotine with less combustion than cigarettes. More of these PREPs are likely to be introduced in the future. These products may be promoted as aids to quitting or even as being less harmful to human health. However, there is a significant possibility that some will in fact be cigarette substitutes, which might maintain nicotine addiction and even reduce cessation rates.

There is virtually no information today about possible consumer interest in PREPs in Canada. However, given the strong interest in many smokers who want to quit, there might be expected to be some interest in such products, especially if they were promoted as reducing harm.

Environics Research Group was retained to conduct qualitative research into consumer interest in PREPs in order to provide Health Canada with insights into the potential appeal of these kinds of products. The study focussed on those products likely to be, or currently, produced by cigarette companies. We did not explore products that might be produced by the pharmaceutical industry.

The goals of this qualitative research were:

- 1 • To examine potential interest in PREPs among smokers, including interest in switching;
- 2 • To understand what product qualities consumers respond to in PREPs;
- 3 • To explore how the availability of such products might affect smoking and smoking cessation behaviours.

Six focus groups were conducted; two each in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. These groups consisted of smokers, both "hard-core" smokers and potential quitters. In each city, one group was conducted with smokers aged 18 (or 19) to 34, and the other with smokers aged 35 or older. The sessions were held in June 2002.

The topics examined during these focus group discussions included:

- Smokers' perceptions of the causes of health risks from cigarettes;
- Perceptions, knowledge, expectations, and interest in "harm reduced" tobacco products or cigarettes;
- Perceptions of and interest in low-tar cigarettes, reduced nicotine cigarettes, cigarettes with fewer chemicals, changes to cigarette filters;
- Influence of corporate brand on interest in such products;
- Response to and interest in specific products: Accord, Eclipse, Omni;
- Effect of availability of such products on smoking and smoking cessation behaviours: would consumers switch rather than quit?
- Perceptions of descriptors: light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth and others;

- Response to removal of descriptors such as light and mild, from cigarette packages, by government or by the tobacco companies;
- Effect of removal of descriptors on smoking behaviour.

This report presents the findings of this qualitative research. The discussion agendas are attached.

Qualitative research is by its nature exploratory, and provides insight into the range of opinion held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projectable.

2.0 SUMMARY

Among the main findings of the focus group study are:

- Most smokers believe that smoking is at least somewhat harmful to one's health, but many minimize such harm as being no greater than that caused by other sources.
- Most smokers are able to mention at least one or more components or constituents that might be causing this harm to health, but the level of knowledge about specific constituents or processes is extremely low.
- There is a clear expressed interest in a cigarette product that might be less harmful, but in fact smokers are not willing to give up much to switch to such a product. There is considerable scepticism that such a product could be produced, especially one with the same taste and flavour qualities as current brands.
- Of the four qualities of cigarettes tested that might possibly produce a "less harmful" product, those with "fewer chemicals" would have the most appeal, and those with "less tar" would have some appeal. Cigarettes with "less nicotine" and "different filters" have little or no appeal to smokers.
- A number of smokers appear to be using the tar content figures on cigarette packages as a way to identify their brand.
- Of three specific products, the Omni and Eclipse have some, although rather limited, appeal. Some smokers found the tobacco company claims in the Omni ad to be credible; most did not.
- A fairly small number of smokers think that they might switch to a "less harmful" product instead of quitting, or as a step towards quitting.
- The vast majority of smokers either support or are indifferent, to the idea of removing descriptors such as light, mild, ultra light and ultra mild from cigarette packs, as long as they can still identify their brand.

We conclude from this study that although there is expressed interest in “harm reduced” tobacco products, there are considerable attitudinal and perceptual barriers to overcome, among smokers, before such products could achieve widespread acceptance or success in the market. Important among these barriers is the widespread idea that “less harmful” cigarettes would not deliver the taste, flavour, and other positive qualities of the smoking experience. Another important attitudinal barrier is the considerable scepticism and cynicism that smokers have about the tobacco industry and its credibility and suspect motives in creating such a product. Many smokers want to have some sort of proof or evidence that such a product would be “less harmful”, before they would even consider trying it.

The regulatory environment itself will make it extremely difficult to overcome such attitudinal barriers. First, tobacco manufacturers have limited ability to market the taste, flavour and other qualities of their products, and they have even less ability to suggest that a product may be less harmful. Therefore, they would have to use such terms as “fewer chemicals” or “reduced carcinogens” to try to communicate a message about “less harm”. But even here, the regulated health warning statements provide an important and powerful message that clearly contradicts any descriptions (“low tar”, “reduced carcinogens”) that might appear on the packs. As we saw in testing the Omni product and its ad, most smokers remain extremely sceptical of the claims of a tobacco company when they see the warning message along side such claims.

Still, these products do have some appeal among a fairly small number of smokers, particularly among women smokers, among potential quitters (women and men) and among “experimenters” - that small number of smokers who like to try different and new brands. Some smokers are indeed willing to give up some of the flavour and other qualities, are attracted by “low carcinogens” or similar messages, and are open to a “balanced”, “straight forward” message from the tobacco industry.

Below, we discuss the focus group findings in detail.

3.0 HARM FROM TOBACCO

Most participants, particularly those in the younger age groups, agreed that smoking cigarettes is at least somewhat or very harmful. Some participants made reference to specific health problems affecting either their personal health or that of family or friends, which they attributed at least in part to smoking.

“I find I get bronchitis now, twice a year, and I never used to, and I blame it on cigarettes.”

“I lost both of my parents to cancer. Both of them smoked all my life, as far as I can remember.”

However, even among those who agreed that smoking is harmful, a number of participants attempted to minimize the potential harm by comparing it to other things they felt were equally harmful, such as air pollution and chemicals in food and other products.

“It’s no worse than living in downtown Toronto.”

“Sure it’s harmful, but compared to what? There’s so many things that are harmful.”

“More harmful things in the air than in cigarettes.”

“Cigarettes are harmful to you – most products have something harmful.”

“Only one thing of many harmful things in the environment.”

“If you were worried about what was in things, you wouldn’t eat or drink anything.”

“Just the fumes coming off your sofa can be just as bad.”

A small number of older participants in Toronto and Winnipeg expressed a belief that cigarette smoking is not really harmful. Some of these participants stated that despite their own smoking history, they were in better health than many younger people they knew, or that their health problems were clearly attributable to other causes than smoking. Others reported stories of family members or friends who have smoked all their lives without any apparent harm to their health.

“My dad smoked ‘til he was 90. He still had all his faculties, he just passed away in his sleep.”

Some felt that smoking might be harmful for some people, but was not harmful for everyone.

“If you’ve already got something wrong with you in the first place, it might [cause harm], but otherwise, I don’t really believe all that.”

“It’s got a lot to do with genetic makeup – if someone is genetically prone to cancer, smoking would more than likely accelerate it.”

A few participants commented on what they perceived to be beneficial health effects of smoking. One woman noted that smoking had helped her with pain management following dental surgery. Others noted that smoking helps them to reduce stress, “and stress can be a killer.”

In Montreal, the older participants had difficulty in responding to the moderator’s questions about harm from smoking, but in the group of 18 to 34 year-olds, the participants as a whole admitted that cigarettes can have very major negative effects on health, but that they did not worry about it given their youth. Issues that were mentioned as negative effects of smoking by the younger Montreal participants included: addiction; poor social acceptance, fewer and fewer places where smoking is allowed; the high price of cigarettes; and physical inconveniences (bad breath, yellow fingers, coughing).

Most participants overall were able to name at least some components in cigarettes that might cause harm to health. Tar and nicotine were the most frequently mentioned specific ingredients. Some suggested that nicotine in itself was not harmful to health, but that it was the addictive agent and thus indirectly caused harm by making it hard to quit smoking and thus avoid exposure to the harmful ingredients in tobacco. While it was understood by most participants that nicotine is a naturally occurring component of tobacco, some speculated that manufacturers manipulate or enhance the nicotine content of cigarettes in some way during the processing of the tobacco.

“They manipulate the tobacco so it is more... it causes more problems and it is addictive.”

Many referred to “poisons,” “chemicals,” “additives,” “carcinogens,” “trace elements” or “toxic stuff” in general. Some made specific reference to such ingredients as arsenic, carbon monoxide, formaldehyde, cyanide and sugar.

“I guess it’s just the ingredients. You’re sucking tar and carbon monoxide into your lungs.”

“Tar... we know it blackens lungs.”

A few participants mentioned harmful substances used in cigarette filters, such as fiberglass or charcoal. In Montreal, acid in the white paper was also mentioned. A few older participants in Winnipeg stated that tobacco now was more harmful than it was when they were younger because of all of the additives, including agricultural pesticides used in farming tobacco. Some Montreal participants also expressed the belief that today’s cigarettes are much more harmful than those produced 30 years ago.

Some participants distinguished between the harmful effects of tobacco and the harmful effects of smoking.

“The smoke that goes into your lungs.”

“Inhaling smoke – inhaling anything can’t be good for you.”

“It’s both the chemicals and the smoke.”

“It’s the smoking itself... like how many firefighters live to a long age? It’s because they’re inhaling the smoke. Period. The smoke itself has all the things in it, and what it does to your lungs, and your lungs affect everything else – it’s just the start of many little things.”

Some participants in Montreal also mentioned the manner of smoking cigarettes, inhaling all the smoke, as something which causes harm.

However, in spite of the mention of a number of components that might cause harm, most participants could not say whether one element was more harmful to health than another, nor were most able to describe how the harm might come about. The impression left was that although ingredients were mentioned, the knowledge level about harm to health was very low.

“It’s everything combined.”

“There’s nothing good in them.”

4.0 INTEREST IN “HARM REDUCED” PRODUCTS

4.1 Awareness of “Harm Reduced” Products

Participants had a mixed response to the question: can cigarettes/tobacco products be made less harmful? Some felt that actions can be taken to make individual cigarettes less harmful, such as changing the manufacturing process, ending the manipulation of nicotine levels that they believed was a part of cigarette manufacturing, and using fewer chemicals or carcinogens in processing the tobacco. Others suggested using natural or organically grown tobacco; some asserted that natural tobacco contains fewer or no chemicals. Others mentioned making cigarettes that produce less smoke and developing filter technology.

“Get rid of all the junk.”

“If they just took the tobacco and cut it up and rolled it, I think it would do far less damage.”

“Just smoke raw tobacco.”

Some mentioned making cigarettes less addictive: “If they removed the nicotine, maybe people would get over the physical addiction.” In Montreal, this was considered to be an important aspect of a less harmful cigarette; participants clearly believed that no-nicotine cigarettes would be less harmful to health.

However, there was a more prevalent sense that making a less harmful cigarette would not be successful. Many commented that in making a “safer” cigarette, many of the elements they valued most about smoking – such as taste and flavour or the strength of the “drag” – might be altered.

“It wouldn’t be a cigarette anymore, it would be something else.”

“If you took all the chemicals out, it wouldn’t be a cigarette.”

“If they start changing it, it’s not worth it.”

Others observed that making a less harmful cigarette could lead to smoking more cigarettes, or to inhaling more strongly or deeply, in order to get the same “fix.” In fact, some suggested that that “light” cigarettes are even more harmful than so-called “regular” cigarettes, because they produce more of a temptation to inhale.

“You could make them lighter, but then you just smoke more – if it’s poison, well, then it’s light poison.”

“You have an addiction, so you’re going to do what you need to get it – what you need.”

“You smoke more of the special filter brand to get the same effect of smoking one regular cigarette.”

“You smoke double the amount to get your fix.”

“A light cigarette, you’re just going to puff harder.”

A few participants believed that there was no way to make cigarettes less harmful: “No, it’s a black and white issue.” Others felt that “smoking is smoking.” Even if it is technically possible to make a less harmful cigarette, the key fact remains that all cigarettes are harmful.

“That’s like standing out on the highway and getting hit by a car going 50 miles an hour as opposed to 100 miles an hour. Whatever they make it out of, there’s still smoke. When anything burns, there’s bad stuff.”

“It’s like skinning a cat – there’s a hundred ways to do it, but it’s still skinning a cat. You can do all these things to it, but in the end, you’re still doing something that’s harmful to you: smoking.”

A very few participants were concerned that making a less harmful cigarette would lead to increased use, and might encourage young people to start smoking because of increased social acceptability.

“If something is less harmful, it’s actually more harmful, because you’re more deceived into doing it more. Like alcohol – it’s legal, so people think it’s no problem. You’re just killing yourself a little slower, that’s all.”

Some participants were aware of tobacco products that they believed were less harmful. Low tar brands were mentioned by some, as were the variety of light, mild, extra light and ultra light brands currently on the market. The belief was expressed by some that cigarettes with long filters were safer because the filter removed some of the tar and chemical additives. Others mentioned natural, raw or leaf tobacco. In Montreal, a few older participants mentioned natural tobacco and biological cigarettes of the Lépine brand, and a few younger participants mentioned “Drumm” tobacco and “American Spirit” cigarettes.

Others mentioned non-tobacco products, such as mullein, ginseng or other herbal cigarettes, wood or “Tree” cigarettes.

A few participants mentioned cigarettes that they believed were either smoke-free or produced less smoke during burning. A couple of participants said they had heard that there were “safer cigarettes” currently being developed.

4.2 General Interest in “Harm Reduced” Products

There was a high expressed general interest in a cigarette that might be less harmful, but at the same time, most participants indicated that they would not be prepared to give up much in terms of their ideal smoking experience in order to have a less harmful cigarette. Some said that they would be willing to try a cigarette that was less harmful – particularly if it had been proven to be less harmful by independent scientific research – but that if it did not deliver a similar experience at all levels, then they would not be likely to continue with it.

“It has to emulate the entire process of smoking a cigarette – which would have to be another cigarette.”

“Everything I get from a regular cigarette but less harmful – I’d buy it.”

“If it gives me the same sort of satisfaction.”

A few said that they would be interested in trying a new product that might cause less harm to their health. Their reasons for being willing were varied:

“I’d try something new.”

“The pleasure of having a cigarette without doing so much harm.”

“Might help me quit”

“Hopefully, it’s extending your life.”

“A better quality product.”

“If it was better for me and I still got my nicotine fix.”

Taste or flavour was one of the most important concerns. A large number of participants anticipated that less harmful cigarettes would have a different taste, and some in fact were prepared to accept a cigarette with a small difference in taste.

“I’d expect it to taste a little different, but if it tasted too different from what I’m used to, then I’d just stay with what I’m used to.”

“I like to smoke, so it would be easier... it would definitely be calming for my conscience, easier, but again it would have to be something at least comparable to what’s available. It couldn’t taste completely foreign or have no taste at all – there would be no point to it.”

“If it was a different taste but not a totally different taste...”

Most, however, indicated that the taste was of prime importance to them and was something they were not willing to give up. While expressed in all groups, this attitude was particularly strong among Montreal participants.

“I can’t smoke light cigarettes, I’ve tried. I like strong cigarettes. It’d probably be light, it wouldn’t be strong at all... and I like that flavour.”

“I highly doubt they’re going to come out with a healthy, strong cigarette – the two kind of compete with each other.”

“If I couldn’t tell the difference.”

“Need to be the same flavour.”

A few said that the taste was not of particular importance to them, or even that they did not enjoy the taste of the cigarettes they currently smoke. For these few, satisfying the nicotine addiction or other aspects of their “habit” was of greatest importance. If they could do this with a reduced harm product, they would consider switching even if the taste were markedly different.

In addition to taste, a number of other aspects of the smoking sensorium were mentioned as elements that participants would be unwilling to give up; as one participant said “there’s so many things that go together.” Some of these other elements mentioned were:

“Nicotine rush”

“Finger fixation”

“Satisfying the craving”

“Stress reduction”

“I’d want the same ‘drag’”

“Flavour is not important, but the hand thing...”

“I wouldn’t want something without any smoke...”

“That feeling when you go ‘ahhhhh’ [inhales and exhales deeply]”

For a few, the likelihood of their trying, and possibly switching, to a cigarette identified as less harmful was dependent on whether the harm reduction had been verified by scientific research, and on the degree of harm reduction.

“Less harmful and scientific data are two different things. If someone came out with something, with scientific data to back it up, I would try it.”

“How much less harmful is it?”

“It would have to be a lot less harmful before I would switch.”

Price was an issue for some participants. Some would not consider paying more for a product that was less harmful. Others were willing to pay a slightly higher price, but placed limits on the amount they would pay. A few declared that price was the thing they would be most willing to give up.

“I wouldn’t want to pay more.”

“It would need to be the same price or cheaper.”

“I would pay a bit more.”

“I would pay more, but not double.”

“I wouldn’t pay ten bucks for a pack of cigarettes if they were supposedly healthier.”

“I’d give up price – if it was double the price, I’d still do it.”

In Montreal, participants mentioned several other expectations that they would have of cigarettes marketed as less harmful that were not mentioned in other cities:

- that information be given about their ingredients and manufacturing method;
- that an environmental/biodegradable product be offered;
- that tobacco companies demonstrate a real willingness to make their cigarettes less harmful, by applying this change to their entire line of products.

4.3 Cigarettes with Lower Tar Levels

There was definitely some interest in such a product. At the same time, it is clear that a significant number of smokers, perhaps a growing number, are familiar with or are looking at the tar content of their own brand (on the package information), as a way to identify their brand.

Some participants said that they would try a low tar cigarette. A few mentioned that they have looked at the content information on packages in the past in order to find a cigarette with lower tar levels. A small number of participants, primarily in Montreal, said they would try a low tar cigarette if it was offered in their current brand.

“If it tasted the same, I don’t see why not. That’s one less chemical in there.”

Others said that there seemed to be little point in just lowering one of the potentially harmful ingredients in cigarettes.

“[Smoking] is bad enough as it is, if you just lower one thing, it won’t make much of a difference.”

“With all the other chemicals in it, really, is it going to make a difference?”

