

PROPRIETARY - FOR COMPANY USE ONLY

TODAY'S CLIMATE of
CANADIAN CONCERN about POLLUTION -
and its ACTIONABLE SIGNIFICANCE
in RESPONSE to STANDARD'S "F-310,"
and to "LEAD FREE" GAS -

- A "Before" vs "After" Segment Analysis -

Submitted to:

Imperial Oil Limited
Toronto, Ontario
Canada

Submitted by:

Albert Shepard Associates
Yorktown Heights, New York

October 1970

A-10427

- Index to our Findings -

Executive Summary Statement -

THREE INDICATED
STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITIES
for IMPERIAL-ESSO

- I. TODAY'S CLIMATE of
CANADIAN CONCERN about POLLUTION,
 - Perception of "Causes,"
 - Expectations about "Improvement"

- II. FACTORS and APPEALS
MOTIVATING SEGMENT RESPONSE
to STANDARD'S F-310

- III. CONFLICTING HOPES vs FEARS
EVOKED BY "LEAD FREE" GAS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY STATEMENT

THREE INDICATED

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPERIAL-ESSO

Executive Summary Statement -

THREE INDICATED

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPERIAL-ESSO

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITY #1 -

Utilize the indicated special opportunities for Imperial Oil to help resolve widespread, conflicting fears among Canadian motorists about possible effects of a lead-free gas on decreased power, less mileage, and noisy knock, especially on present engines, by developing for Esso the most effective promise of smooth performance, in some feasible form of "99% pure" reduced-lead gas, taking advantage of Esso's believable assets among Canadian motorists in your "engine cleaner," "Tiger Power," and "fast winter starts."

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITY #2

To increase Esso's contact with Canadian motorist perceptions of carbon buildup and carburetor clog as the "villain" mainly responsible for rough, sluggish performance, - for stuttering starts, - for wasted mileage, - and for dirty exhaust, - focus Imperial's product development on all possible steps to increase the effectiveness of your "engine cleaner," in helping to prevent carbon buildup and carburetor clog, thereby believably reinforcing Esso's promise of smoother power, and extra miles of trouble-free performance, together with less polluting carbon exhaust, for all Esso grades.

In advertising any such improved formulation, aim for graphic visual dramatization and demonstration of benefits for the motorist, - such as portraying the sound and feel of smooth responsive power, instead of stuttering sluggishness, on winter starts, and on entry onto high speed thruways.

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITY #3

Since both the Toronto and Vancouver results, and the Los Angeles and San Francisco evidence, indicate that motorists and public concerns about pollution are personal and deepseated, and growing, especially around urban areas, and especially among the new young generation of car drivers, among mothers troubled about family health, and among college-educated segments in the population, -

and since we find continuing Canadian "leadership" expectations for Imperial, - based on your "Electronic Car Clinics" and your "more research in Canada," - which represents special opportunity for positive transfer to your neighborhood stations, through any new kinds of "electronic" tools, or special "tune-ups," to help further link Esso with cleaner-running engines, and "cleaner burning gas," and cleaner air, -

o Continue to invest in intensive research efforts on any steps of improvements in decreasing air and water pollution, - whether from tailpipe exhaust, -

especially those most visible and resented emissions behind big buses and trucks, - or from refinery smoke stack emissions, - or from oil tanker spills.

⊙ Announce, and promote, every initiative by Imperial, even on working progress for any specific improvements in this direction, resulting from your own or Jersey Standard's world-wide research activities.

⊙ Promote any such "1st" steps in realistic terms in order to avoid F-310's California and Vancouver overexpectations, thereby helping Imperial to avoid any boomerang entanglement with intense air pollution concerns among significant segments of the Canadian public.

We now report the detailed findings upon which these Three Strategic Opportunities were based, - about today's climate of Canadian concerns about pollution, and its actionable significance in response to "F-310" and to "lead-free" gas:-

I. TODAY'S CLIMATE OF
CANADIAN CONCERN ABOUT POLLUTION

- Perception of "Causes"
- Expectations about "Improvement"

I. TODAY'S CLIMATE OF
CANADIAN CONCERN ABOUT POLLUTION

- Perception of "Causes",
- Expectations about "Improvement"

1. Our depth interviews in Toronto and Vancouver reveal that spontaneous concerns about air pollution are wide-spread, genuine, and deep-rooted.
2. These air pollution concerns are expressed intensely by close to 3 out of 10 motorists in both Toronto and Vancouver, and are shared, with somewhat lesser intensity, by about half of all motorists interviewed.
3. These concerns were expressed more intensely among mothers, younger car drivers, and among college educated, including present students and faculty.
4. While we find fears about air pollution more immediate in Toronto, we find that people in Vancouver, while recognizing their smog "is not as bad yet as Toronto...or Los Angeles" express their anxiety about "preventing Vancouver from becoming as bad as Toronto" just as we found California respondents in San Francisco expressing a similar concern not to become "as bad as Los Angeles."

5. The spontaneous sources of this widespread concern, reflected much more than just a response to all the featured articles in various Canadian media. We found these personal sources of deeper feeling clearly revealed as people's annoying sensory experiences with irritated eyes and nostrils, - with an unpleasant smell, - with perceived frightening grey or black smog as one drives into town, - with smokestack emissions.

6. We found one of the most vivid irritations was triggered by the smell of exhaust emissions "behind big buses or trucks", in crowded traffic, an experience which tended to evoke underlying fears about "carbon monoxide", which the total evidence in these depth interviews reveal as the most frequent spontaneously perceived "villain" in air pollution, more than lead, at the time of the two waves of field interviews conducted this Spring, and completed this Summer.

We find "carbon" also to be the most feared element in air pollution, because of its past linkage in newspaper reports or stories people have heard about "deaths from invisible carbon monoxide" in closed cars. (We will report further details about the problem, and the

strategic opportunities of these "carbon" concerns in Chapter III on conflicting hopes vs. fears about a "lead-free" gas.)

7. We found these air pollution concerns both more immediate, and more personal, among mothers who worried about possible smog effects on personal and family health, related not only to colds, sore throats and bronchitis, but even to some underlying nightmare fears about "lung cancer" or "emphysema."

8. Generally we found that water pollution seemed a less immediate and daily threat to comfort and health, though we found frequent expressions of intense resentment about pollution of lakes and rivers, possibly endangering young children swimming, slightly more frequent in Vancouver; and about "mercury poisoning of fish," slightly more frequent in Toronto. We found that younger motorists, 29 years of age and under, seemed to feel even more intensely about water pollution, because concerns about use of water in Summer are more immediate to them, and health fears seem somewhat more remote to younger people.

We also found, though less frequently, spontaneous references to "oil spillage messing up the coastal beaches" and to anxiety about general threats to the "arctic ecology."

9. We found that the primary responsibility for exhaust emission is attributed about three times as frequently to car makers and their car engines, as to oil companies and their gasoline, with no indicated tendency to single out any specific Canadian oil company as more responsible for the problem than any others.
10. We found in Vancouver, spontaneous positive expression of feelings that "at least the oil companies are trying to do something" about air pollution, resulting from the combined effects of Standard's F-310, and the beginnings of publicity about new forms of "lead free" or "low lead" gas.
11. We found significant spontaneous positive expectation of "leadership" from Imperial Esso, in our first wave of Toronto and Vancouver interviews, which respondents based on Esso's general leadership in "innovating new things," and on awareness of your "electronic car clinics" and your "more research in Canada."

In relation to this, we found not one single reflection in the comments of any motorist or some of the newspaper editorial comments about "foreign owned" oil companies; rather our total evidence continues to indicate that to Canadians, Imperial Esso is an integral part of the Canadian landscape, "as Canadian as Hockey."