Some expressed confusion over what are the harm-causing ingredients in cigarettes, and whether tar was really one of these. These participants seemed to feel that if tar was harmful, then they would be interested, but that until it was clearly explained to them exactly which ingredients were the worst for their health, and whether tar was one of these, they would not want to try a low tar cigarette.

“If all the poison – the arsenic, the carbon monoxide - is found in the tar, I would assume if you reduce the tar, it would be less harmful to your health.”

“I don’t know what is the worst thing – if I knew that tar was the worst thing, then I might be interested.”

“As a smoker, you’re not entirely sure what component it is.”

“What part is bad and what part isn’t? Maybe I’ll look for a cigarette with less of that if I know what is bad.”

Some smokers, particularly those for whom flavour is a key ingredient of the smoking experience, rejected the idea of a low tar cigarette quite strongly.

“Tar IS the flavour.”

“For someone like me, if they took it [tar] away, it would destroy the taste.”

Others stated that such a cigarette would still be addictive, and a few expressed concerns that smoking a low tar cigarette might lead to smoking more cigarettes.

“If I’m smoking ten of a low tar cigarette, and I used to smoke four of a regular, then it’s not doing any good.”

A number of participants said that the tar would be replaced by another substance to compensate for the lower tar content or that the process of removing the tar would increase chemical content in the cigarette.

“If they take out something, they’ve got to put something in, to keep the flavour.”

“If they take one thing out, they’ll add four others, and who says they’re not worse?”

“The milder the cigarette, the more bleaches and other chemicals they put in it.”

Finally, several participants hesitated to voice an opinion, because of a lack of information, or indicated that they did not feel interested in this cigarette.

4.4 Cigarettes with Less Nicotine

There was little interest in low nicotine cigarettes, mainly because nicotine was seen to be the most important component in the smoking experience.

“No, that [the nicotine] is the whole point.”

“That’s the kick in it.”

“That’s what I like... some people are coffee fanatics, I’m a nicotine junkie.”

Some participants expressed interest in a low nicotine cigarette, because it would be less addictive. A number of these participants saw a low nicotine cigarette as a step toward quitting smoking. A few older participants said that they would like to be less addicted and smoke “for pleasure.” A few older participants in Montreal indicated that they would be willing to try this cigarette if it contained no chemicals.

“I might try it – it’d be a good tool to quit smoking, I think. You wouldn’t get the nicotine rush, but at least you would still be able to smoke until you were weaned off if it.”

“If it’s less nicotine, it’s less addictive - so it’s easier to cut down or quit.” [Note: following this comment, the other participants interjected: “If you want to!” amid some laughter]

“If nicotine is the thing that’s making me addicted...”

A very few participants who smoked only a few cigarettes per day said that they did not think they were physically addicted to the nicotine, but were rather psychologically addicted to the experience of smoking, and that a low nicotine cigarette was not relevant to them.

Most participants did not think that a low nicotine cigarette would be less harmful; nicotine was generally seen as addictive but not necessarily harmful to one’s health.

“Nicotine isn’t the major harmful thing, it’s the tar and the carbon monoxide.”

Some felt that a low nicotine cigarette might actually be more harmful, since they might smoke more in order to maintain their physical level of addiction. These participants did not want to risk the experience of withdrawal that might accompany a switch to a low nicotine cigarette unless it was done with the clear intention of preparing to quit smoking altogether.

“I don’t equate it with being less healthier. Maybe it’s lower nicotine, but then I’m smoking two packs a day, so what’s the benefit, unless I was quitting and wanted to wean myself off.”

4.5 Cigarettes with Fewer/Less Chemicals

Compared to the other cigarette characteristics probed above, a cigarette that would contain “fewer chemicals” generated the most interest. Many participants readily expressed the view that the chemicals in cigarettes are a major cause of negative health effects, and perceived a cigarette with a reduced chemical content as less harmful to their health.

“Any additives, especially when you start burning them, are going to be harmful.”

“It appeals to me far more than low tar or low nicotine.”

“The chemicals they add to make it burn slower – they can’t be all that good for you.”

“Anything that’s got less chemicals obviously is going to be better for you than something with more chemicals.”

Among those who expressed interest, some added that even though they perceived a reduced chemical content cigarette as less harmful, it would still not be enough for them to switch unless the elements of smoking that they considered important, such as taste, were still present.

“I’d try it. Like, someone said Viscount had less things in it, I tried it, I didn’t like it, I threw it away and went back to my regular cigarettes.”

“If you take something away, you’re cutting down on something you already have.”

Others, however, were sceptical. They did not believe that a cigarette marketed as lower in chemicals would necessarily be good for them, and a few said they would want independent verification of any claims.. Much of this scepticism seemed to be based in a general distrust of tobacco companies and their marketing practices.

“I’d be very sceptical. Just for the fact that, you know, those guys have been saying one thing and doing another for how many years now... you know, they’re just another type of pack of cigarettes that they want us to smoke.”

“I’d have to wait until studies are done on it.”

Some, particularly in Montreal, felt that they would need more information before they could comment on such a product.

A few were concerned that if a cigarette that was generally perceived as less harmful was available on the market, this might encourage more young people to begin smoking, because the “less harmful” cigarettes would be more socially acceptable.

4.6 Cigarettes with Different Filters

Generally, this characteristic generated little enthusiasm but many questions and some scepticism among participants. Some felt that putting different filters on cigarettes was simply a marketing device, and a very few insisted that there were no real differences in filters, that the differences were only cosmetic, such as changing the colour of the paper or the band.

“They say all the filters have this or that... we don’t know what’s in the filter, so how can we know what changing the filter would do?”

“It’s psychological.”

“They’re just playing with you.”

A number of participants said that modification of filters was how tobacco companies were already creating different strengths of cigarettes. Some were familiar with brands in which the filters have holes or perforations, but not all agreed that these filters were effective in reducing harm. Others avoided cigarettes with these filters because it was so difficult to get a good “drag” from them.

“The filters with the perforations just put more air in... you get as much stuff, it just takes longer.”

“I had to suck too hard to get anything.”

Some said that a few of the filters already in use were harmful; specific mention was made of charcoal filters and filters containing fibreglass, said to be in Export and Players brands. Some argued that changing these filters by removing the charcoal or fibreglass would make these brands less harmful.

Some participants in Montreal said that any modification of the filter should be applied to all of a tobacco company's cigarettes, so that the company would demonstrate a real willingness to improve smokers' health.

A few participants said that they would still be willing to try a cigarette with a filter that would make it less harmful; some added that they would only be interested as long as the filter does not adversely affect the taste of cigarettes.

"If someone could design a filter that eliminates tar and the more harmful chemicals, I would be interested in that."

"I'm afraid it would change the taste of cigarettes."

A couple of participants in the Toronto groups had had some experience with the use of external filters. One participant had tried a new "filter contraption" but had found that it altered the taste of his cigarette, so he stopped using it. Another had seen a relative using a filter, and commented on the amount of residue that could be shaken out of the filter after a cigarette had been smoked with it.

4.7 Effect of Brand on Interest in "Harm Reduced" Products

Some participants said that they would be more inclined to try a new "healthier" cigarette if it were introduced by the company that manufactured their current brand or if it were an extension of their brand. Most said that this was not so much because they felt their brand manufacturer had greater credibility, but because they preferred the taste of that brand, and therefore hoped that a healthier cigarette produced by the same manufacturer would have the same, or at least a similar, taste.

Others said that the brand would not make a real difference in whether they would try a "safer" cigarette or not. These participants would investigate a healthier cigarette no matter what company brought it out, and tended to express the belief that all tobacco companies were similar or the same.

"I'd be interested in reading about anybody who came up with that."

"I would prefer it if it were my brand, but it wouldn't make a difference. If I could get the benefit and if I could tolerate it, I'd switch."

"I wouldn't care who came out with it."

It was important to a number of participants that the company be a Canadian company, able to produce a cigarette for the preferences of the Canadian market. Several commented that they found the taste and smell of American cigarettes unpleasant.

Some noted that it really did not matter which company initially brought out a "safer" cigarette, because if it were successful, soon all companies would be making a similar product available.

"I think whenever any company makes something, every other company would be right behind them, making the same thing... so you can stick with your brand, you can go to a different brand, it doesn't matter."

Several participants expressed a degree of cynicism about tobacco companies who might release a "safer" cigarette, saying that it would most likely be just a marketing device. A few thought there might be a more devious objective behind marketing such cigarettes: they thought that tobacco companies might hope to encourage ex-smokers to return to smoking by persuading them that new, much safer cigarettes were available.

As well, many participants expressed a general distrust of all tobacco manufacturers: "I'm not very trusting of the tobacco companies anyway."

5.0 RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC PRODUCTS

In all groups, participants were shown samples of three different tobacco products now on the market in the U.S. – Accord, Eclipse, and Omni – and asked about their impressions of these products. Packs of these brands were handed around the group for participants to look at, to open, and to take out and look at the cigarettes.

One or two participants had ever seen or heard of any of these products. One participant said she had seen an ad for Accord while visiting in New York, and one or two others believed they had seen something like either Accord or Eclipse before. For almost all of the participants, however, all three products were completely unknown. Because of the lack of previous information about these products and the fact that it was not possible for the participants to try them out, some participants found it difficult to express an opinion on them, or were cautious in their assessments of the products.

In particular, many participants were confused by the lack of health warning messages and the information panel giving amounts of nicotine and tar on these packages. A number of participants said they could not really assess the products unless they could see the content information and compare the products and the product labelling to cigarettes they were familiar with.

"Low tar doesn't tell me anything about the contents."

"American cigarettes don't tell us the content so we don't know if they will give us the same satisfaction as a regular cigarette."

"What's the nicotine and chemical levels?"

"Nowhere on here does it say what's in here – in terms of chemicals, tar, not a single spot says anything about it."

Of the three products, participants were least interested in the Accord cigarette and holder system. Some participants, particularly in Montreal and, to a lesser extent, in Winnipeg, were interested in the Eclipse cigarette. The Omni cigarette generated the most appeal and was particularly popular in Toronto.

5.1 Accord

Participants were shown the cigarettes first, and asked to give their initial opinions before being shown a picture of the Accord holder in which the Accord cigarettes are to be placed and smoked.

Upon initial inspection of the product, only a few participants expressed interest in trying it, either out of curiosity, or because of its description as a low tar cigarette, or because it might be less addictive.

“It says ultra low tar – I would assume low tar means less poisons in it, I would assume a healthier cigarette, so I’d try it.”

Many commented spontaneously on the small size of the Accord cigarette. A few thought it was “cute,” and suggested they might try it as a novelty, but most thought the size of the cigarette was too small to provide a satisfying smoke. Some were also concerned that it would burn too quickly.

“They should be longer.”

“Two drags and it’s gone.”

“It doesn’t seem like a real cigarette, it looks almost like a toy.”

“A child’s cigarette.”

“There’s no tar because there’s no cigarette.”

“This is, like, a drag.”

Some commented that they thought they would smoke more if they were using this product. A few suggested that the small size might promote chainsmoking.

“I’d have to buy two packs at a time.”

“I’d probably smoke several packs a day instead of one.”

Some were concerned about the tube, or wrapping, of the product, which appeared thicker than that found in regular cigarettes.

“Makes me more cautious because of all the cardboard inside.”

“It’s double-wrapped or something.”

Many participants expressed confusion after reading the instructions on the package. Some of this confusion continued even after the participants learned that the Accord holder serves as a lighter and a holder for the product. Participants had many questions about how the lighting function works, how they would smoke the cigarette, what happens to the smoke from burning, and other aspects connected to practical use of the holder.

“If you’re not allowed to light these, how do you smoke them?”

“What would happen if you lit it? Would it blow up?”

After seeing the picture of the Accord holder and being told that the cigarette is placed inside the lighter and smoked, almost all the already minimal interest in the product disappeared. In general, the participants thought that the holder was unattractive and would be awkward to carry and use. Some said that using the holder would deprive them of the physical sensations of holding the cigarette. Several just laughed out loud upon first seeing the picture of it.

“I wouldn’t want to do that.”

“It looks crazy.”

“It’s not practical if we want to smoke outside.”

“It’s too much trouble.”

“Half the habit is holding it in your hand.”

“Too much to carry around.”

“Looks stupid.”

A number of participants thought that the holder was suggestive of illegal drug paraphernalia, and said they would be reluctant to use it even if they were interested for fear of being thought to be using drugs.

“It looks like a crack pipe or something.”

“Oh, it’s a holder! It looks like we’re doing drugs.”

“The cops would be on your doorstep.”

Some were concerned that using a device like this would be uncomfortable for them because it was different and unusual: “Not only does it look weird, it draws way too much attention to yourself.”

A few participants wondered about the costs involved in having to buy both the holder and the cigarettes. In Montreal, several participants mentioned the high price (\$60 - \$70 CDN) of the Accord holder.

Some participants were confused as to what made the product a low tar cigarette. Was it the cigarette itself, or the holder in which it is to be smoked?

A few speculated on whether smoking the Accord in its holder would reduce second hand smoke, but no one seemed particularly interested in this potential advantage when considered against all of the perceived disadvantages of the product.

5.2 Eclipse

During their initial examination of the Eclipse product, some participants mentioned its greater resemblance to a conventional cigarette, and the absence of a cumbersome device, compared to the Accord product. Some said they found the product attractive in appearance. A very few male participants thought that the design of the product made it clearly a product for women.

“I really like the style of these ones, they’re very stylish.”

“Looks like Ovation chocolate mints.”

However, some participants found the filter and the construction of the cigarette strange, confusing or bizarre, and said that the cigarette seems to contain little tobacco but a lot of paper. Participants found that it does not have the same “look” as a conventional cigarette. Even after reading the information provided with the product package, some participants did not seem able to visualise the process involved in “smoking” the Eclipse cigarette.

“This is kind of intimidating to me.”

“So are we just smoking the little tip that blackens after we give ourselves asthma lighting it?”

“This one is more favourable, but I don’t understand the science of it.”

“What’s that thing in the middle?”

Despite the interest it creates, this product still raised many questions among most participants: “What is being smoked? What are the ingredients? How is this cigarette made?” A few participants commented on the 1-800 number and said they would want to call it and get more information about the product before trying it.

A few participants believed that the Eclipse product might be more harmful than regular cigarettes because of all of the components.

“I worry that with all that in it, it might be more harmful.”

“It has plastic on it.”

Most participants who expressed an interest in the Eclipse cigarette commented on the reduction of second-hand smoke offered by the product. This aspect was of particular interest to participants with children. They liked the idea of less second-hand smoke for a variety of reasons: greater social tolerance (smoking without harming others); the possibility of smoking in a confined or crammed area (car, house, bar); a positive impact on the health of non-smokers, especially children; and the reduction of the lingering odour from smoking.

“Anyone with kids is going to say yes.”

“Probably not less harmful to me, but I have kids.”

“Kind of cool – there’s less smoke, so you’re not damaging other people, you’re only hurting yourself.”

“It says ‘no lingering odour.’”

“No ashes – that’s good.”

“People would buy these because of low second-hand smoke.”

“The ‘less odour’ appeals to me.”

Participants who did not have children or who did not generally smoke around children or inside did not express the same degree of interest in the product. Some commented that they were very careful about not exposing people to second-hand smoke, and hence would not need a product that reduces second-hand smoke.

Some felt that in eliminating ashes and most of the smoke, the product was losing aspects of the smoking experience that they valued, and that it would not be satisfying for them.

“It sounds pretty interesting, but still – you take away the odour and the smoke, I don’t know what you have left.”

“I have to flick.”

Several participants commented that they would probably continue to smoke their usual cigarettes but that they would smoke the Eclipse product if the context or circumstances imposed it.

“I would keep a pack just so if I go out somewhere where they have kids, of anything else, I have them on the side.”

5.3 Omni

Participants were shown the Omni product and, after they had seen and assessed it, they were shown a tobacco company ad about the product that appeared in People Magazine in 2001.

Overall, Omni generated the most interest of the three products.

A number of Toronto participants, expressed interest in the Omni product during the initial examination of the product. The most attractive features on first glance were the more conventional nature and appearance of the product and the description of it as being lower in carcinogens. A few mentioned that they would buy it. A very few suggested that it appeared to be a women's cigarette.

"It's more of a cigarette – the filter is a bit long but I can live with that."

"It's supposed to be lower carcinogens."

"I would be willing to try this one- it's the most similar."

"Actually smells like tobacco."

"I like the premise of less chemicals."

"Less chemicals must be safer."

"I would try this because it looks like a normal cigarette."

Initial negative response to the Omni cigarette centred on two aspects: the packaging, and on apparent contradictions in the information on the package. A number of participants were concerned about the packaging – they did not like the "crushable" pack, thought it to be impractical, and were afraid that their cigarettes would get broken easily.

As well, a number of participants were confused by what they perceived as conflicting statements on the packaging. They noted that while the packaging said that the Omni cigarette was the first product to offer reduced levels of cancer-causing ingredients, it also contained a warning that reducing carcinogens has not been proven to be less harmful. A few participants suggested that this apparent contradiction was the result of legal necessity – "covering their ass" – but many continued to express confusion about whether this product really would be less harmful.

"They're saying 'we're doing this and we think it's safer, but we don't know if it's good.'"

"See there, it tells you it has not been proven, even though they give you the catch phrase."

Others said that their interest might increase if there was a way to substantiate the claim that the cigarette contained fewer carcinogens and was actually less harmful.

"I don't know if it's a safer cigarette – it's just their claim."

"I might buy it if I can believe what they say about it."

The advertising had a mixed response, with some participants still sceptical about the “less harmful” claims while others were more impressed. Few liked the picture portion of the ad (a woman in Western-style clothing), but a larger number liked the text-letter portion of the ad and thought it was credible.

After looking at the advertising, some expressed continued confusion and scepticism toward the reduced harm claims of the Omni product.