We did find, however, a significant reduction, in Vancouver, in these leadership expectations in relation to air pollution, from Imperial Esso, and a corresponding significant increase in expectations from Standard, in direct response "after" Standard's promotion of F-310.

12. Our probed depth data also revealed these two danger signals:-

a. When our field interviewers offered each respondent a choice between talking to "government leaders" or "leading car makers", or "leading oil company executives", we found more than 6 out of 10 of our Canadian respondents expressed a desire to talk "1st" to government leaders, about the government "forcing" or "requiring" or imposing "bigger fines" to "compel" improvement in air pollution. About 2 out of 10 Canadian respondents indicated a wish to talk "1st" to car makers, and about half

as many indicated a wish to talk "1st" to oil companies, reflecting both in the Toronto and Vancouver regions, the consumers' present perception of the relative responsibility for air pollution, and their present level of expectation about the possibility of required government intervention to cope with this problem.

b. When probed on "what kinds of companies" they'd expect to act "voluntarily" to cope with air pollution, compared to those that might have to be "forced", we found more than half of our respondents expressing the conviction that all companies and all industries will "probably have to be forced", with about 2 out of 10 in Toronto, and 4 out of 10 in Vancouver forcefully protesting that "none" of these big companies will "do anything voluntarily."

Among the close to half that expressed some hope that some companies might act voluntarily, these hopes were about equally divided between the "large industries" who can "afford to invest in research and improvement", the oil companies, and the car makers.

We now report, for your information, the detailed patterns of field response on today's concerns about environment, about "causes", and about expectations for "improvement."

I-A. TODAY'S CLIMATE of
CANADIAN CONCERN about ENVIRONMENT -

	TORONTO		VANCOUVER	
	<u>Air</u>	<u>Water</u>	<u>Air</u>	<u>Water</u>
1- <u>Spontaneous "Discussion"</u> about " <u>Environmental Dangers</u> "	42	38	35	49
2- <u>Spontaneous</u> - " <u>Personally</u> <u>most Disturbing</u> "	53	34	44	39
3- <u>Probed</u> - Intensity of Concern	52	52	36	57
4- Getting " <u>Worse Lately</u> " -	69	62	78	74
5- Air Pollution - " <u>Worse</u> " vs " <u>Better</u> " in " <u>Your</u> <u>Area</u> " vs " <u>Rest of Canada</u> " -				
	"WORSE"	75	33	
	"BETTER"	12	54	

A. TODAY'S CLIMATE OF
CANADIAN CONCERN ABOUT ENVIRONMENT

(See Probed Response Pattern I-A, opposite page)

1. Spontaneous "Discussion" about "Environmental Dangers"

When we encouraged our respondents to tell us about any "discussions" about any "environmental dangers" that they remembered with friends and neighbors, we found that the overwhelming majority did remember several such discussions in recent months.

When we compared the frequency of spontaneous reference to air pollution vs. water pollution, note that we found more frequent mention of air pollution in Toronto, 42% to 38%, as compared to somewhat more frequent reference to water pollution in Vancouver, - 49% to 35%.

2. Spontaneous - "Personally" Most "Disturbing"

When we asked each respondent, "which of these dangers that you've mentioned, you personally find most disturbing," note that references to air pollution were first in both cities, and that the frequency of reference increased by about 10% to 53% in Toronto, to 44% in Vancouver.

3. Probed - Intensity of Concern

At a later point, we introduced reference to "six problems troubling people in Canada", and listed such other problems as "drug use by the young", - "taxes and prices", the "quality of education", along with water and air pollution, and probed for a rank order of the personal concern of each respondent with each of these problems.

Combining those who assigned a #1 or #2 ranking, we find that more than half of our respondents in Toronto indicated this general high level of concern about both air and water pollution, which increased slightly to 57% concern about water pollution in Vancouver, compared to 36% about air.

Overall, close to 3 out of 10 of our Canadian respondents revealed a #1 intensity of concern about air pollution.

4. Getting "Worse Lately" -

Note that in both cities the dominant feeling of about 7 out of 10 is that both air and water pollution have been "getting worse lately."

5. Air Pollution - "Worse" vs. "Better"
in "Your Area" vs. "Rest of Canada" -

When we probed specifically about impressions about air pollution in "your area", compared to the "rest of Canada", note a significant and substantial difference between Toronto and Vancouver, with 75% convinced that Toronto air pollution is "worse", where 54% in Vancouver feel that their area is "better" than the rest of Canada.

I-B. PERCEIVED "CAUSES"
of AIR POLLUTION -

	<u>TORONTO</u>	<u>VANCOUVER</u>
1- Alternative " <u>Causes</u> "		
Smoke Stack <u>Emissions</u>	50	43
<u>Car Engines</u>	36	46
<u>Gasoline</u>	10	8
Home Heating <u>Fuel</u>	1	2
2- <u>Who</u> is " <u>Primarily Responsible</u> "		
<u>Car Makers</u>	61	61
<u>Oil Companies</u>	26	27
3- <u>Whom</u> would you wish to " <u>Talk to 1st.</u> "		
<u>Government</u>	63	73
<u>Car Makers</u>	20	16
<u>Oil Companies</u>	11	8
4- <u>Spontaneous</u> : What " <u>Causes Pollution</u> " from tail pipe emissions -		
" <u>Carbon</u> "	66	74
" <u>Lead</u> "	26	21

B. PERCEIVED "CAUSES" OF AIR POLLUTION

(See Probed Response Patterns I-B, opposite page)

1. Alternative "Causes"

Our field interviews probed on the perception of various possible "causes" of air pollution. We found *smokestack* emissions singled out by about half, more in Toronto. Note that about 4 out of 10 felt "car engines" were mainly responsible. Note the first reflection of a consistent pattern throughout this study, with only about 1 out of 10 perceiving gasoline as mainly responsible. And finally, we note that fewer respondents, at this time, saw home heating fuel as a basic cause of air pollution in Canada, though we did find some scattered awareness about a change in home heating fuel having successfully reduced the level of smog and pollution in London.

2. Who Is "Primarily Responsible"

When we probed for perceived "responsibility" for the problem of air pollution, note the unusual stability of both the Toronto and Vancouver response, with an identical 61% blaming car makers, and only about 26% blaming oil companies.

3. Whom Would You Wish to "Talk To 1st"

When we offered each respondent an opportunity to talk to Government leaders, or car makers, or oil company executives, our tabulations revealed that about 6 out of 10 indicated a wish to "talk 1st" to Government leaders, somewhat more frequently in Vancouver, a reflection of a dangerously growing feeling of dependence upon Government intervention to cope with this problem.

Note that only about 2 out of 10 wanted to talk "1st" to car makers, and only about 1 out of 10 to oil companies, further confirmation of the relative responsibility assigned by Canadian motorists to these two industries..

4. Spontaneous - What "Causes Pollution" from Tailpipe Emissions-

When we probed for impressions about what it is that might "cause pollution from tailpipe emissions", note that 7 out of 10 respondents spontaneously identified "carbon" as the key "villain" compared to a little over 2 out of 10 mentioning "lead", despite some of the recent publicity about lead and "lead free" gas.

I-C. EXPECTATIONS about IMPROVEMENT -

	<u>TORONTO</u>	<u>VANCOUVER</u>	
		<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>
1- This <u>coming year</u> , Air Pollution will:-			
Improve	53	39	40
Get Worse	40	58	56
2- Will Air "ever be <u>over</u> <u>90% Pollution Free</u> " -			
"No-Never"	75	73	63
1975 - '79	17	2	3
1980 - 2000	8	13	16
3- How much "Improvement by 1972?"			
10%	30	33	45
20%	24	35	18
30%	12	8	6
	<u>66</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>69</u>

- COMPETITIVE FAVORERS -

4- Spontaneous: Which Oil
Company will be "1st" with
improvements?