“Well, Omni hasn’t been proved to reduce health risks, they just say that ‘low chemicals in our opinion is less harmful.’”

“They say it might be safer but it might not be – they don’t tell you any more than the packaging does.”

“On one hand, they say they’re the first to make a cigarette without this, but on the side they say it isn’t proven that they’re safer.”

Some participants became even more sceptical than they had been initially. A few insisted that “there is no ‘safer cigarette.’” Some expressed scepticism about whether it was actually possible to make a cigarette with fewer carcinogens.

“I think they’re lying – smoking doesn’t just give you lung cancer, it gives you all kinds of different problems.”

“This is all half-truths.”

Others expressed a positive feeling about the tone of the advertising. They appreciated a tobacco company saying that smoking is harmful to their health. A few said they liked the message they understood from the advertising: that smoking is harmful, but the manufacturer has tried to make a cigarette that might be less harmful by removing some carcinogenic ingredients.

“They’re not any safer than anything else, but the difference is they actually tell you. I don’t think I’ve ever seen any other brand tell you that it’s not safe.”

“The way this is written, it doesn’t sound like they’re lying to you.”

“It seems very professional.”

“They seem to be honest – we don’t want to encourage you to smoke, but if you do, smoke these.”

Others said that the advertising had provided them with more information, including tar and nicotine levels, which allowed them to compare the product to their own brand on those issues. A few commented on the inclusion of a website URL, and said they would be interested enough to look the product up on the Internet.

While some found that even the possibility that a cigarette with reduced carcinogens might be less harmful was appealing enough for them to consider trying it, they did stress that they were unlikely to switch unless the taste was comparable to their current brand. The issue of taste particularly worried participants who did not like the taste of American cigarettes. A very few also raised the issue of cost, saying that they would be reluctant to pay more for the Omni product than they already pay for their current brand.

“It would be something I would definitely try – but the flavour would have to be there.”

“Cost and taste would have to be similar.”

“I’m not interested in doubling my cost for a big maybe.”

“I would think less carcinogens, less harmful to your health. If it did the same things that my regular cigarette did, when I tried it, I’d probably switch.”

“It’s supposed to have less stuff in it. If it tasted good, I’d probably smoke it.”

“Need to see how they smoke and how they taste.”

A number of participants, particularly in Montreal, stated that there were no real advantages to adopting this cigarette as opposed to a conventional cigarette. They felt that this product was not really all that different from other cigarettes on the market.

“It’s just like another light cigarette.”

Some added that the image used in the advertising was not consistent with the product’s claimed benefits: participants referred to the “Marlboro cowboy,” saying that this is just another marketing approach, taking any means to sell a product.

“The western theme, Marlboro.”

“Marketing to women and farmers.”

“It’s nice picture, out in the wild and all that, but it’s just, you know, advertising.”

6.0 IMPACT OF HARM REDUCED PRODUCTS ON BEHAVIOUR

Most participants noted that they really could not say for certain whether they would consider switching to any of the products discussed unless they had tried them first, as they were not interested in switching to a product that did not provide them with the aspects of smoking that were important to them.

“If the taste is there, yeah.”

“Less is good, but I would have to get pleasure out of it.”

“I wouldn’t switch unless it was a really good smoke.”

“If I felt the same feeling and if I liked the taste...”

Some added that they would need more information on the products before they would consider trying them. In most groups, at least a few participants suggested that they might consider trying either the Eclipse cigarette or the Omni cigarette if these brands were available.

A few were clearly interested in adopting a “safer” cigarette as a deliberate risk reduction strategy, since they did not intend to quit smoking in the near future.

“I have the mindset that I am a smoker, so making it less dangerous – by all means.”

“I would make the effort for something with less chemicals, less carcinogens.”

However, many participants – particularly those who smoked regular or strong cigarettes - indicated that they would not change their current smoking habits if any of these three products were available on the market. Several participants, particularly in Montreal, thought that the products might interest other people because of the ever-growing number of people who are concerned with their health.

Some participants – but not a large number – said that they might switch to one of these products instead of quitting smoking. However, most smokers, whether they were seriously considering quitting at the present moment or not, said that they would prefer to quit cold turkey.

Some smokers also said that they might switch to one of these products as a step toward quitting, although their intention would remain, ultimately, to quit. A few commented that switching to a reduced harm cigarette from a regular cigarette reminded them of placing heroin addicts on methadone.

“If I want to quit, I’ll quit.”

“I might, as an interim thing.”

“It’s like taking an alcoholic that’s been drinking vodka all his life and putting him on beer.”

7.0 DESCRIPTORS

7.1 Written Exercise

Participants were invited to complete a short written exercise early in the focus group session. The purpose of this exercise was to learn about their perceptions of the tar, nicotine and chemical content implied by various descriptors that are applied to cigarettes and tobacco products (light, mild, ultra-mild, smooth, natural tobacco, etc.) compared to regular cigarettes, and about their perceptions of the harmful health effects. For each of the ten descriptors tested, participants were asked to indicate whether each would have more, less or about the same amount of tar, nicotine, chemicals as regular cigarettes, and whether it would lead to more, less or the same amount of harm to smokers' health.

The results reveal that most participants believe that light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth and low-tar cigarettes are about as harmful to smokers' health as regular cigarettes. However, about one in five smokers think these products are in fact less harmful.

A plurality of participants, particularly in Toronto, believe that light, mild, ultra light and ultra mild cigarettes have less tar than regular cigarettes. Some participants, particularly older participants and participants in the Montreal sessions, think that all of these have about the same amount of tar as regular cigarettes.

As well, a plurality of participants believe that ultra light and ultra mild cigarettes would have less nicotine, and a smaller number, again most notably among older participants and participants in the Montreal sessions, think they would have about the same amount of nicotine. Participants are divided as to whether light and mild cigarettes would have about the same or less nicotine.

Most believe that smooth cigarettes have about the same amount of tar and nicotine as regular cigarettes, although a significant minority think that smooth cigarettes would have less tar and nicotine.

Very few think that light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild or smooth cigarettes would have more tar or nicotine than regular cigarettes.

Most believe that low tar cigarettes do indeed have less tar than regular cigarettes.

With respect to chemical content, most participants believe that all of these types of cigarettes - light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth and low-tar - have about the same amount of chemicals as regular cigarettes, although significant numbers believe light, mild, ultra light, and ultra mild have less.

With regard to natural tobacco and additive-free tobacco, most participants believe that these products contain less chemicals than regular cigarettes, particularly in the case of natural tobacco. Significant numbers, although not a majority, believe that the harm to smoker's health would be less from both natural tobacco and additive-free tobacco.

Opinions differ as to the tar and nicotine content of these two types of cigarette. Many think that natural tobacco would have less tar and nicotine than regular cigarettes, but among those who disagree, some say it would have about the same and some, particularly among the younger participants, say it would have more. With respect to additive-free tobacco, some think this would have less tar and nicotine, while others think it would have about the same amount. Among Montreal participants, the greater numbers think that both natural and additive-free tobacco would have less tar and nicotine.

Finally, with regard to Silver products and smokeless tobacco, many participants did not offer a comparison on any of the dimensions. Among those who did make assessments of these products, most believe that these products would be about the same as regular cigarettes on all four dimensions. Some, particularly among younger participants, believe that these products – more so in the case of smokeless tobacco – would be less harmful and have less amounts of tar, nicotine and chemicals. A few – again, particularly among younger participants – believe that smokeless tobacco would be more harmful and have more tar, nicotine and chemicals than regular cigarettes.

The table appended below summarizes the results of the written exercise.

7.2 Removal of Descriptors

For most participants, the descriptors – mild, light, ultra-mild, ultra-light – on many packs of cigarettes are how they identify their brand. For most, particularly in Toronto and in Winnipeg, it is an indication of the strength of some of the ingredients in their brand of cigarettes, and secondarily an indicator of taste. For some, particularly in Montreal, it is more of an indicator of taste.

“It’s about chemical content, tar content, nicotine content.”

Most participants expressed either support for or indifference to the removal of descriptions currently used on packs of cigarettes: mild, light, ultra-mild, ultra-light. However, they were concerned that the actual brands they now smoke would still be available, and that there would be some means of identifying their brand. Participants wanted information to guide them to their brand, such as a colour code or a number code. They believed that such a code would quickly be adopted by tobacco companies.

“I just want the cigarette I regularly smoke.”

“If I’m still able to access the cigarette that I like, whether it be by a colour coding or a secret handshake or whatever, I don’t care. “

“If they’re going to have Gold, Silver, Bronze, then I’m at the Bronze level.”

Some stressed that having “the numbers” on the packages would be important to them if the descriptors were removed, suggesting again, the importance of these figures as a way to identify brands.

“I would still need to see the stats on the packs.”

“You can get rid of those words, but I need to see the milligrams of tar and so on.”

In the event that the current descriptors were removed, participants indicated that this would in no way change their smoking habits.

“I don’t see how words on a package are going to affect anyone’s nicotine habit.”

Most participants did not appear to care whether the government required the removal of the descriptors or the tobacco companies removed them voluntarily. As well, the vast majority did not object to a government initiative that would require their removal.

A few thought that removing the descriptors would have positive effects. These participants tended to see the descriptors as marketing tools, and were conscious of the fact that the meaning, in terms of actual levels of nicotine, tar, and other ingredients, of the descriptors varied markedly from brand to brand. A few also thought that removing the descriptors might make smokers more aware of the levels of ingredients in the various brands.

“It would make a difference, because putting that on there is deceiving, because people think ‘oh, extra light, no problem, it’s not that bad.’”

“I’d be happy – I think it’s all a huge marketing scam.”

It’s a misnomer anyway – ultra light in relation to what?”

A few thought that there could be negative consequences; they were concerned that young people starting to smoke might select something stronger than they really wanted to, without the descriptors to tell them which were the lighter cigarettes.

One or two participants did object to the removal of the descriptors, and particularly if such a removal came about through government regulation.

“They are going too far in regulating cigarettes.”

“It’s just too much – I mean, we’re already getting kicked out of restaurants.”

Summary of Written Exercise

Here are some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Does each of the following types of cigarettes have or lead to more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals, and harm to smokers' health compared to regular cigarettes?

1. Light cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	1	31	23
Nicotine	1	28	26
Chemicals	6	17	32
Harm to smokers' health	4	9	42

2. Mild cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	33	21
Nicotine	-	25	29
Chemicals	5	18	31
Harm to smokers' health	5	9	40

3. Ultra Light cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	1	36	17
Nicotine	1	32	21
Chemicals	9	18	28
Harm to smokers' health	9	9	36

4. Ultra Mild cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	38	15
Nicotine	-	33	21
Chemicals	5	20	29
Harm to smokers' health	6	11	36

5. Smooth	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	17	35
Nicotine	-	18	34
Chemicals	6	9	31
Harm to smokers' health	6	3	42

6. Low Tar	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	42	11
Nicotine	7	14	34
Chemicals	7	7	40
Harm to smokers' health	4	9	40

7. Natural tobacco	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	10	27	15
Nicotine	10	24	18
Chemicals	1	36	16
Harm to smokers' health	4	15	32

8. Additive-free tobacco	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	3	21	23
Nicotine	3	22	22
Chemicals	-	30	17
Harm to smokers' health	-	14	33

9. Silver	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	5	21
Nicotine	-	4	22
Chemicals	-	6	20
Harm to smokers' health	1	1	25

10. Smokeless tobacco	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	4	10	24
Nicotine	3	11	24
Chemicals	8	10	19
Harm to smokers' health	7	6	24



June 3, 2002

Discussion Agenda
Draft 3
PN5153

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Introduction to focus group procedures.
We want your opinion.
Feel free to agree or disagree and express your views freely.
You are being audio-taped and observed.
Your individual comments will not be linked to you.
The receptionist will pay you at the end of the session.

2.0 INTRODUCTION TO PARTICIPANTS

Today we are going to be talking about some topics related to smoking.

Let's go around the table so that each one of you can tell us your name, something about yourself, and also about your smoking background. How much do you smoke? When did you start?

3.0 HARM FROM TOBACCO

What causes harm to your health when you smoke a cigarette?

4.0 WRITTEN EXERCISE

I would like you now to complete a brief written exercise. Here are some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Please indicate whether you think each of the following has more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals and harm to smokers' health as regular cigarettes?

HAND OUT AND COMPLETE WRITTEN EXERCISE.

5.0 INTEREST IN "HARM REDUCED" PRODUCTS

Can tobacco products be made less harmful? How?

Are there any brands or types of cigarettes that you know of that are less harmful? What makes them so?

If such a product existed, would you be interested in it? What would you want or expect from such a product in terms of harm reduction? What would you expect in terms of taste or flavour? Anything else? What, if anything, would you be willing to give up?

How about a cigarette with lower tar levels? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

How about a cigarette with less nicotine? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

How about removing chemicals? Which ones? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

How about changing the filter? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

Would it make any difference to you which tobacco company made these products?

6.0 SPECIFIC PRODUCTS

Here are some packs of a product called Accord. HAND AROUND PACKS. Have you heard of it before? What are your impressions of it? Does it appeal to you? Why or why not? Would it be less harmful? To what extent? How does it reduce the harm?

Here are some packs of a product called Eclipse. HAND AROUND PACKS. Have you heard of it before? What are your impressions of it? Does it appeal to you? Why or why not? Would it be less harmful? To what extent? How does it reduce the harm?

Here are some pack of a product called Omni. HAND AROUND PACKS. Have you heard of it before? What are your impressions of it? Does it appeal to you? Why or why not? Would it be less harmful? To what extent? How does it reduce the harm?

Here is a magazine ad about Omni. HAND OUT AD. Does it interest you in the product?

RETURN ALL PACKS AND ADS.

7.0 BEHAVIOR/IMPACT

Would anybody here switch to any of these brands or these types of cigarettes if they were available? Does anybody think they would try them or switch to them instead of trying to quit smoking?

8.0 DESCRIPTORS

Let's return now to the written exercise you did. As you know, many of these descriptions - light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth - are on a lot of cigarettes.

What do these mean? (Light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth)

What if these words were removed from the packs? What is your response to that? What if the government required it? What if the tobacco company removed these descriptions?

If these descriptions were taken off, would it change what you smoke? The amount you smoke?

Thank and Close.

Written Exercise

Here are some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Does each of the following types of cigarettes have or lead to more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals, and harm to smokers' health compared to regular cigarettes?

1. Light cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

2. Mild cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

3. Ultra Light cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

4. Ultra Mild cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

5. Smooth

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

(over)

6. Low Tar

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

7. Natural tobacco

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

8. Additive-free tobacco

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

9. Silver

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

10. Smokeless tobacco

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			



GUIDE DE DISCUSSION

Projet No 02-2465

Groupes du 5 juin 2002

1. INTRODUCTION

- Identification de l'animateur.
- Informations relatives à la procédure de déroulement d'une rencontre de groupe.
- On veut connaître votre opinion; il est important que tous participent.
- Sentez-vous libre d'être d'accord ou en désaccord et exprimez vos opinions en toute liberté : aucun jugement de valeur.
- Vous êtes enregistré sur bandes audio et vidéo et il y a des observateurs derrière le miroir.
- Aucun de vos propos individuels ne sera identifié : garantie de confidentialité et d'anonymat.

2. INTRODUCTION DES PARTICIPANTS

- Aujourd'hui, nous allons discuter de différents sujets en rapport avec la cigarette.
- Faisons d'abord un tour de table pour que chacun puisse se présenter par son prénom, se décrire en quelques mots (occupation, composition du ménage) et parler de ses usages de la cigarette : depuis combien de temps vous fumez, combien de cigarettes vous fumez par jour...

3. LES EFFETS DU TABAC SUR LA SANTÉ

- Qu'est-ce qui cause les effets négatifs sur votre santé quand vous fumez la cigarette?

4. EXERCICE ÉCRIT

- J'aimerais maintenant que vous complétiez un court exercice sur papier. Voici certains mots qui sont utilisés pour décrire la cigarette. Veuillez indiquer concernant chacun de ces mots si vous pensez que les cigarettes ainsi décrites ont plus, moins ou environ la même composition en goudron, nicotine, produits chimiques et/ou ont un impact négatif plus

grand, égal ou moindre sur la santé des fumeurs que les cigarettes régulières.

DISTRIBUER ET FAIRE COMPLÉTER L'EXERCICE ÉCRIT
--

5. INTÉRÊT À L'ÉGARD DES PRODUITS COMPORTANT « MOINS DOMMAGEABLES » POUR LA SANTÉ

- Les produits du tabac peuvent-ils être moins dommageables pour la santé?
- Y a-t-il des marques ou des types de cigarettes que vous connaissez qui sont moins dommageables? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'elles sont moins dommageables?
- Si un tel produit existait, y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Quelles seraient vos attentes ou que voudriez-vous d'un tel produit en ce qui a trait à la réduction des effets sur la santé? Quelles seraient vos attentes en matière de goût ou de saveur? Autre chose? Quelle concession, s'il y a lieu, seriez-vous prêt(e) à faire?
- Que dire concernant une cigarette avec des niveaux moindres de goudron? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Maintenant, s'il s'agissait d'une cigarette avec moins de nicotine? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Que dire si on enlevait des produits chimiques de la cigarette? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Et si on changeait le filtre de la cigarette? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Votre réaction pourrait-elle varier dépendant quelle compagnie de tabac fait ces produits?