Esso	45	18	15
Standard		13	31

5- Which Oil Company "1st"
with "Electronic Tune Ups"
at Neighborhood Stations?

Esso	49	44	34
Standard		5	13

C. EXPECTATIONS ABOUT IMPROVEMENT

1. This Coming Year, Air Pollution Will:-

Our probing on expectations of improvement in air pollution revealed a slight five to four margin of hope for improvement in Toronto, compared to a reverse five to four margin of feeling that "things will probably get worse this coming year," in Vancouver.

2. Will Air "Ever Be Over 90% Pollution Free"-

Note a widespread skepticism about air "ever being over 90% pollution free", with again, an almost identical 75% in Toronto and 73% in the "before" wave in Vancouver, indicating "No, never." Note one of the initial effects of the promotion of F-310, resulting in a 10% decrease in Vancouver, to 63%, who still feel the air will "never" be "over 90% pollution free."

Note that the time expectation for such improvement ranged from 1975-79 in Toronto, to dominantly 1980-2000 in Vancouver.

3. How Much "Improvement by 1972?"

When we then probed specifically for the level of expectation about improvements in air pollution "by 1972", note that about 7 out of 10 indicated a realistic expectation that improvement of only about 10% to 30% could be expected.

4. Spontaneous - Which Oil Company Will Be "1st" With Improvements?

Towards the end of each Depth Interview we probed in each Wave for impressions about which of the leading Canadian Oil Companies would probably be "1st" with hoped for improvements for cleaner air.

Note the leadership expectations about Esso in Toronto, among 45% of "Competitive Favorers", motorists presently buying competitive brands of gas. Note that while Esso led Standard by 18% to 13% before F-310 was introduced, this was reversed after F-310, Standard led Esso in Vancouver by 31% to 15%.

5. Which Oil Company "1st" With

"Electronic Tune-ups" at Neighborhood Stations?

Our Field Staff probed first for all impressions about the possible effects of a "tune-up" on "car engines", "car performance", or "cleaner air", and then probed on which Company would be expected to be "1st" with some "new kind of electronic tune-up tool, for use at their neighborhood stations." We found a significant majority expression by Canadian motorists that a tune-up is expected to remove carbon deposits or carbon buildup, to clean out clogged carburetors or engine parts; the significant expected result was visualized as believably producing more completely burning gasoline, thereby resulting in less wasted gasoline and better mileage, less exhaust emission, and overall smoother performance in the tuned-up car, a clear indication of the significant and believable potential among a majority of Canadian motorists for linking tune-ups and improved "engine cleaning" ingredients, as related to and believably linking preventing or reducing carbon deposits, carbon buildup and carburetor clog, with the desired results for his car of smoother performance and better mileage, and with the publicly desired benefits of cleaner air.

Note the indicated special Strategic Opportunities for Esso in relation to possible development of any new kinds of "electronic tools", among 49% in Toronto, and Esso's substantial lead over Standard 44% to 5% before F-310, and a continuing though lesser, 34% to 13% lead in Vancouver, even after F-310. These results tend to confirm the potential believability of steps to transfer respect for Esso's electronic car clinics and diagnostic equipment in your car clinic centers, to your neighborhood stations, through development of some new kinds of tune-up tools, and to Esso gasoline through further development and improvement of the ingredients and formulation of your "engine cleaner."

II. FACTORS and APPEALS

MOTIVATING SEGMENT RESPONSE

TO STANDARD's F-310

II. FACTORS and APPEALS
MOTIVATING SEGMENT RESPONSE
TO STANDARD'S F-310

In order to identify the key factors motivating segment response to Standard's F-310, we systematically represented in our Vancouver sample, after close to two months of exposure to F-310 advertising, segments of motorists who had actually recently Switched To Standard, - vs. Buyers of Competitive Brands who had tried one or more tankfuls but not continued buying Standard, - vs. Resisters who had not even tried Standard once during these many weeks of F-310 advertising.