6. PRODUITS SPÉCIFIQUES

- Voici des paquets d'un produit appelé « ACCORD ». (FAIRE CIRCULER LES PAQUETS) En avez-vous entendu parler auparavant? Quelles sont vos impressions à ce sujet? Est-ce un produit qui vous intéresse? Pourquoi? Pourquoi pas? Serait-il moins dommageable pour la santé? À quel point le serait-il? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'il y a réduction de risques pour la santé?
- Voici des paquets d'un produit appelé « ECLIPSE ». (FAIRE CIRCULER LES PAQUETS) En avez-vous entendu parler auparavant? Quelles sont vos impressions à ce sujet? Est-ce un produit qui vous intéresse? Pourquoi? Pourquoi pas? Serait-il moins dommageable pour la santé? À quel point le serait-il? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'il y a réduction de risques pour la santé?
- Voici des paquets d'un produit appelé « OMNI ». (FAIRE CIRCULER LES PAQUETS) En avez-vous entendu parler auparavant? Quelles sont vos impressions à ce sujet? Est-ce un produit qui vous intéresse? Pourquoi?

Pourquoi pas? Serait-il moins dommageable pour la santé? À quel point le serait-il? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'il y a réduction de risques pour la santé?

- Voici l'annonce d'Omni parue dans une revue. (FAIRE CIRCULER LA PUBLICITÉ) Quelle est votre réaction? Est-ce que cela suscite de l'intérêt envers le produit?

REMETTRE TOUS LES PAQUETS ET LES PUBLICITÉS À L'ANIMATEUR

7. EFFET SUR LE COMPORTEMENT

- Y a-t-il des gens qui changeraient de marques de cigarettes si ces produits étaient disponibles? Y a-t-il des gens qui pensent qu'ils feraient l'essai de ces produits ou adopteraient leur usage plutôt que d'essayer d'arrêter de fumer?

8. LES DESCRIPTEURS DE PRODUITS

- Revenons maintenant à l'exercice individuel que vous avez complété en début de rencontre. Comme vous le savez, on utilise ces éléments de description — douces, légères, ultra-douces, ultra-légères — sur de nombreux paquets de cigarettes.
- Que signifient-ils? (Légère, douce, ultra-légère, ultra-douce)
- Quelle serait votre réaction si on enlevait ces mots sur les paquets de cigarettes? Quelle serait votre réaction si le gouvernement exigeait qu'on retire ces mots? Quelle serait votre réaction si les compagnies de tabac retiraient ces mots?
- Si ces descriptions étaient retirées, cela changerait-il quelque chose quant à ce que vous fumez? Quant à la quantité que vous fumez?

REMERCIEMENTS!

EXERCICE ÉCRIT

Voici certains mots qui sont utilisés pour décrire la cigarette. En considérant chacun des types de cigarettes suivants, diriez-vous, en comparaison des cigarettes régulières, qu'ils contiennent plus, moins ou contiennent à peu près la même quantité de goudron, de nicotine, de produits chimiques et/ou de risques de dommages à la santé ?

re some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Does each of the following types of cigarettes have or lead to more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals, and harm to smokers' health compared to regular cigarettes?

1. Les cigarettes légères

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommages sur la santé des fumeurs			

2. Les cigarettes douces

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommages sur la santé des fumeurs			

3. Les cigarettes ultra-légères

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		

Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

4. Les cigarettes ultra-douces

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

5. Velouté

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

6. À faible teneur en goudron

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

7. Tabac naturel

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

8. Le tabac sans additif

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

9. Argent

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

10. Le tabac sans fumée

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			



**Consumer Interest in Potential Reduced Exposure Products:
Results of a National Survey**

FINAL REPORT

FOCUS CANADA 2002-4 Omnibus
POR-02-112

Prepared for: Health Canada

Prepared by: Environics Research Group Limited

February 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	AWARENESS OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTES	4
3.0	IMPORTANCE OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTE QUALITIES.....	5
4.0	IMPACT OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTES ON SMOKING BEHAVIOUR	5

Appendix: Questionnaires

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In November 2002, Environics Research Group was retained by Health Canada to conduct quantitative research with adult smokers to better understand consumer awareness and interest in potential reduced exposure products (PREPs). This quantitative survey is a follow-up to qualitative research conducted on the same topic in March 2002.

That main topics addressed in the survey include:

- 1 ♦ Awareness of “safer”/”less harmful” cigarettes among smokers;
- 2 ♦ Importance of “safer”/”less harmful” cigarette qualities to smokers;
- 3 ♦ Impact that “safer”/”less harmful” cigarettes would have on smoking behaviour.

The survey is based on a sample of 537 adult smokers across Canada. The survey was conducted, by telephone, between December 19, 2002 and January 12, 2003. The results of a survey of this magnitude can be considered accurate to within plus or minus 4.2 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

This report summarizes the findings of the survey.

The questionnaires are attached.

2.0 AWARENESS OF "SAFER"/"LESS HARMFUL" CIGARETTES

Awareness of potential reduced exposure tobacco products is quite low.

When asked an unaided question as to whether they have seen or heard of any types of cigarettes or cigarette-like products that tobacco companies are developing which they claim are safer or less harmful than ordinary cigarettes, 80 per cent of Canadian adult smokers say that they have not seen or heard of a safer or less harmful cigarette-like product.

Awareness of Cigarette-Like Products Claiming to Be Safer or Less Harmful	
Yes	19
No	80
DK/NA	1

Of the 19 percent of adult smokers who say they are aware of such products, 47 percent of this group cannot name any products. A further 35 percent of this group say that no new cigarette product is less harmful than ordinary cigarettes. There is some mention of light cigarettes and cigarettes without additives.

Naming of Cigarette Products Thought to Be Less Harmful* (Among Aware)	
Light Cigarettes	4
Cigarettes Without Any Additives	3
Player's Silver	2
Supreme	2
Black Cat	2
All Other Mentions	8
None Are Less Harmful	35
DK/NA	47

Of the 19 percent of adult smokers who are aware of safer or less harmful cigarette-like products, the largest numbers mention fewer chemicals, less nicotine or less tar as the main reasons why they think such new products might be less harmful. Again, a further 25 percent of this group say that no new cigarette product is less harmful than ordinary cigarettes, and 15 percent don't know.

What Might Make New Cigarette Products Safer or Less Harmful* (Among Aware)	
Fewer Chemicals/Toxics/Carcinogens	19
Less Nicotine	16
Less Tar/Lower Tar	11
Less Harmful Ingredients in General	9
Less Additives	9
Self-Extinguishing Cigarettes	5
Different Filters/No Fibreglass	4
All Other Mentions	6
None Are Less Harmful	25
DK/NA	15

* Multiple answers possible

Older smokers have slightly higher awareness of such products than younger smokers.

3.0 IMPORTANCE OF "SAFER"/"LESS HARMFUL" CIGARETTE QUALITIES

When asked how important each of the following qualities would be in considering whether to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product, two-thirds of Canadian adult smokers say the extent to which the new product is less harmful to both the health of non-smokers (67%) and their own health (66%) is extremely important. More than three in ten adult smokers say that product features like taste (39%), price similarity to ordinary cigarettes (38%), and ability to easily inhale (32%) are extremely important. Whether the new product looks like an ordinary cigarette is considered extremely important by only 23 percent of adult smokers.

Important Qualities in a Safer or Less Harmful Cigarette	% Who Say Quality Is		
	Extremely Important ¹	Somewhat Important ²	Not Important ³
Extent of Harm to Non-Smokers' Health	67	14	11
Extent of Harm to Smoker's Health	66	14	12
Taste of Safer or Less Harmful Cigarette	39	28	18
Price Similarity to Ordinary Cigarettes	38	18	26
Ability to Easily Inhale	32	22	28
Looks Like an Ordinary Cigarette	23	22	36

4.0 IMPACT OF "SAFER"/"LESS HARMFUL" CIGARETTES ON SMOKING BEHAVIOUR

In contrast to the low visibility of such products, smokers appear to express considerable interest switching to a less harmful product if it were available, as well as some interest in switching instead of quitting smoking. Although this interest appears significant in this survey, the focus group research uncovered widespread cynicism among smokers that the tobacco companies would actually produce such products.

When asked how likely they would be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product if it were available, 78 percent of adult smokers say they would be very (51%) or somewhat (27%) likely to switch. A total of 22 percent of adult smokers say they would be not very (6%) or not at all (16%) likely to switch.

¹ Score of 7 on a scale from 1 to 7.

² Score of 5 or 6.

³ Score of 1 to 3.

Likelihood of Switching to a Safer/Less Harmful Cigarette Product if it Were Available	
Very Likely	51
Somewhat Likely	27
Not Very Likely	6
Not At All Likely	16

When asked what they would be willing to pay for a safer or less harmful cigarette product, 72 percent of adult smokers say they would be willing to pay no more than they do now for ordinary cigarettes, while 24 percent of adult smokers say they would be willing to pay a lot more (4%) or somewhat more (20%) for such a product.

What Adult Smokers Would Be Willing to Pay for a Safer/Less Harmful Cigarette Product Compared to Ordinary Cigarettes	
A Lot More	4
Somewhat More	20
No More	72
Not Interested	3
DK/NA	*

*Less than one percent

When asked how likely they would be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product instead of trying to quit smoking, 61 percent of adult smokers say they would be very (32%) or somewhat (29%) likely to switch. Conversely, 38 percent of adult smokers say they would be not very (10%) or not at all (28%) likely to switch instead of trying to quit.

Likelihood of Switching to a Safer/Less Harmful Cigarette Product Instead of Trying to Quit Smoking	
Very Likely	32
Somewhat Likely	29
Not Very Likely	10
Not At All Likely	28
DK/NA	1

Cost similarly is more important to low income smokers. There are no significant demographics differences in interest levels overall in these new products, but older smokers are more likely than younger smokers to switch to these products as an alternative to quitting.

APPENDIX

December 13, 2002

HEALTH CANADA
"safer"/"less harmful" cigarettes
Focus Canada – environics
adults Age 18 years plus
FC24

1. D At the present time, do you smoke cigarettes (manufactured or roll your own) every day, occasionally or not at all?

01 - Every day **SMOKER - GO TO Q.2D**
02 - Occasionally (less than every day) **SMOKER - GO TO Q.2D**
03 - Not at all **NON- SMOKER - SKIP TO NEXT SECTION**
99 - DK/NA **NON- SMOKER - SKIP TO NEXT SECTION**

ASK ALL SMOKERS

2. D Have you seen or heard of any new types of cigarettes or cigarette-like products that tobacco companies are developing which they claim are safer or less harmful than ordinary cigarettes?

01 – Yes	ASK Q.3D
02 – No	SKIP TO Q.5D
99 – DK/NA	SKIP TO Q.5D

IF YES TO Q. 2D, ASK:

3. D Can you name any new cigarette products that you think are less harmful? **IF YES: What are they? DO NOT READ. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.**

01 - Accord
02 - Eclipse
03 - Omni
04 - Ariva
05 - Advance
06 - Exult
07 - Cigarettes without any additives
08 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
09 - None are less harmful
99 - No, can't name/DK/NA

4. D As far as you know, what is it about any of these products that might make them safer or less harmful? **DO NOT READ. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.**

01 - Less tar/lower tar
02 - Less nicotine
03 - Fewer chemicals/toxics/carcinogens
04 - Less second-hand smoke
05 - Less harmful ingredients in general
06 - Burn at lower temperature
07 - Less additives
08 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
09 - Not less harmful
99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL SMOKERS

5. D If a safer or less harmful cigarette product were available, how important would each of the following qualities be for you in considering whether to switch to such a product? Using a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is extremely important, and the mid-point 4 is neither, how important would each of the following be? **READ AND ROTATE**

- a) the taste of the new product

01 - 1 (not at all important)
02 - 2
03 - 3
04 - 4 (neither)
05 - 5
06 - 6
07 - 7 (extremely important)
99 - DK/NA

- b) the ability to easily inhale the new product

- c) the extent to which the new product was less harmful to a smoker's health

- d) the extent to which the new product was less harmful to the health of non-smokers from second-hand smoke

- e) the extent to which the new product was similar in price to cigarettes now on the market

- f) the extent to which the new product looks like an ordinary cigarette.

6. D How likely would you be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product if it were available? Would you be very, somewhat, not very or not at all likely?

01 - Very likely
02 - Somewhat likely
03 - Not very likely
04 - Not at all likely
99 - DK/NA

7. D Would you be willing to pay a lot more, somewhat more, or no more than you are paying now, for a safer or less harmful cigarette product?

01 - A lot more
02 - Somewhat more
03 - No more

VOLUNTEERED

04 - Not interested
99 - DK/NA

8. D How likely would you be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product instead of trying to quit smoking? Would you be very, somewhat, not very or not at all likely?

01 - Very likely
02 - Somewhat likely
03 - Not very likely
04 - Not at all likely
99 - DK/NA

SANTÉ CANADA
Cigarettes «plus sécuritaires/moins dangereuses»
Focus Canada – Environics
Adultes de 18 ans et plus
FC24

1. D Actuellement est-ce que vous fumez la cigarette (de commerce ou roulée) tous les jours, occasionnellement ou jamais?

01 - Tous les jours **FUMEUR - PASSER À Q.2D**
02 - Occasionnellement (moins souvent qu'une fois par jour) **FUMEUR - PASSER À Q.2D**
03 - Jamais **NON FUMEUR - PASSER À LA SECTION SUIVANTE**
99 - NSP/PR **NON FUMEUR - PASSER À LA SECTION SUIVANTE**

DEMANDER À TOUS LES FUMEURS

2. D Est-ce que vous avez vu ou entendu parler de nouveaux types de cigarettes ou de produits semblables à la cigarette que les compagnies de tabac sont en train de mettre au point et qui, d'après ces fabricants, sont plus sécuritaires et moins dangereux que les cigarettes ordinaires?

01 – Oui	POSER Q.3D
02 – Non	PASSER À Q.5D
99 – NSP/PR	PASSER À Q.5D

SI OUI À Q. 2D, DEMANDER :

3. D Est-ce que vous pouvez nommer des **nouveaux produits de cigarette** qui **sont** moins dangereux, d'après vous? **SI OUI : Quels sont ces produits? NE PAS LIRE. CODER TOUTES LES MENTIONS QUI S'APPLIQUENT.**

01- Accord
02 - Eclipse
03 - Omni
04 - Ariva
05 - Advance
06 – Exult
07 – Cigarettes sans additifs
08 - Autre (PRÉCISER) _____
09 - Aucun n'est moins dangereux
99 - Non, ne peut en nommer/ NSP/PR

4. D Pour autant que vous le sachiez, qu'est-ce qui peut rendre ces produits plus sécuritaires ou moins dangereux? **NE PAS LIRE. CODER TOUTES LES MENTIONS QUI S'APPLIQUENT.**

01 - Moins de goudron/teneur plus faible en goudron
02 - Moins de nicotine
03 - Moins de produits chimiques/de toxines/de carcinogènes
04 - Moins de fumée des autres
05 - Ingrédients moins dangereux en général
06 - Brûle à une température plus faible
07 – Moins d'additifs
08 - Autre (PRÉCISER) _____
09 - Pas moins dangereux
99 - NSP/PR

DEMANDER À TOUS LES FUMEURS

5. D Si un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux était disponible, dans quelle mesure chacune des caractéristiques suivantes serait-elle importante pour vous si vous envisagiez de changer pour adopter un de ces produits? En utilisant une échelle de 1 à 7, où 1 veut dire pas du tout importante, où 7 veut dire extrêmement importante et où le point milieu 4 veut dire ni l'un ni l'autre, quelle serait l'importance de chacune de ces caractéristiques? **LIRE EN ROTATION**

- a) le goût du nouveau produit

01 - 1 (pas du tout important)
02 - 2
03 - 3
04 - 4 (ni l'un ni l'autre)
05 - 5
06 - 6
07 - 7 (extrêmement important)
99 - NSP/PR

- b) la capacité d'inhaler facilement le nouveau produit

- c) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit est moins dangereux pour la santé d'un fumeur

- d) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit est moins dangereux pour la santé des non-fumeurs à cause de la fumée des autres

- e) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit coûte le même prix que les cigarettes sur le marché en ce moment

- f) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit ressemble à une cigarette ordinaire.

6. D Quelle est la probabilité que vous adoptiez un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux s'il était disponible? Est-ce que ce serait très probable, assez probable, pas très probable ou pas du tout probable?

01 - Très probable
02 - Assez probable
03 - Pas très probable
04 - Pas du tout probable
99 - NSP/PR

7. D Est-ce que vous seriez prêt à payer beaucoup plus cher, un peu plus cher ou pas plus cher que vous payez maintenant pour un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux?

01 - Beaucoup plus cher
02 - Un peu plus cher
03 - Pas plus cher

NON SUGGÉRÉ

04 - PAS INTÉRESSÉ
99 - NSP/PR

8. D Quelle est la probabilité que vous adoptiez un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux au lieu d'essayer de cesser de fumer? Est-ce que ce serait très probable, assez probable, pas très probable ou pas du tout probable?

01 - Très probable
02 - Assez probable
03 - Pas très probable
04 - Pas du tout probable
99 - NSP/PR

103 0303

B2



ENVIRONICS
RESEARCH GROUP

**Consumer Interest in
Potential Reduced Exposure Products:
Results of a Focus Group Study**

Final Report
PN5153

POR-02-112

Prepared for: Health Canada

Prepared by: Environics Research Group

March 2003

8080 801
54

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	SUMMARY	4
3.0	HARM FROM TOBACCO	5
4.0	INTEREST IN "HARM REDUCED" PRODUCTS	8
4.1	Awareness of "Harm Reduced" Products.....	8
4.2	General Interest in "Harm Reduced" Products.....	9
4.3	Cigarettes with Lower Tar Levels.....	12
4.4	Cigarettes with Less Nicotine	13
4.5	Cigarettes with Fewer/Less Chemicals	14
4.6	Cigarettes with Different Filters	15
4.7	Effect of Brand on Interest in "Harm Reduced" Products	16
5.0	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC PRODUCTS.....	17
5.1	Accord.....	18
5.2	Eclipse	20
5.3	Omni	22
6.0	IMPACT OF HARM REDUCED PRODUCTS ON BEHAVIOUR	25
7.0	DESCRIPTORS.....	26
7.1	Written Exercise	26
7.2	Removal of Descriptors	27

APPENDICES

Summary of Written Exercise

Discussion Agendas

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In March 2002, Environics Research Group Limited was retained by Health Canada to conduct qualitative research involving a series of focus groups with adult smokers to better understand consumer interest in potential reduced exposure products (PREPs).

Recently tobacco and cigarette-like products have been introduced that result in decreased emissions of some toxins. These include cigarette-like products that deliver nicotine with less combustion than cigarettes. More of these PREPs are likely to be introduced in the future. These products may be promoted as aids to quitting or even as being less harmful to human health. However, there is a significant possibility that some will in fact be cigarette substitutes, which might maintain nicotine addiction and even reduce cessation rates.

There is virtually no information today about possible consumer interest in PREPs in Canada. However, given the strong interest in many smokers who want to quit, there might be expected to be some interest in such products, especially if they were promoted as reducing harm.

Environics Research Group was retained to conduct qualitative research into consumer interest in PREPs in order to provide Health Canada with insights into the potential appeal of these kinds of products. The study focussed on those products likely to be, or currently, produced by cigarette companies. We did not explore products that might be produced by the pharmaceutical industry.

The goals of this qualitative research were:

- To examine potential interest in PREPs among smokers, including interest in switching;
- To understand what product qualities consumers respond to in PREPs;
- To explore how the availability of such products might affect smoking and smoking cessation behaviours.

Six focus groups were conducted; two each in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. These groups consisted of smokers, both "hard-core" smokers and potential quitters. In each city, one group was conducted with smokers aged 18 (or 19) to 34, and the other with smokers aged 35 or older. The sessions were held in June 2002.

The topics examined during these focus group discussions included:

- Smokers' perceptions of the causes of health risks from cigarettes;
- Perceptions, knowledge, expectations, and interest in "harm reduced" tobacco products or cigarettes;
- Perceptions of and interest in low-tar cigarettes, reduced nicotine cigarettes, cigarettes with fewer chemicals, changes to cigarette filters;
- Influence of corporate brand on interest in such products;
- Response to and interest in specific products: Accord, Eclipse, Omni;
- Effect of availability of such products on smoking and smoking cessation behaviours: would consumers switch rather than quit?
- Perceptions of descriptors: light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth and others;

- Response to removal of descriptors such as light and mild, from cigarette packages, by government or by the tobacco companies;
- Effect of removal of descriptors on smoking behaviour.

This report presents the findings of this qualitative research. The discussion agendas are attached.

Qualitative research is by its nature exploratory, and provides insight into the range of opinion held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projectable.

2.0 SUMMARY

Among the main findings of the focus group study are:

- Most smokers believe that smoking is at least somewhat harmful to one's health, but many minimize such harm as being no greater than that caused by other sources.
- Most smokers are able to mention at least one or more components or constituents that might be causing this harm to health, but the level of knowledge about specific constituents or processes is extremely low.
- There is a clear expressed interest in a cigarette product that might be less harmful, but in fact smokers are not willing to give up much to switch to such a product. There is considerable scepticism that such a product could be produced, especially one with the same taste and flavour qualities as current brands.
- Of the four qualities of cigarettes tested that might possibly produce a "less harmful" product, those with "fewer chemicals" would have the most appeal, and those with "less tar" would have some appeal. Cigarettes with "less nicotine" and "different filters" have little or no appeal to smokers.
- A number of smokers appear to be using the tar content figures on cigarette packages as a way to identify their brand.
- Of three specific products, the Omni and Eclipse have some, although rather limited, appeal. Some smokers found the tobacco company claims in the Omni ad to be credible; most did not.
- A fairly small number of smokers think that they might switch to a "less harmful" product instead of quitting, or as a step towards quitting.
- The vast majority of smokers either support or are indifferent, to the idea of removing descriptors such as light, mild, ultra light and ultra mild from cigarette packs, as long as they can still identify their brand.

We conclude from this study that although there is expressed interest in “harm reduced” tobacco products, there are considerable attitudinal and perceptual barriers to overcome, among smokers, before such products could achieve widespread acceptance or success in the market. Important among these barriers is the widespread idea that “less harmful” cigarettes would not deliver the taste, flavour, and other positive qualities of the smoking experience. Another important attitudinal barrier is the considerable scepticism and cynicism that smokers have about the tobacco industry and its credibility and suspect motives in creating such a product. Many smokers want to have some sort of proof or evidence that such a product would be “less harmful”, before they would even consider trying it.

The regulatory environment itself will make it extremely difficult to overcome such attitudinal barriers. First, tobacco manufacturers have limited ability to market the taste, flavour and other qualities of their products, and they have even less ability to suggest that a product may be less harmful. Therefore, they would have to use such terms as “fewer chemicals” or “reduced carcinogens” to try to communicate a message about “less harm”. But even here, the regulated health warning statements provide an important and powerful message that clearly contradicts any descriptions (“low tar”, “reduced carcinogens”) that might appear on the packs. As we saw in testing the Omni product and its ad, most smokers remain extremely sceptical of the claims of a tobacco company when they see the warning message along side such claims.

Still, these products do have some appeal among a fairly small number of smokers, particularly among women smokers, among potential quitters (women and men) and among “experimenters” - that small number of smokers who like to try different and new brands. Some smokers are indeed willing to give up some of the flavour and other qualities, are attracted by “low carcinogens” or similar messages, and are open to a “balanced”, “straight forward” message from the tobacco industry.

Below, we discuss the focus group findings in detail.

3.0 HARM FROM TOBACCO

Most participants, particularly those in the younger age groups, agreed that smoking cigarettes is at least somewhat or very harmful. Some participants made reference to specific health problems affecting either their personal health or that of family or friends, which they attributed at least in part to smoking.

“I find I get bronchitis now, twice a year, and I never used to, and I blame it on cigarettes.”

“I lost both of my parents to cancer. Both of them smoked all my life, as far as I can remember.”

However, even among those who agreed that smoking is harmful, a number of participants attempted to minimize the potential harm by comparing it to other things they felt were equally harmful, such as air pollution and chemicals in food and other products.

“It’s no worse than living in downtown Toronto.”

“Sure it’s harmful, but compared to what? There’s so many things that are harmful.”

“More harmful things in the air than in cigarettes.”

“Cigarettes are harmful to you – most products have something harmful.”

“Only one thing of many harmful things in the environment.”

“If you were worried about what was in things, you wouldn’t eat or drink anything.”

“Just the fumes coming off your sofa can be just as bad.”

A small number of older participants in Toronto and Winnipeg expressed a belief that cigarette smoking is not really harmful. Some of these participants stated that despite their own smoking history, they were in better health than many younger people they knew, or that their health problems were clearly attributable to other causes than smoking. Others reported stories of family members or friends who have smoked all their lives without any apparent harm to their health.

“My dad smoked ‘til he was 90. He still had all his faculties, he just passed away in his sleep.”

Some felt that smoking might be harmful for some people, but was not harmful for everyone.

“If you’ve already got something wrong with you in the first place, it might [cause harm], but otherwise, I don’t really believe all that.”

“It’s got a lot to do with genetic makeup – if someone is genetically prone to cancer, smoking would more than likely accelerate it.”

A few participants commented on what they perceived to be beneficial health effects of smoking. One woman noted that smoking had helped her with pain management following dental surgery. Others noted that smoking helps them to reduce stress, “and stress can be a killer.”

In Montreal, the older participants had difficulty in responding to the moderator’s questions about harm from smoking, but in the group of 18 to 34 year-olds, the participants as a whole admitted that cigarettes can have very major negative effects on health, but that they did not worry about it given their youth. Issues that were mentioned as negative effects of smoking by the younger Montreal participants included: addiction; poor social acceptance, fewer and fewer places where smoking is allowed; the high price of cigarettes; and physical inconveniences (bad breath, yellow fingers, coughing).

Most participants overall were able to name at least some components in cigarettes that might cause harm to health. Tar and nicotine were the most frequently mentioned specific ingredients. Some suggested that nicotine in itself was not harmful to health, but that it was the addictive agent and thus indirectly caused harm by making it hard to quit smoking and thus avoid exposure to the harmful ingredients in tobacco. While it was understood by most participants that nicotine is a naturally occurring component of tobacco, some speculated that manufacturers manipulate or enhance the nicotine content of cigarettes in some way during the processing of the tobacco.

“They manipulate the tobacco so it is more... it causes more problems and it is addictive.”

Many referred to “poisons,” “chemicals,” “additives,” “carcinogens,” “trace elements” or “toxic stuff” in general. Some made specific reference to such ingredients as arsenic, carbon monoxide, formaldehyde, cyanide and sugar.

“I guess it’s just the ingredients. You’re sucking tar and carbon monoxide into your lungs.”

“Tar... we know it blackens lungs.”

A few participants mentioned harmful substances used in cigarette filters, such as fiberglass or charcoal. In Montreal, acid in the white paper was also mentioned. A few older participants in Winnipeg stated that tobacco now was more harmful than it was when they were younger because of all of the additives, including agricultural pesticides used in farming tobacco. Some Montreal participants also expressed the belief that today’s cigarettes are much more harmful than those produced 30 years ago.

Some participants distinguished between the harmful effects of tobacco and the harmful effects of smoking.

“The smoke that goes into your lungs.”

“Inhaling smoke – inhaling anything can’t be good for you.”

“It’s both the chemicals and the smoke.”

“It’s the smoking itself... like how many firefighters live to a long age? It’s because they’re inhaling the smoke. Period. The smoke itself has all the things in it, and what it does to your lungs, and your lungs affect everything else – it’s just the start of many little things.”

Some participants in Montreal also mentioned the manner of smoking cigarettes, inhaling all the smoke, as something which causes harm.

However, in spite of the mention of a number of components that might cause harm, most participants could not say whether one element was more harmful to health than another, nor were most able to describe how the harm might come about. The impression left was that although ingredients were mentioned, the knowledge level about harm to health was very low.

“It’s everything combined.”

“There’s nothing good in them.”

4.0 INTEREST IN “HARM REDUCED” PRODUCTS

4.1 Awareness of “Harm Reduced” Products

Participants had a mixed response to the question: can cigarettes/tobacco products be made less harmful? Some felt that actions can be taken to make individual cigarettes less harmful, such as changing the manufacturing process, ending the manipulation of nicotine levels that they believed was a part of cigarette manufacturing, and using fewer chemicals or carcinogens in processing the tobacco. Others suggested using natural or organically grown tobacco; some asserted that natural tobacco contains fewer or no chemicals. Others mentioned making cigarettes that produce less smoke and developing filter technology.

“Get rid of all the junk.”

“If they just took the tobacco and cut it up and rolled it, I think it would do far less damage.”

“Just smoke raw tobacco.”

Some mentioned making cigarettes less addictive: “If they removed the nicotine, maybe people would get over the physical addiction.” In Montreal, this was considered to be an important aspect of a less harmful cigarette; participants clearly believed that no-nicotine cigarettes would be less harmful to health.

However, there was a more prevalent sense that making a less harmful cigarette would not be successful. Many commented that in making a “safer” cigarette, many of the elements they valued most about smoking – such as taste and flavour or the strength of the “drag” – might be altered.

“It wouldn’t be a cigarette anymore, it would be something else.”

“If you took all the chemicals out, it wouldn’t be a cigarette.”

“If they start changing it, it’s not worth it.”

Others observed that making a less harmful cigarette could lead to smoking more cigarettes, or to inhaling more strongly or deeply, in order to get the same “fix.” In fact, some suggested that that “light” cigarettes are even more harmful than so-called “regular” cigarettes, because they produce more of a temptation to inhale.

“You could make them lighter, but then you just smoke more – if it’s poison, well, then it’s light poison.”

“You have an addiction, so you’re going to do what you need to get it – what you need.”

“You smoke more of the special filter brand to get the same effect of smoking one regular cigarette.”

“You smoke double the amount to get your fix.”

“A light cigarette, you’re just going to puff harder.”

A few participants believed that there was no way to make cigarettes less harmful: “No, it’s a black and white issue.” Others felt that “smoking is smoking.” Even if it is technically possible to make a less harmful cigarette, the key fact remains that all cigarettes are harmful.

“That’s like standing out on the highway and getting hit by a car going 50 miles an hour as opposed to 100 miles an hour. Whatever they make it out of, there’s still smoke. When anything burns, there’s bad stuff.”

“It’s like skinning a cat – there’s a hundred ways to do it, but it’s still skinning a cat. You can do all these things to it, but in the end, you’re still doing something that’s harmful to you: smoking.”

A very few participants were concerned that making a less harmful cigarette would lead to increased use, and might encourage young people to start smoking because of increased social acceptability.

“If something is less harmful, it’s actually more harmful, because you’re more deceived into doing it more. Like alcohol – it’s legal, so people think it’s no problem. You’re just killing yourself a little slower, that’s all.”

Some participants were aware of tobacco products that they believed were less harmful. Low tar brands were mentioned by some, as were the variety of light, mild, extra light and ultra light brands currently on the market. The belief was expressed by some that cigarettes with long filters were safer because the filter removed some of the tar and chemical additives. Others mentioned natural, raw or leaf tobacco. In Montreal, a few older participants mentioned natural tobacco and biological cigarettes of the Lépine brand, and a few younger participants mentioned “Drumm” tobacco and “American Spirit” cigarettes.

Others mentioned non-tobacco products, such as mullein, ginseng or other herbal cigarettes, wood or “Tree” cigarettes.

A few participants mentioned cigarettes that they believed were either smoke-free or produced less smoke during burning. A couple of participants said they had heard that there were “safer cigarettes” currently being developed.

4.2 General Interest in “Harm Reduced” Products

There was a high expressed general interest in a cigarette that might be less harmful, but at the same time, most participants indicated that they would not be prepared to give up much in terms of their ideal smoking experience in order to have a less harmful cigarette. Some said that they would be willing to try a cigarette that was less harmful – particularly if it had been proven to be less harmful by independent scientific research – but that if it did not deliver a similar experience at all levels, then they would not be likely to continue with it.

“It has to emulate the entire process of smoking a cigarette – which would have to be another cigarette.”

“Everything I get from a regular cigarette but less harmful – I’d buy it.”

“If it gives me the same sort of satisfaction.”

A few said that they would be interested in trying a new product that might cause less harm to their health. Their reasons for being willing were varied:

“I’d try something new.”

“The pleasure of having a cigarette without doing so much harm.”

“Might help me quit”

“Hopefully, it’s extending your life.”

“A better quality product.”

“If it was better for me and I still got my nicotine fix.”

Taste or flavour was one of the most important concerns. A large number of participants anticipated that less harmful cigarettes would have a different taste, and some in fact were prepared to accept a cigarette with a small difference in taste.

“I’d expect it to taste a little different, but if it tasted too different from what I’m used to, then I’d just stay with what I’m used to.”

“I like to smoke, so it would be easier... it would definitely be calming for my conscience, easier, but again it would have to be something at least comparable to what’s available. It couldn’t taste completely foreign or have no taste at all – there would be no point to it.”

“If it was a different taste but not a totally different taste...”

Most, however, indicated that the taste was of prime importance to them and was something they were not willing to give up. While expressed in all groups, this attitude was particularly strong among Montreal participants.

“I can’t smoke light cigarettes, I’ve tried. I like strong cigarettes. It’d probably be light, it wouldn’t be strong at all... and I like that flavour.”

“I highly doubt they’re going to come out with a healthy, strong cigarette – the two kind of compete with each other.”

“If I couldn’t tell the difference.”

“Need to be the same flavour.”

A few said that the taste was not of particular importance to them, or even that they did not enjoy the taste of the cigarettes they currently smoke. For these few, satisfying the nicotine addiction or other aspects of their “habit” was of greatest importance. If they could do this with a reduced harm product, they would consider switching even if the taste were markedly different.

In addition to taste, a number of other aspects of the smoking sensorium were mentioned as elements that participants would be unwilling to give up; as one participant said “there’s so many things that go together.” Some of these other elements mentioned were:

“Nicotine rush”

“Finger fixation”

“Satisfying the craving”

“Stress reduction”

“I’d want the same ‘drag’”

“Flavour is not important, but the hand thing...”

“I wouldn’t want something without any smoke...”

“That feeling when you go ‘ahhhhh’ [inhales and exhales deeply]”

For a few, the likelihood of their trying, and possibly switching, to a cigarette identified as less harmful was dependent on whether the harm reduction had been verified by scientific research, and on the degree of harm reduction.

“Less harmful and scientific data are two different things. If someone came out with something, with scientific data to back it up, I would try it.”

“How much less harmful is it?”

“It would have to be a lot less harmful before I would switch.”

Price was an issue for some participants. Some would not consider paying more for a product that was less harmful. Others were willing to pay a slightly higher price, but placed limits on the amount they would pay. A few declared that price was the thing they would be most willing to give up.

“I wouldn’t want to pay more.”

“It would need to be the same price or cheaper.”

“I would pay a bit more.”

“I would pay more, but not double.”

“I wouldn’t pay ten bucks for a pack of cigarettes if they were supposedly healthier.”

“I’d give up price – if it was double the price, I’d still do it.”

In Montreal, participants mentioned several other expectations that they would have of cigarettes marketed as less harmful that were not mentioned in other cities:

- that information be given about their ingredients and manufacturing method;
- that an environmental/biodegradable product be offered;
- that tobacco companies demonstrate a real willingness to make their cigarettes less harmful, by applying this change to their entire line of products.

4.3 Cigarettes with Lower Tar Levels

There was definitely some interest in such a product. At the same time, it is clear that a significant number of smokers, perhaps a growing number, are familiar with or are looking at the tar content of their own brand (on the package information), as a way to identify their brand.

Some participants said that they would try a low tar cigarette. A few mentioned that they have looked at the content information on packages in the past in order to find a cigarette with lower tar levels. A small number of participants, primarily in Montreal, said they would try a low tar cigarette if it was offered in their current brand.