Our Field Staff encouraged each motorist to talk spontaneously about "everything interesting" they remembered hearing about any brands of gas, in conversations with friends, then probed for any further "overheard comments" about leading brands in Vancouver, and then, after Standard was referred to, probed further for "everything they remembered seeing or hearing about Standard in ads." Each segment was then probed for "personal impressions" about any ways that Standard gas might be "different" from other brands.

Only after our Field Staff had evoked maximum spontaneous expression of all these segment impressions, did we introduce "some differences between gas brands mentioned by other people," such as "cleaner air," - "better mileage," - "cleaner engine," - and probed for "which of the leading brands" each motorist associated with each of these "different" gas qualities.

We then studied and compared all these patterns of spontaneous and probed response, to discover the motivating factors at work that accounted for the significant differences in purchase behavior between motorists who switched to vs. competitive buyers who had tried vs. those who had resisted trying Standard. We report first our spontaneous depth findings, and then our tabulated patterns of field results:-

A. FIVE SPONTANEOUS SEGMENT MOTIVATIONS

for SWITCHING TO STANDARD -

1. We found that close to 8 out of 10 Vancouver Switch Tos talked 1st about their varied hopes for what new F-310 might do for "my car" or "my engine," and tended to refer last to either "clean air" or "less pollution."
2. Only about 2 out of 10 Switch Tos, more frequently females, indicated that "cleaner air" was their dominant motivation, and many of these also referred to their hope before switching, and their impression after switching, that their car "did seem to run a little better" with F-310.
3. We note a significant contrast between Vancouver, and our California results in Los Angeles, where intensity of concern about air pollution in Los Angeles seemed to account for about 10% increase among Switch Tos in that region. In Vancouver, #1 intensity of concern about air pollution was expressed by almost equal proportions of about 3 out of 10 respondents, among the Resisters, the Triers, and the Switch Tos, and did not significantly differentiate these three key Vancouver segments.

We also note the contrast that, while few Switch Tos talked only about "cleaner air," the segment that most frequently tended to link F-310 only with their "claim about less pollution," and who referred least to any promised effects on the car or the engine, were the Resisters, those competitive buyers who had not even tried one tankful of Standard gas, many of whom seemed to be resisting precisely because they saw only "clean air," and "nothing in it for me, or my car's performance."

4. The main advantages for their car that Switch Tos hoped for, and which most expressed the impression that their car "seemed to deliver, at least a little," were the following in about this Rank Order of frequency:-

a. "Run a little better...smoother...idle quieter," signaled by the sound of the motor running "smooth and quiet" or a little less "rough or noisy."

b. Varied impressions that the "gas will burn cleaner," that the "engine runs cleaner," with some expressing the related hope for "less dirty carbon deposits or buildup."

In relation to this we noted that about 20% more of the Switch Tos owned cars four years of age or older, than among those who had tried but not switched to Standard.

c. Hopes for and impressions of somewhat more "pep...
power...pickup...starts faster...easier," again often signaled by the sound of a smoother running motor on entry to thruways, or when passing.

d. General hopes or expectations of "good or better mileage," with some spontaneous translation of F-310's visual pictures of "less dirty exhaust" into visual-ization of the gas "burning more completely" or "burning cleaner" therefore resulting in less "wasted gasoline," a perception stimulated, of course, by the "voice over" TV advertising slogan, and the station displays, promising "turns dirty exhaust into good clean mileage."

e. "Cleaner air" was next in frequency of spontaneously perceived "differences," after these motorists had switched to Standard, with many expressing their appreciation that "Standard is at least trying to do something about pollution," and that F-310 seemed to them to be "probably at least a little better for less pollution."

5. Finally, we found that the addition of new formula F-310 contributed, among these Switch Tos, and also among many previous Favorers of Standard, a specific rationale for their hope that this brand was "overall the best quality gas."