“If it tasted the same, I don’t see why not. That’s one less chemical in there.”

Others said that there seemed to be little point in just lowering one of the potentially harmful ingredients in cigarettes.

“[Smoking] is bad enough as it is, if you just lower one thing, it won’t make much of a difference.”

“With all the other chemicals in it, really, is it going to make a difference?”

Some expressed confusion over what are the harm-causing ingredients in cigarettes, and whether tar was really one of these. These participants seemed to feel that if tar was harmful, then they would be interested, but that until it was clearly explained to them exactly which ingredients were the worst for their health, and whether tar was one of these, they would not want to try a low tar cigarette.

“If all the poison – the arsenic, the carbon monoxide - is found in the tar, I would assume if you reduce the tar, it would be less harmful to your health.”

“I don’t know what is the worst thing – if I knew that tar was the worst thing, then I might be interested.”

“As a smoker, you’re not entirely sure what component it is.”

“What part is bad and what part isn’t? Maybe I’ll look for a cigarette with less of that if I know what is bad.”

Some smokers, particularly those for whom flavour is a key ingredient of the smoking experience, rejected the idea of a low tar cigarette quite strongly.

“Tar IS the flavour.”

“For someone like me, if they took it [tar] away, it would destroy the taste.”

Others stated that such a cigarette would still be addictive, and a few expressed concerns that smoking a low tar cigarette might lead to smoking more cigarettes.

“If I’m smoking ten of a low tar cigarette, and I used to smoke four of a regular, then it’s not doing any good.”

A number of participants said that the tar would be replaced by another substance to compensate for the lower tar content or that the process of removing the tar would increase chemical content in the cigarette.

“If they take out something, they’ve got to put something in, to keep the flavour.”

“If they take one thing out, they’ll add four others, and who says they’re not worse?”

“The milder the cigarette, the more bleaches and other chemicals they put in it.”

Finally, several participants hesitated to voice an opinion, because of a lack of information, or indicated that they did not feel interested in this cigarette.

4.4 Cigarettes with Less Nicotine

There was little interest in low nicotine cigarettes, mainly because nicotine was seen to be the most important component in the smoking experience.

“No, that [the nicotine] is the whole point.”

“That’s the kick in it.”

“That’s what I like... some people are coffee fanatics, I’m a nicotine junkie.”

Some participants expressed interest in a low nicotine cigarette, because it would be less addictive. A number of these participants saw a low nicotine cigarette as a step toward quitting smoking. A few older participants said that they would like to be less addicted and smoke “for pleasure.” A few older participants in Montreal indicated that they would be willing to try this cigarette if it contained no chemicals.

“I might try it – it’d be a good tool to quit smoking, I think. You wouldn’t get the nicotine rush, but at least you would still be able to smoke until you were weaned off if it.”

“If it’s less nicotine, it’s less addictive - so it’s easier to cut down or quit.” [Note: following this comment, the other participants interjected: “If you want to!” amid some laughter]

“If nicotine is the thing that’s making me addicted...”

A very few participants who smoked only a few cigarettes per day said that they did not think they were physically addicted to the nicotine, but were rather psychologically addicted to the experience of smoking, and that a low nicotine cigarette was not relevant to them.

Most participants did not think that a low nicotine cigarette would be less harmful; nicotine was generally seen as addictive but not necessarily harmful to one’s health.

“Nicotine isn’t the major harmful thing, it’s the tar and the carbon monoxide.”

Some felt that a low nicotine cigarette might actually be more harmful, since they might smoke more in order to maintain their physical level of addiction. These participants did not want to risk the experience of withdrawal that might accompany a switch to a low nicotine cigarette unless it was done with the clear intention of preparing to quit smoking altogether.

“I don’t equate it with being less healthier. Maybe it’s lower nicotine, but then I’m smoking two packs a day, so what’s the benefit, unless I was quitting and wanted to wean myself off.”

4.5 Cigarettes with Fewer/Less Chemicals

Compared to the other cigarette characteristics probed above, a cigarette that would contain “fewer chemicals” generated the most interest. Many participants readily expressed the view that the chemicals in cigarettes are a major cause of negative health effects, and perceived a cigarette with a reduced chemical content as less harmful to their health.

“Any additives, especially when you start burning them, are going to be harmful.”

“It appeals to me far more than low tar or low nicotine.”

“The chemicals they add to make it burn slower – they can’t be all that good for you.”

“Anything that’s got less chemicals obviously is going to be better for you than something with more chemicals.”

Among those who expressed interest, some added that even though they perceived a reduced chemical content cigarette as less harmful, it would still not be enough for them to switch unless the elements of smoking that they considered important, such as taste, were still present.

“I’d try it. Like, someone said Viscount had less things in it, I tried it, I didn’t like it, I threw it away and went back to my regular cigarettes.”

“If you take something away, you’re cutting down on something you already have.”

Others, however, were sceptical. They did not believe that a cigarette marketed as lower in chemicals would necessarily be good for them, and a few said they would want independent verification of any claims.. Much of this scepticism seemed to be based in a general distrust of tobacco companies and their marketing practices.

“I’d be very sceptical. Just for the fact that, you know, those guys have been saying one thing and doing another for how many years now... you know, they’re just another type of pack of cigarettes that they want us to smoke.”

“I’d have to wait until studies are done on it.”

Some, particularly in Montreal, felt that they would need more information before they could comment on such a product.

A few were concerned that if a cigarette that was generally perceived as less harmful was available on the market, this might encourage more young people to begin smoking, because the “less harmful” cigarettes would be more socially acceptable.

4.6 Cigarettes with Different Filters

Generally, this characteristic generated little enthusiasm but many questions and some scepticism among participants. Some felt that putting different filters on cigarettes was simply a marketing device, and a very few insisted that there were no real differences in filters, that the differences were only cosmetic, such as changing the colour of the paper or the band.

“They say all the filters have this or that... we don’t know what’s in the filter, so how can we know what changing the filter would do?”

“It’s psychological.”

“They’re just playing with you.”

A number of participants said that modification of filters was how tobacco companies were already creating different strengths of cigarettes. Some were familiar with brands in which the filters have holes or perforations, but not all agreed that these filters were effective in reducing harm. Others avoided cigarettes with these filters because it was so difficult to get a good “drag” from them.

“The filters with the perforations just put more air in... you get as much stuff, it just takes longer.”

“I had to suck too hard to get anything.”

Some said that a few of the filters already in use were harmful; specific mention was made of charcoal filters and filters containing fibreglass, said to be in Export and Players brands. Some argued that changing these filters by removing the charcoal or fibreglass would make these brands less harmful.

Some participants in Montreal said that any modification of the filter should be applied to all of a tobacco company's cigarettes, so that the company would demonstrate a real willingness to improve smokers' health.

A few participants said that they would still be willing to try a cigarette with a filter that would make it less harmful; some added that they would only be interested as long as the filter does not adversely affect the taste of cigarettes.

"If someone could design a filter that eliminates tar and the more harmful chemicals, I would be interested in that."

"I'm afraid it would change the taste of cigarettes."

A couple of participants in the Toronto groups had had some experience with the use of external filters. One participant had tried a new "filter contraption" but had found that it altered the taste of his cigarette, so he stopped using it. Another had seen a relative using a filter, and commented on the amount of residue that could be shaken out of the filter after a cigarette had been smoked with it.

4.7 Effect of Brand on Interest in "Harm Reduced" Products

Some participants said that they would be more inclined to try a new "healthier" cigarette if it were introduced by the company that manufactured their current brand or if it were an extension of their brand. Most said that this was not so much because they felt their brand manufacturer had greater credibility, but because they preferred the taste of that brand, and therefore hoped that a healthier cigarette produced by the same manufacturer would have the same, or at least a similar, taste.

Others said that the brand would not make a real difference in whether they would try a "safer" cigarette or not. These participants would investigate a healthier cigarette no matter what company brought it out, and tended to express the belief that all tobacco companies were similar or the same.

"I'd be interested in reading about anybody who came up with that."

"I would prefer it if it were my brand, but it wouldn't make a difference. If I could get the benefit and if I could tolerate it, I'd switch."

"I wouldn't care who came out with it."

It was important to a number of participants that the company be a Canadian company, able to produce a cigarette for the preferences of the Canadian market. Several commented that they found the taste and smell of American cigarettes unpleasant.

Some noted that it really did not matter which company initially brought out a "safer" cigarette, because if it were successful, soon all companies would be making a similar product available.

"I think whenever any company makes something, every other company would be right behind them, making the same thing... so you can stick with your brand, you can go to a different brand, it doesn't matter."

Several participants expressed a degree of cynicism about tobacco companies who might release a "safer" cigarette, saying that it would most likely be just a marketing device. A few thought there might be a more devious objective behind marketing such cigarettes: they thought that tobacco companies might hope to encourage ex-smokers to return to smoking by persuading them that new, much safer cigarettes were available.

As well, many participants expressed a general distrust of all tobacco manufacturers: "I'm not very trusting of the tobacco companies anyway."

5.0 RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC PRODUCTS

In all groups, participants were shown samples of three different tobacco products now on the market in the U.S. – Accord, Eclipse, and Omni – and asked about their impressions of these products. Packs of these brands were handed around the group for participants to look at, to open, and to take out and look at the cigarettes.

One or two participants had ever seen or heard of any of these products. One participant said she had seen an ad for Accord while visiting in New York, and one or two others believed they had seen something like either Accord or Eclipse before. For almost all of the participants, however, all three products were completely unknown. Because of the lack of previous information about these products and the fact that it was not possible for the participants to try them out, some participants found it difficult to express an opinion on them, or were cautious in their assessments of the products.

In particular, many participants were confused by the lack of health warning messages and the information panel giving amounts of nicotine and tar on these packages. A number of participants said they could not really assess the products unless they could see the content information and compare the products and the product labelling to cigarettes they were familiar with.

"Low tar doesn't tell me anything about the contents."

"American cigarettes don't tell us the content so we don't know if they will give us the same satisfaction as a regular cigarette."

"What's the nicotine and chemical levels?"

"Nowhere on here does it say what's in here – in terms of chemicals, tar, not a single spot says anything about it."

Of the three products, participants were least interested in the Accord cigarette and holder system. Some participants, particularly in Montreal and, to a lesser extent, in Winnipeg, were interested in the Eclipse cigarette. The Omni cigarette generated the most appeal and was particularly popular in Toronto.

5.1 Accord

Participants were shown the cigarettes first, and asked to give their initial opinions before being shown a picture of the Accord holder in which the Accord cigarettes are to be placed and smoked.

Upon initial inspection of the product, only a few participants expressed interest in trying it, either out of curiosity, or because of its description as a low tar cigarette, or because it might be less addictive.

“It says ultra low tar – I would assume low tar means less poisons in it, I would assume a healthier cigarette, so I’d try it.”

Many commented spontaneously on the small size of the Accord cigarette. A few thought it was “cute,” and suggested they might try it as a novelty, but most thought the size of the cigarette was too small to provide a satisfying smoke. Some were also concerned that it would burn too quickly.

“They should be longer.”

“Two drags and it’s gone.”

“It doesn’t seem like a real cigarette, it looks almost like a toy.”

“A child’s cigarette.”

“There’s no tar because there’s no cigarette.”

“This is, like, a drag.”

Some commented that they thought they would smoke more if they were using this product. A few suggested that the small size might promote chainsmoking.

“I’d have to buy two packs at a time.”

“I’d probably smoke several packs a day instead of one.”

Some were concerned about the tube, or wrapping, of the product, which appeared thicker than that found in regular cigarettes.

“Makes me more cautious because of all the cardboard inside.”

“It’s double-wrapped or something.”

Many participants expressed confusion after reading the instructions on the package. Some of this confusion continued even after the participants learned that the Accord holder serves as a lighter and a holder for the product. Participants had many questions about how the lighting function works, how they would smoke the cigarette, what happens to the smoke from burning, and other aspects connected to practical use of the holder.

“If you’re not allowed to light these, how do you smoke them?”

“What would happen if you lit it? Would it blow up?”

After seeing the picture of the Accord holder and being told that the cigarette is placed inside the lighter and smoked, almost all the already minimal interest in the product disappeared. In general, the participants thought that the holder was unattractive and would be awkward to carry and use. Some said that using the holder would deprive them of the physical sensations of holding the cigarette. Several just laughed out loud upon first seeing the picture of it.

“I wouldn’t want to do that.”

“It looks crazy.”

“It’s not practical if we want to smoke outside.”

“It’s too much trouble.”

“Half the habit is holding it in your hand.”

“Too much to carry around.”

“Looks stupid.”

A number of participants thought that the holder was suggestive of illegal drug paraphernalia, and said they would be reluctant to use it even if they were interested for fear of being thought to be using drugs.

“It looks like a crack pipe or something.”

“Oh, it’s a holder! It looks like we’re doing drugs.”

“The cops would be on your doorstep.”

Some were concerned that using a device like this would be uncomfortable for them because it was different and unusual: “Not only does it look weird, it draws way too much attention to yourself.”

A few participants wondered about the costs involved in having to buy both the holder and the cigarettes. In Montreal, several participants mentioned the high price (\$60 - \$70 CDN) of the Accord holder.

Some participants were confused as to what made the product a low tar cigarette. Was it the cigarette itself, or the holder in which it is to be smoked?

A few speculated on whether smoking the Accord in its holder would reduce second hand smoke, but no one seemed particularly interested in this potential advantage when considered against all of the perceived disadvantages of the product.

5.2 Eclipse

During their initial examination of the Eclipse product, some participants mentioned its greater resemblance to a conventional cigarette, and the absence of a cumbersome device, compared to the Accord product. Some said they found the product attractive in appearance. A very few male participants thought that the design of the product made it clearly a product for women.

“I really like the style of these ones, they’re very stylish.”

“Looks like Ovation chocolate mints.”

However, some participants found the filter and the construction of the cigarette strange, confusing or bizarre, and said that the cigarette seems to contain little tobacco but a lot of paper. Participants found that it does not have the same “look” as a conventional cigarette. Even after reading the information provided with the product package, some participants did not seem able to visualise the process involved in “smoking” the Eclipse cigarette.

“This is kind of intimidating to me.”

“So are we just smoking the little tip that blackens after we give ourselves asthma lighting it?”

“This one is more favourable, but I don’t understand the science of it.”

“What’s that thing in the middle?”

Despite the interest it creates, this product still raised many questions among most participants: “What is being smoked? What are the ingredients? How is this cigarette made?” A few participants commented on the 1-800 number and said they would want to call it and get more information about the product before trying it.

A few participants believed that the Eclipse product might be more harmful than regular cigarettes because of all of the components.

“I worry that with all that in it, it might be more harmful.”

“It has plastic on it.”

Most participants who expressed an interest in the Eclipse cigarette commented on the reduction of second-hand smoke offered by the product. This aspect was of particular interest to participants with children. They liked the idea of less second-hand smoke for a variety of reasons: greater social tolerance (smoking without harming others); the possibility of smoking in a confined or cramped area (car, house, bar); a positive impact on the health of non-smokers, especially children; and the reduction of the lingering odour from smoking.

“Anyone with kids is going to say yes.”

“Probably not less harmful to me, but I have kids.”

“Kind of cool – there’s less smoke, so you’re not damaging other people, you’re only hurting yourself.”

“It says ‘no lingering odour.’”

“No ashes – that’s good.”

“People would buy these because of low second-hand smoke.”

“The ‘less odour’ appeals to me.”

Participants who did not have children or who did not generally smoke around children or inside did not express the same degree of interest in the product. Some commented that they were very careful about not exposing people to second-hand smoke, and hence would not need a product that reduces second-hand smoke.

Some felt that in eliminating ashes and most of the smoke, the product was losing aspects of the smoking experience that they valued, and that it would not be satisfying for them.

“It sounds pretty interesting, but still – you take away the odour and the smoke, I don’t know what you have left.”

“I have to flick.”

Several participants commented that they would probably continue to smoke their usual cigarettes but that they would smoke the Eclipse product if the context or circumstances imposed it.

“I would keep a pack just so if I go out somewhere where they have kids, of anything else, I have them on the side.”

5.3 Omni

Participants were shown the Omni product and, after they had seen and assessed it, they were shown a tobacco company ad about the product that appeared in People Magazine in 2001.

Overall, Omni generated the most interest of the three products.

A number of Toronto participants, expressed interest in the Omni product during the initial examination of the product. The most attractive features on first glance were the more conventional nature and appearance of the product and the description of it as being lower in carcinogens. A few mentioned that they would buy it. A very few suggested that it appeared to be a women's cigarette.

"It's more of a cigarette – the filter is a bit long but I can live with that."

"It's supposed to be lower carcinogens."

"I would be willing to try this one- it's the most similar."

"Actually smells like tobacco."

"I like the premise of less chemicals."

"Less chemicals must be safer."

"I would try this because it looks like a normal cigarette."

Initial negative response to the Omni cigarette centred on two aspects: the packaging, and on apparent contradictions in the information on the package. A number of participants were concerned about the packaging – they did not like the "crushable" pack, thought it to be impractical, and were afraid that their cigarettes would get broken easily.

As well, a number of participants were confused by what they perceived as conflicting statements on the packaging. They noted that while the packaging said that the Omni cigarette was the first product to offer reduced levels of cancer-causing ingredients, it also contained a warning that reducing carcinogens has not been proven to be less harmful. A few participants suggested that this apparent contradiction was the result of legal necessity – "covering their ass" – but many continued to express confusion about whether this product really would be less harmful.

"They're saying 'we're doing this and we think it's safer, but we don't know if it's good.'"

"See there, it tells you it has not been proven, even though they give you the catch phrase."

Others said that their interest might increase if there was a way to substantiate the claim that the cigarette contained fewer carcinogens and was actually less harmful.