This specific additional rationale of "new F-310" was then combined by the Switch Tos with other previous positive aspects of the Standard image in Vancouver, its "better service," its "bright modern stations and clean rest rooms," its "convenient and available stations everywhere."

B. THREE SPONTANEOUS SEGMENT MOTIVATIONS

FOR TRYING, BUT NOT CONTINUING STANDARD -

1. The majority penetration of the advertising, and the frequent conversations about the merits of F-310, stimulated trial purchase curiosity among those motorists who wanted to "try it and see for myself, what it does for my engine," We found that the extent of response in Vancouver seemed significantly less than in California, in the extent of conversations, and in the intensity of controversy, and in the extent of curiosity and trial, that had been stimulated by the saturation promotion advertising of this new ingredient in the California market.

2. Most of those who tried, and did not continue, tended to report a similar experience, "I tried it once, or several tankfuls...and I couldn't see any difference."

The differences they had been led to expect by the ads dominantly related to some change in the way that the car would run, some expectations about some noticeable change either in its running smoother, or with easier starts, or with better pickup, or better mileage.

3. Related to this, we note that less than 1 out of 10 of the Triers made reference to actually checking the exhaust smoke, to see if it was "cleaner" as promised, compared to the more frequent references to "noticing no difference" in the way their car sounded or ran or performed. And we found that any such references to "cleaner exhaust" or "clean air" were usually second or third in their sequence of spontaneous comments.

C. THREE SPONTANEOUS SEGMENT MOTIVATIONS

FOR RESISTERS TO SOCIAL --

1. Buyers of competitive brands who had not tried Social differed from triers in their more frequent spontaneous expressions of general satisfaction with their present brands, or their dealers, or their station service, or the gas. And again we note that comparing Vancouver to Los Angeles, there seems to be a significantly higher level of more stable dealer, and station, and service, and brand satisfaction in the Vancouver market, than in the Los Angeles market.
2. The Resisters more often reported hearing more frequent negative word-of-mouth comments either by others who had already tried Standard and had told their friends that they saw "no difference," or by skeptics who claimed that any difference was "only slight," or by rejecters who felt that the ads were "over exaggerated," or "just another advertising claim."
- 3a. While Resisters indicated awareness of the "clean air" promise, they significantly less often than Triers seemed to have translated Standard's advertising into the implied promise of a smoother or better running car or better mileage, in any other personal benefit for their car.

3b. Finally, we noted a minority of Resisters who felt that F-310 was really not for my car, having heard talk that new F-310 "might do some little good, but only for very dirty engines or older cars," a perception which tended also to be reflected in our finding that a higher proportion of those with older cars appeared to be represented in those switching to Standard.

Other Resisters more typically tended to acknowledge that "while new F-310 might be some slight improvement in exhaust fumes, I am skeptical that they are over-rating this value."

D. THREE INDICATED BASIC DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE VANCOUVER MARKET AND THE CALIFORNIA
MARKET, IN THEIR RESPONSE TO F-310 -

1. We found less active interest and involvement, either positive or negative, and more of a tone of passive awareness, among all segments of Vancouver motorists compared to California.
2. We found less widespread discussion and less intense controversy about F-310 in Vancouver. The tone of these discussions appeared to be more ranging from mildly positive to mildly skeptical, with less intense argument and debate, either by critics or defenders of Standard.
3. We found a consistent pattern of somewhat less detailed ad recall and less personally and emotionally involved advertising recall in Vancouver.

Our indicative clues suggest that the basic sources of these differences in response between Vancouver and California were the following:-

1. The more stable price situation in Vancouver, compared to the price gap that developed in Los Angeles,

which provoked a more intensely negative reaction by Resisters, and required people switching to Standard to a greater need to justify paying "that much more."

2. Second, as noted in our previous Chapter, there seems to be a lower level of intense, personal, and immediate anxiety about pollution in Vancouver, than in the Los Angeles market.