"I don't know if it's a safer cigarette – it's just their claim."

"I might buy it if I can believe what they say about it."

The advertising had a mixed response, with some participants still sceptical about the “less harmful” claims while others were more impressed. Few liked the picture portion of the ad (a woman in Western-style clothing), but a larger number liked the text-letter portion of the ad and thought it was credible.

After looking at the advertising, some expressed continued confusion and scepticism toward the reduced harm claims of the Omni product.

“Well, Omni hasn’t been proved to reduce health risks, they just say that ‘low chemicals in our opinion is less harmful.’”

“They say it might be safer but it might not be – they don’t tell you any more than the packaging does.”

“On one hand, they say they’re the first to make a cigarette without this, but on the side they say it isn’t proven that they’re safer.”

Some participants became even more sceptical than they had been initially. A few insisted that “there is no ‘safer cigarette.’” Some expressed scepticism about whether it was actually possible to make a cigarette with fewer carcinogens.

“I think they’re lying – smoking doesn’t just give you lung cancer, it gives you all kinds of different problems.”

“This is all half-truths.”

Others expressed a positive feeling about the tone of the advertising. They appreciated a tobacco company saying that smoking is harmful to their health. A few said they liked the message they understood from the advertising: that smoking is harmful, but the manufacturer has tried to make a cigarette that might be less harmful by removing some carcinogenic ingredients.

“They’re not any safer than anything else, but the difference is they actually tell you. I don’t think I’ve ever seen any other brand tell you that it’s not safe.”

“The way this is written, it doesn’t sound like they’re lying to you.”

“It seems very professional.”

“They seem to be honest – we don’t want to encourage you to smoke, but if you do, smoke these.”

Others said that the advertising had provided them with more information, including tar and nicotine levels, which allowed them to compare the product to their own brand on those issues. A few commented on the inclusion of a website URL, and said they would be interested enough to look the product up on the Internet.

While some found that even the possibility that a cigarette with reduced carcinogens might be less harmful was appealing enough for them to consider trying it, they did stress that they were unlikely to switch unless the taste was comparable to their current brand. The issue of taste particularly worried participants who did not like the taste of American cigarettes. A very few also raised the issue of cost, saying that they would be reluctant to pay more for the Omni product than they already pay for their current brand.

“It would be something I would definitely try – but the flavour would have to be there.”

“Cost and taste would have to be similar.”

“I’m not interested in doubling my cost for a big maybe.”

“I would think less carcinogens, less harmful to your health. If it did the same things that my regular cigarette did, when I tried it, I’d probably switch.”

“It’s supposed to have less stuff in it. If it tasted good, I’d probably smoke it.”

“Need to see how they smoke and how they taste.”

A number of participants, particularly in Montreal, stated that there were no real advantages to adopting this cigarette as opposed to a conventional cigarette. They felt that this product was not really all that different from other cigarettes on the market.

“It’s just like another light cigarette.”

Some added that the image used in the advertising was not consistent with the product’s claimed benefits: participants referred to the “Marlboro cowboy,” saying that this is just another marketing approach, taking any means to sell a product.

“The western theme, Marlboro.”

“Marketing to women and farmers.”

“It’s nice picture, out in the wild and all that, but it’s just, you know, advertising.”

6.0 IMPACT OF HARM REDUCED PRODUCTS ON BEHAVIOUR

Most participants noted that they really could not say for certain whether they would consider switching to any of the products discussed unless they had tried them first, as they were not interested in switching to a product that did not provide them with the aspects of smoking that were important to them.

“If the taste is there, yeah.”

“Less is good, but I would have to get pleasure out of it.”

“I wouldn’t switch unless it was a really good smoke.”

“If I felt the same feeling and if I liked the taste...”

Some added that they would need more information on the products before they would consider trying them. In most groups, at least a few participants suggested that they might consider trying either the Eclipse cigarette or the Omni cigarette if these brands were available.

A few were clearly interested in adopting a “safer” cigarette as a deliberate risk reduction strategy, since they did not intend to quit smoking in the near future.

“I have the mindset that I am a smoker, so making it less dangerous – by all means.”

“I would make the effort for something with less chemicals, less carcinogens.”

However, many participants – particularly those who smoked regular or strong cigarettes - indicated that they would not change their current smoking habits if any of these three products were available on the market. Several participants, particularly in Montreal, thought that the products might interest other people because of the ever-growing number of people who are concerned with their health.

Some participants – but not a large number – said that they might switch to one of these products instead of quitting smoking. However, most smokers, whether they were seriously considering quitting at the present moment or not, said that they would prefer to quit cold turkey.

Some smokers also said that they might switch to one of these products as a step toward quitting, although their intention would remain, ultimately, to quit. A few commented that switching to a reduced harm cigarette from a regular cigarette reminded them of placing heroin addicts on methadone.

“If I want to quit, I’ll quit.”

“I might, as an interim thing.”

“It’s like taking an alcoholic that’s been drinking vodka all his life and putting him on beer.”

7.0 DESCRIPTORS

7.1 Written Exercise

Participants were invited to complete a short written exercise early in the focus group session. The purpose of this exercise was to learn about their perceptions of the tar, nicotine and chemical content implied by various descriptors that are applied to cigarettes and tobacco products (light, mild, ultra-mild, smooth, natural tobacco, etc.) compared to regular cigarettes, and about their perceptions of the harmful health effects. For each of the ten descriptors tested, participants were asked to indicate whether each would have more, less or about the same amount of tar, nicotine, chemicals as regular cigarettes, and whether it would lead to more, less or the same amount of harm to smokers' health.

The results reveal that most participants believe that light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth and low-tar cigarettes are about as harmful to smokers' health as regular cigarettes. However, about one in five smokers think these products are in fact less harmful.

A plurality of participants, particularly in Toronto, believe that light, mild, ultra light and ultra mild cigarettes have less tar than regular cigarettes. Some participants, particularly older participants and participants in the Montreal sessions, think that all of these have about the same amount of tar as regular cigarettes.

As well, a plurality of participants believe that ultra light and ultra mild cigarettes would have less nicotine, and a smaller number, again most notably among older participants and participants in the Montreal sessions, think they would have about the same amount of nicotine. Participants are divided as to whether light and mild cigarettes would have about the same or less nicotine.

Most believe that smooth cigarettes have about the same amount of tar and nicotine as regular cigarettes, although a significant minority think that smooth cigarettes would have less tar and nicotine.

Very few think that light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild or smooth cigarettes would have more tar or nicotine than regular cigarettes.

Most believe that low tar cigarettes do indeed have less tar than regular cigarettes.

With respect to chemical content, most participants believe that all of these types of cigarettes - light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth and low-tar - have about the same amount of chemicals as regular cigarettes, although significant numbers believe light, mild, ultra light, and ultra mild have less.

With regard to natural tobacco and additive-free tobacco, most participants believe that these products contain less chemicals than regular cigarettes, particularly in the case of natural tobacco. Significant numbers, although not a majority, believe that the harm to smoker's health would be less from both natural tobacco and additive-free tobacco.

Opinions differ as to the tar and nicotine content of these two types of cigarette. Many think that natural tobacco would have less tar and nicotine than regular cigarettes, but among those who disagree, some say it would have about the same and some, particularly among the younger participants, say it would have more. With respect to additive-free tobacco, some think this would have less tar and nicotine, while others think it would have about the same amount. Among Montreal participants, the greater numbers think that both natural and additive-free tobacco would have less tar and nicotine.

Finally, with regard to Silver products and smokeless tobacco, many participants did not offer a comparison on any of the dimensions. Among those who did make assessments of these products, most believe that these products would be about the same as regular cigarettes on all four dimensions. Some, particularly among younger participants, believe that these products – more so in the case of smokeless tobacco – would be less harmful and have less amounts of tar, nicotine and chemicals. A few – again, particularly among younger participants – believe that smokeless tobacco would be more harmful and have more tar, nicotine and chemicals than regular cigarettes.

The table appended below summarizes the results of the written exercise.

7.2 Removal of Descriptors

For most participants, the descriptors – mild, light, ultra-mild, ultra-light – on many packs of cigarettes are how they identify their brand. For most, particularly in Toronto and in Winnipeg, it is an indication of the strength of some of the ingredients in their brand of cigarettes, and secondarily an indicator of taste. For some, particularly in Montreal, it is more of an indicator of taste.

“It’s about chemical content, tar content, nicotine content.”

Most participants expressed either support for or indifference to the removal of descriptions currently used on packs of cigarettes: mild, light, ultra-mild, ultra-light. However, they were concerned that the actual brands they now smoke would still be available, and that there would be some means of identifying their brand. Participants wanted information to guide them to their brand, such as a colour code or a number code. They believed that such a code would quickly be adopted by tobacco companies.

“I just want the cigarette I regularly smoke.”

“If I’m still able to access the cigarette that I like, whether it be by a colour coding or a secret handshake or whatever, I don’t care. “

“If they’re going to have Gold, Silver, Bronze, then I’m at the Bronze level.”

Some stressed that having “the numbers” on the packages would be important to them if the descriptors were removed, suggesting again, the importance of these figures as a way to identify brands.

“I would still need to see the stats on the packs.”

“You can get rid of those words, but I need to see the milligrams of tar and so on.”

In the event that the current descriptors were removed, participants indicated that this would in no way change their smoking habits.

“I don’t see how words on a package are going to affect anyone’s nicotine habit.”

Most participants did not appear to care whether the government required the removal of the descriptors or the tobacco companies removed them voluntarily. As well, the vast majority did not object to a government initiative that would require their removal.

A few thought that removing the descriptors would have positive effects. These participants tended to see the descriptors as marketing tools, and were conscious of the fact that the meaning, in terms of actual levels of nicotine, tar, and other ingredients, of the descriptors varied markedly from brand to brand. A few also thought that removing the descriptors might make smokers more aware of the levels of ingredients in the various brands.

“It would make a difference, because putting that on there is deceiving, because people think ‘oh, extra light, no problem, it’s not that bad.’”

“I’d be happy – I think it’s all a huge marketing scam.”

It’s a misnomer anyway – ultra light in relation to what?”

A few thought that there could be negative consequences; they were concerned that young people starting to smoke might select something stronger than they really wanted to, without the descriptors to tell them which were the lighter cigarettes.

One or two participants did object to the removal of the descriptors, and particularly if such a removal came about through government regulation.

“They are going too far in regulating cigarettes.”

“It’s just too much – I mean, we’re already getting kicked out of restaurants.”

Summary of Written Exercise

Here are some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Does each of the following types of cigarettes have or lead to more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals, and harm to smokers' health compared to regular cigarettes?

1. Light cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	1	31	23
Nicotine	1	28	26
Chemicals	6	17	32
Harm to smokers' health	4	9	42

2. Mild cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	33	21
Nicotine	-	25	29
Chemicals	5	18	31
Harm to smokers' health	5	9	40

3. Ultra Light cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	1	36	17
Nicotine	1	32	21
Chemicals	9	18	28
Harm to smokers' health	9	9	36

4. Ultra Mild cigarettes	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	38	15
Nicotine	-	33	21
Chemicals	5	20	29
Harm to smokers' health	6	11	36

5. Smooth	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	17	35
Nicotine	-	18	34
Chemicals	6	9	31
Harm to smokers' health	6	3	42

6. Low Tar	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	42	11
Nicotine	7	14	34
Chemicals	7	7	40
Harm to smokers' health	4	9	40

7. Natural tobacco	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	10	27	15
Nicotine	10	24	18
Chemicals	1	36	16
Harm to smokers' health	4	15	32

8. Additive-free tobacco	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	3	21	23
Nicotine	3	22	22
Chemicals	-	30	17
Harm to smokers' health	-	14	33

9. Silver	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	-	5	21
Nicotine	-	4	22
Chemicals	-	6	20
Harm to smokers' health	1	1	25

10. Smokeless tobacco	More	Less	About the Same
Tar	4	10	24
Nicotine	3	11	24
Chemicals	8	10	19
Harm to smokers' health	7	6	24



June 3, 2002

Discussion Agenda
Draft 3
PN5153

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Introduction to focus group procedures.
We want your opinion.
Feel free to agree or disagree and express your views freely.
You are being audio-taped and observed.
Your individual comments will not be linked to you.
The receptionist will pay you at the end of the session.

2.0 INTRODUCTION TO PARTICIPANTS

Today we are going to be talking about some topics related to smoking.

Let's go around the table so that each one of you can tell us your name, something about yourself, and also about your smoking background. How much do you smoke? When did you start?

3.0 HARM FROM TOBACCO

What causes harm to your health when you smoke a cigarette?

4.0 WRITTEN EXERCISE

I would like you now to complete a brief written exercise. Here are some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Please indicate whether you think each of the following has more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals and harm to smokers' health as regular cigarettes?

HAND OUT AND COMPLETE WRITTEN EXERCISE.

5.0 INTEREST IN "HARM REDUCED" PRODUCTS

Can tobacco products be made less harmful? How?

Are there any brands or types of cigarettes that you know of that are less harmful? What makes them so?

If such a product existed, would you be interested in it? What would you want or expect from such a product in terms of harm reduction? What would you expect in terms of taste or flavour? Anything else? What, if anything, would you be willing to give up?

How about a cigarette with lower tar levels? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

How about a cigarette with less nicotine? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

How about removing chemicals? Which ones? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

How about changing the filter? Would you be interested in this? Would it be less harmful?

Would it make any difference to you which tobacco company made these products?

6.0 SPECIFIC PRODUCTS

Here are some packs of a product called Accord. HAND AROUND PACKS. Have you heard of it before? What are your impressions of it? Does it appeal to you? Why or why not? Would it be less harmful? To what extent? How does it reduce the harm?

Here are some packs of a product called Eclipse. HAND AROUND PACKS. Have you heard of it before? What are your impressions of it? Does it appeal to you? Why or why not? Would it be less harmful? To what extent? How does it reduce the harm?

Here are some pack of a product called Omni. HAND AROUND PACKS. Have you heard of it before? What are your impressions of it? Does it appeal to you? Why or why not? Would it be less harmful? To what extent? How does it reduce the harm?

Here is a magazine ad about Omni. HAND OUT AD. Does it interest you in the product?

RETURN ALL PACKS AND ADS.

7.0 BEHAVIOR/IMPACT

Would anybody here switch to any of these brands or these types of cigarettes if they were available? Does anybody think they would try them or switch to them instead of trying to quit smoking?

8.0 DESCRIPTORS

Let's return now to the written exercise you did. As you know, many of these descriptions - light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth - are on a lot of cigarettes.

What do these mean? (Light, mild, ultra light, ultra mild, smooth)

What if these words were removed from the packs? What is your response to that? What if the government required it? What if the tobacco company removed these descriptions?

If these descriptions were taken off, would it change what you smoke? The amount you smoke?

Thank and Close.

Written Exercise

Here are some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Does each of the following types of cigarettes have or lead to more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals, and harm to smokers' health compared to regular cigarettes?

1. Light cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

2. Mild cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

3. Ultra Light cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

4. Ultra Mild cigarettes

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

5. Smooth

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

(over)

6. Low Tar

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

7. Natural tobacco

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

8. Additive-free tobacco

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

9. Silver

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			

10. Smokeless tobacco

	More	Less	About the Same
	compared to regular cigarettes?		
Tar			
Nicotine			
Chemicals			
Harm to smokers' health			



GUIDE DE DISCUSSION

Projet No 02-2465

Groupes du 5 juin 2002

1. INTRODUCTION

- Identification de l'animateur.
- Informations relatives à la procédure de déroulement d'une rencontre de groupe.
- On veut connaître votre opinion; il est important que tous participent.
- Sentez-vous libre d'être d'accord ou en désaccord et exprimez vos opinions en toute liberté : aucun jugement de valeur.
- Vous êtes enregistré sur bandes audio et vidéo et il y a des observateurs derrière le miroir.
- Aucun de vos propos individuels ne sera identifié : garantie de confidentialité et d'anonymat.

2. INTRODUCTION DES PARTICIPANTS

- Aujourd'hui, nous allons discuter de différents sujets en rapport avec la cigarette.
- Faisons d'abord un tour de table pour que chacun puisse se présenter par son prénom, se décrire en quelques mots (occupation, composition du ménage) et parler de ses usages de la cigarette : depuis combien de temps vous fumez, combien de cigarettes vous fumez par jour...

3. LES EFFETS DU TABAC SUR LA SANTÉ

- Qu'est-ce qui cause les effets négatifs sur votre santé quand vous fumez la cigarette?

4. EXERCICE ÉCRIT

- J'aimerais maintenant que vous complétiez un court exercice sur papier. Voici certains mots qui sont utilisés pour décrire la cigarette. Veuillez indiquer concernant chacun de ces mots si vous pensez que les cigarettes ainsi décrites ont plus, moins ou environ la même composition en goudron, nicotine, produits chimiques et/ou ont un impact négatif plus

grand, égal ou moindre sur la santé des fumeurs que les cigarettes régulières.

DISTRIBUER ET FAIRE COMPLÉTER L'EXERCICE ÉCRIT
--

5. INTÉRÊT À L'ÉGARD DES PRODUITS COMPORTANT « MOINS DOMMAGEABLES » POUR LA SANTÉ

- Les produits du tabac peuvent-ils être moins dommageables pour la santé?
- Y a-t-il des marques ou des types de cigarettes que vous connaissez qui sont moins dommageables? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'elles sont moins dommageables?
- Si un tel produit existait, y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Quelles seraient vos attentes ou que voudriez-vous d'un tel produit en ce qui a trait à la réduction des effets sur la santé? Quelles seraient vos attentes en matière de goût ou de saveur? Autre chose? Quelle concession, s'il y a lieu, seriez-vous prêt(e) à faire?
- Que dire concernant une cigarette avec des niveaux moindres de goudron? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Maintenant, s'il s'agissait d'une cigarette avec moins de nicotine? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Que dire si on enlevait des produits chimiques de la cigarette? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Et si on changeait le filtre de la cigarette? Y seriez-vous intéressé(e)? Serait-elle moins dommageable pour la santé?
- Votre réaction pourrait-elle varier dépendant quelle compagnie de tabac fait ces produits?

6. PRODUITS SPÉCIFIQUES

- Voici des paquets d'un produit appelé « ACCORD ». (FAIRE CIRCULER LES PAQUETS) En avez-vous entendu parler auparavant? Quelles sont vos impressions à ce sujet? Est-ce un produit qui vous intéresse? Pourquoi? Pourquoi pas? Serait-il moins dommageable pour la santé? À quel point le serait-il? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'il y a réduction de risques pour la santé?
- Voici des paquets d'un produit appelé « ECLIPSE ». (FAIRE CIRCULER LES PAQUETS) En avez-vous entendu parler auparavant? Quelles sont vos impressions à ce sujet? Est-ce un produit qui vous intéresse? Pourquoi? Pourquoi pas? Serait-il moins dommageable pour la santé? À quel point le serait-il? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'il y a réduction de risques pour la santé?
- Voici des paquets d'un produit appelé « OMNI ». (FAIRE CIRCULER LES PAQUETS) En avez-vous entendu parler auparavant? Quelles sont vos impressions à ce sujet? Est-ce un produit qui vous intéresse? Pourquoi?

Pourquoi pas? Serait-il moins dommageable pour la santé? À quel point le serait-il? Qu'est-ce qui fait qu'il y a réduction de risques pour la santé?

- Voici l'annonce d'Omni parue dans une revue. (FAIRE CIRCULER LA PUBLICITÉ) Quelle est votre réaction? Est-ce que cela suscite de l'intérêt envers le produit?

REMETTRE TOUS LES PAQUETS ET LES PUBLICITÉS À L'ANIMATEUR

7. EFFET SUR LE COMPORTEMENT

- Y a-t-il des gens qui changeraient de marques de cigarettes si ces produits étaient disponibles? Y a-t-il des gens qui pensent qu'ils feraient l'essai de ces produits ou adopteraient leur usage plutôt que d'essayer d'arrêter de fumer?

8. LES DESCRIPTEURS DE PRODUITS

- Revenons maintenant à l'exercice individuel que vous avez complété en début de rencontre. Comme vous le savez, on utilise ces éléments de description — douces, légères, ultra-douces, ultra-légères — sur de nombreux paquets de cigarettes.
- Que signifient-ils? (Légère, douce, ultra-légère, ultra-douce)
- Quelle serait votre réaction si on enlevait ces mots sur les paquets de cigarettes? Quelle serait votre réaction si le gouvernement exigeait qu'on retire ces mots? Quelle serait votre réaction si les compagnies de tabac retiraient ces mots?
- Si ces descriptions étaient retirées, cela changerait-il quelque chose quant à ce que vous fumez? Quant à la quantité que vous fumez?

REMERCIEMENTS!

EXERCICE ÉCRIT

Voici certains mots qui sont utilisés pour décrire la cigarette. En considérant chacun des types de cigarettes suivants, diriez-vous, en comparaison des cigarettes régulières, qu'ils contiennent plus, moins ou contiennent à peu près la même quantité de goudron, de nicotine, de produits chimiques et/ou de risques de dommages à la santé ?

re some terms that are used to describe cigarettes. Does each of the following types of cigarettes have or lead to more, less or about the same tar, nicotine, chemicals, and harm to smokers' health compared to regular cigarettes?

1. Les cigarettes légères

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommage sur la santé des fumeurs			

2. Les cigarettes douces

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommage sur la santé des fumeurs			

3. Les cigarettes ultra-légères

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		

Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

4. Les cigarettes ultra-douces

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommages sur la santé des fumeurs			

5. Velouté

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommages sur la santé des fumeurs			

6. À faible teneur en goudron

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommages sur la santé des fumeurs			

7. Tabac naturel

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Dommages sur la santé des fumeurs			

8. Le tabac sans additif

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

9. Argent

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			

10. Le tabac sans fumée

	Plus	Moins	À peu près la même
	comparé aux cigarettes régulières?		
Goudron			
Nicotine			
Produits chimiques			
Domage sur la santé des fumeurs			



**Consumer Interest in Potential Reduced Exposure Products:
Results of a National Survey**

FINAL REPORT

FOCUS CANADA 2002-4 Omnibus
POR-02-112

Prepared for: Health Canada

Prepared by: Environics Research Group Limited

February 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	AWARENESS OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTES	4
3.0	IMPORTANCE OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTE QUALITIES.....	5
4.0	IMPACT OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTES ON SMOKING BEHAVIOUR	5

Appendix: Questionnaires

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In November 2002, Environics Research Group was retained by Health Canada to conduct quantitative research with adult smokers to better understand consumer awareness and interest in potential reduced exposure products (PREPs). This quantitative survey is a follow-up to qualitative research conducted on the same topic in March 2002.

That main topics addressed in the survey include:

- ◆ Awareness of “safer”/”less harmful” cigarettes among smokers;
- ◆ Importance of “safer”/”less harmful” cigarette qualities to smokers;
- ◆ Impact that “safer”/”less harmful” cigarettes would have on smoking behaviour.

The survey is based on a sample of 537 adult smokers across Canada. The survey was conducted, by telephone, between December 19, 2002 and January 12, 2003. The results of a survey of this magnitude can be considered accurate to within plus or minus 4.2 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

This report summarizes the findings of the survey.

The questionnaires are attached.

2.0 AWARENESS OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTES

Awareness of potential reduced exposure tobacco products is quite low.

When asked an unaided question as to whether they have seen or heard of any types of cigarettes or cigarette-like products that tobacco companies are developing which they claim are safer or less harmful than ordinary cigarettes, 80 per cent of Canadian adult smokers say that they have not seen or heard of a safer or less harmful cigarette-like product.

Awareness of Cigarette-Like Products Claiming to Be Safer or Less Harmful	
Yes	19
No	80
DK/NA	1

Of the 19 percent of adult smokers who say they are aware of such products, 47 percent of this group cannot name any products. A further 35 percent of this group say that no new cigarette product is less harmful than ordinary cigarettes. There is some mention of light cigarettes and cigarettes without additives.

Naming of Cigarette Products Thought to Be Less Harmful* (Among Aware)	
Light Cigarettes	4
Cigarettes Without Any Additives	3
Player's Silver	2
Supreme	2
Black Cat	2
All Other Mentions	8
None Are Less Harmful	35
DK/NA	47

Of the 19 percent of adult smokers who are aware of safer or less harmful cigarette-like products, the largest numbers mention fewer chemicals, less nicotine or less tar as the main reasons why they think such new products might be less harmful. Again, a further 25 percent of this group say that no new cigarette product is less harmful than ordinary cigarettes, and 15 percent don't know.

What Might Make New Cigarette Products Safer or Less Harmful* (Among Aware)	
Fewer Chemicals/Toxics/Carcinogens	19
Less Nicotine	16
Less Tar/Lower Tar	11
Less Harmful Ingredients in General	9
Less Additives	9
Self-Extinguishing Cigarettes	5
Different Filters/No Fibreglass	4
All Other Mentions	6
None Are Less Harmful	25
DK/NA	15

* Multiple answers possible

Older smokers have slightly higher awareness of such products than younger smokers.

3.0 IMPORTANCE OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTE QUALITIES

When asked how important each of the following qualities would be in considering whether to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product, two-thirds of Canadian adult smokers say the extent to which the new product is less harmful to both the health of non-smokers (67%) and their own health (66%) is extremely important. More than three in ten adult smokers say that product features like taste (39%), price similarity to ordinary cigarettes (38%), and ability to easily inhale (32%) are extremely important. Whether the new product looks like an ordinary cigarette is considered extremely important by only 23 percent of adult smokers.

Important Qualities in a Safer or Less Harmful Cigarette	% Who Say Quality Is		
	Extremely Important ¹	Somewhat Important ²	Not Important ³
Extent of Harm to Non-Smokers' Health	67	14	11
Extent of Harm to Smoker's Health	66	14	12
Taste of Safer or Less Harmful Cigarette	39	28	18
Price Similarity to Ordinary Cigarettes	38	18	26
Ability to Easily Inhale	32	22	28
Looks Like an Ordinary Cigarette	23	22	36

4.0 IMPACT OF “SAFER”/”LESS HARMFUL” CIGARETTES ON SMOKING BEHAVIOUR

In contrast to the low visibility of such products, smokers appear to express considerable interest switching to a less harmful product if it were available, as well as some interest in switching instead of quitting smoking. Although this interest appears significant in this survey, the focus group research uncovered widespread cynicism among smokers that the tobacco companies would actually produce such products.

When asked how likely they would be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product if it were available, 78 percent of adult smokers say they would be very (51%) or somewhat (27%) likely to switch. A total of 22 percent of adult smokers say they would be not very (6%) or not at all (16%) likely to switch.

¹ Score of 7 on a scale from 1 to 7.

² Score of 5 or 6.

³ Score of 1 to 3.

Likelihood of Switching to a Safer/Less Harmful Cigarette Product if it Were Available	
Very Likely	51
Somewhat Likely	27
Not Very Likely	6
Not At All Likely	16

When asked what they would be willing to pay for a safer or less harmful cigarette product, 72 percent of adult smokers say they would be willing to pay no more than they do now for ordinary cigarettes, while 24 percent of adult smokers say they would be willing to pay a lot more (4%) or somewhat more (20%) for such a product.

What Adult Smokers Would Be Willing to Pay for a Safer/Less Harmful Cigarette Product Compared to Ordinary Cigarettes	
A Lot More	4
Somewhat More	20
No More	72
Not Interested	3
DK/NA	*

*Less than one percent

When asked how likely they would be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product instead of trying to quit smoking, 61 percent of adult smokers say they would be very (32%) or somewhat (29%) likely to switch. Conversely, 38 percent of adult smokers say they would be not very (10%) or not at all (28%) likely to switch instead of trying to quit.

Likelihood of Switching to a Safer/Less Harmful Cigarette Product Instead of Trying to Quit Smoking	
Very Likely	32
Somewhat Likely	29
Not Very Likely	10
Not At All Likely	28
DK/NA	1

Cost similarly is more important to low income smokers. There are no significant demographics differences in interest levels overall in these new products, but older smokers are more likely than younger smokers to switch to these products as an alternative to quitting.

December 13, 2002

HEALTH CANADA
"safer"/"less harmful" cigarettes
Focus Canada – envionics
adults Age 18 years plus
FC24

1. D At the present time, do you smoke cigarettes (manufactured or roll your own) every day, occasionally or not at all?

01 - Every day **SMOKER - GO TO Q.2D**
02 - Occasionally (less than every day) **SMOKER - GO TO Q.2D**
03 - Not at all **NON- SMOKER - SKIP TO NEXT SECTION**
99 - DK/NA **NON- SMOKER - SKIP TO NEXT SECTION**

ASK ALL SMOKERS

2. D Have you seen or heard of any new types of cigarettes or cigarette-like products that tobacco companies are developing which they claim are safer or less harmful than ordinary cigarettes?

01 – Yes	ASK Q.3D
02 – No	SKIP TO Q.5D
99 – DK/NA	SKIP TO Q.5D

IF YES TO Q. 2D, ASK:

3. D Can you name any new cigarette products that you think are less harmful? **IF YES:** What are they? **DO NOT READ. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.**

01- Accord
02 - Eclipse
03 - Omni
04 - Ariva
05 - Advance
06 – Exult
07 – Cigarettes without any additives
08 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
09 - None are less harmful
99 - No, can't name/DK/NA

4. D As far as you know, what is it about any of these products that might make them safer or less harmful? **DO NOT READ. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.**

01 - Less tar/lower tar
02 - Less nicotine
03 - Fewer chemicals/toxics/carcinogens
04 - Less second-hand smoke
05 - Less harmful ingredients in general
06 - Burn at lower temperature
07 – Less additives
08 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
09 - Not less harmful
99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL SMOKERS

5. D If a safer or less harmful cigarette product were available, how important would each of the following qualities be for you in considering whether to switch to such a product? Using a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is extremely important, and the mid-point 4 is neither, how important would each of the following be? **READ AND ROTATE**

- a) the taste of the new product

01 - 1 (not at all important)
02 - 2
03 - 3
04 - 4 (neither)
05 - 5
06 - 6
07 - 7 (extremely important)
99 - DK/NA

- b) the ability to easily inhale the new product

- c) the extent to which the new product was less harmful to a smoker's health

- d) the extent to which the new product was less harmful to the health of non-smokers from second-hand smoke

- e) the extent to which the new product was similar in price to cigarettes now on the market

- f) the extent to which the new product looks like an ordinary cigarette.

6. D How likely would you be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product if it were available? Would you be very, somewhat, not very or not at all likely?

01 - Very likely
02 - Somewhat likely
03 - Not very likely
04 - Not at all likely
99 - DK/NA

7. D Would you be willing to pay a lot more, somewhat more, or no more than you are paying now, for a safer or less harmful cigarette product?

01 - A lot more
02 - Somewhat more
03 - No more

VOLUNTEERED

04 - Not interested
99 - DK/NA

8. D How likely would you be to switch to a safer or less harmful cigarette product instead of trying to quit smoking? Would you be very, somewhat, not very or not at all likely?

01 - Very likely
02 - Somewhat likely
03 - Not very likely
04 - Not at all likely
99 - DK/NA

SANTÉ CANADA
Cigarettes «plus sécuritaires/moins dangereuses»
Focus Canada – Environics
Adultes de 18 ans et plus
FC24

1. D Actuellement est-ce que vous fumez la cigarette (de commerce ou roulée) tous les jours, occasionnellement ou jamais?

01 - Tous les jours **FUMEUR - PASSER À Q.2D**
02 - Occasionnellement (moins souvent qu'une fois par jour) **FUMEUR - PASSER À Q.2D**
03 - Jamais **NON FUMEUR - PASSER À LA SECTION SUIVANTE**
99 - NSP/PR **NON FUMEUR - PASSER À LA SECTION SUIVANTE**

DEMANDER À TOUS LES FUMEURS

2. D Est-ce que vous avez vu ou entendu parler de nouveaux types de cigarettes ou de produits semblables à la cigarette que les compagnies de tabac sont en train de mettre au point et qui, d'après ces fabricants, sont plus sécuritaires et moins dangereux que les cigarettes ordinaires?

01 – Oui	POSER Q.3D
02 – Non	PASSER À Q.5D
99 – NSP/PR	PASSER À Q.5D

SI OUI À Q. 2D, DEMANDER :

3. D Est-ce que vous pouvez nommer des nouveaux produits de cigarette qui sont moins dangereux, d'après vous? **SI OUI : Quels sont ces produits? NE PAS LIRE. CODER TOUTES LES MENTIONS QUI S'APPLIQUENT.**

01 - Accord
02 - Eclipse
03 - Omni
04 - Ariva
05 - Advance
06 – Exult
07 – Cigarettes sans additifs
08 - Autre (PRÉCISER) _____
09 - Aucun n'est moins dangereux
99 - Non, ne peut en nommer/ NSP/PR

4. D Pour autant que vous le sachiez, qu'est-ce qui peut rendre ces produits plus sécuritaires ou moins dangereux? **NE PAS LIRE. CODER TOUTES LES MENTIONS QUI S'APPLIQUENT.**

01 - Moins de goudron/teneur plus faible en goudron
02 - Moins de nicotine
03 - Moins de produits chimiques/de toxines/de carcinogènes
04 - Moins de fumée des autres
05 - Ingrédients moins dangereux en général
06 - Brûle à une température plus faible
07 – Moins d'additifs
08 - Autre (PRÉCISER) _____
09 - Pas moins dangereux
99 - NSP/PR

DEMANDER À TOUS LES FUMEURS

5. D Si un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux était disponible, dans quelle mesure chacune des caractéristiques suivantes serait-elle importante pour vous si vous envisagiez de changer pour adopter un de ces produits? En utilisant une échelle de 1 à 7, où 1 veut dire pas du tout importante, où 7 veut dire extrêmement importante et où le point milieu 4 veut dire ni l'un ni l'autre, quelle serait l'importance de chacune de ces caractéristiques? **LIRE EN ROTATION**

- a) le goût du nouveau produit

01 - 1 (pas du tout important)
02 - 2
03 - 3
04 - 4 (ni l'un ni l'autre)
05 - 5
06 - 6
07 - 7 (extrêmement important)
99 - NSP/PR

- b) la capacité d'inhaler facilement le nouveau produit
c) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit est moins dangereux pour la santé d'un fumeur
d) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit est moins dangereux pour la santé des non-fumeurs à cause de la fumée des autres
e) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit coûte le même prix que les cigarettes sur le marché en ce moment
f) la mesure dans laquelle le nouveau produit ressemble à une cigarette ordinaire.

6. D Quelle est la probabilité que vous adoptiez un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux s'il était disponible? Est-ce que ce serait très probable, assez probable, pas très probable ou pas du tout probable?

01 - Très probable
02 - Assez probable
03 - Pas très probable
04 - Pas du tout probable
99 - NSP/PR

7. D Est-ce que vous seriez prêt à payer beaucoup plus cher, un peu plus cher ou pas plus cher que vous payez maintenant pour un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux?

01 - Beaucoup plus cher
02 - Un peu plus cher
03 - Pas plus cher

NON SUGGÉRÉ
04 - PAS INTÉRESSÉ
99 - NSP/PR

8. D Quelle est la probabilité que vous adoptiez un produit de cigarette plus sécuritaire ou moins dangereux au lieu d'essayer de cesser de fumer? Est-ce que ce serait très probable, assez probable, pas très probable ou pas du tout probable?

01 - Très probable
02 - Assez probable
03 - Pas très probable
04 - Pas du tout probable
99 - NSP/PR