3. As noted above, we also find many indications of a more stable level of general satisfaction with dealers and stations and service, with an indication of significantly less restless and discontented switching around in the Vancouver market than we had found in the Los Angeles market.

II-A. SEVEN FACTORS in SEGMENT RESPONSE to STANDARD's F310 -

-- VANCOUVER --

		Standard		Favorers	Standard Triers	VANCOUVER Competitive-Favorers		TORONTO Competitive- Favorers
		Switch 1st	To 1&2			Before	After	
"Cleaner Air"	ST-	72	79	72	40	4	41	SH- 9 18
	ES-			15		4	3	
" <u>Better Mileage</u> "	ST-	38	52	35	9	1	7	SH-24 11
	ES			18		4	2	
"More Power"	ST-	41	48	41	4	7	7	SH-14 13
	ES-			55		3	5	
"Cleaner Engine"	ST-	34	41	37	4	3	12	SH-13 29
	ES-			53		7	15	
" <u>Usually Lead in trying to meet people's needs</u> "	ST-	34	55	67	4	7	9	SH- 9 28
	ES-			45		14	9	
" <u>More people Switching to lately</u> "	ST-	55	65	44	22	0	20	SH-12 12
	ES-			12		5	8	
" <u>Personally try 1st in a new neighborhood</u> "	ST-	86	96	86	18	5	16	SH-11 13
	ES-			78		11	10	

E. SEVEN PROBED FACTORS IN
SEGMENT RESPONSE TO STANDARD'S F-310 -

We now report what we found, at a later point in our field interviews, when we probed specifically about such factors as "cleaner air," "better mileage," "more power," with the comparative segment field results tabulated in "II-A. SEVEN FACTORS IN SEGMENT RESPONSE TO STANDARD'S F-310," (see opposite page).

Here, for your background information, are the detailed patterns of response to probes on these seven factors, among significant segments:-

1. "CLEANER AIR" - Note that more than 7 out of 10 Switch Tos and Favorers select Standard for "cleaner air," directly reflecting the advertising appeal of the "clean balloon." Note that about 4 out of 10, both among Triers, and among all Vanc. Compet. Favs. (favorers of competitive brands in Vancouver) credit Standard with cleaner air.

By contrast, note that only 15% of Esso Favorers credit it with cleaner air, and only 3% to 4% of Competitive Favorers.

Note the interesting potential in Toronto, where twice as many favorers of competitive brands credit Esso with cleaner air as Shell (18% to 9%,) reflecting indirect translations of your engine cleaner promotion, in the absence of any "F-310" or "Lead-Free" competition.

2. "BETTER MILEAGE" - Note that 38% to 52% of Switch Tos reflect this mileage translation of the effects on their car of F-310, shared by 35% of Favorers. Note this goes down to only 9% among Triers, and 7% among Competitive Favorers.

Note that only about half as many Esso Favorers credit it with better mileage (18%), and that among Competitive Favorers, your selection on this factor went down from 4% before to 2% after F-310.

Note, as expected, in Toronto that Shell leads Esso by better than 2 to 1 among buyers of all competitive brands, 24% to 11%

3. "MORE POWER" - Note that about 4 out of 10 Switch Tos and Favorers select Standard for more power. Note that this goes down to only 4% among those who actually tried Standard recently, and remains stable

both before and after F-310 at around 7% among Vancouver Competitive Favorers, reflecting some past association of "extra power" with Standard.

Note that on power, Esso's Favorers are more loyal than Standard's, by 55% to 41%.

And, note, the standoff equality of Shell and Esso on power in Toronto.

4. "CLEANER ENGINE" - Note that more than 3 out of 10

Switch Tos and Favorers translated the "clean balloon" into the hope for a "cleaner engine," though this tends to be rejected more by those who have actually tried Standard (4%) than by the remainder of competitive users in Vancouver (12% of whom select Standard for this factor.)

Note that among Favorers, Esso leads Standard significantly (53% to 37%), and that your 7% to 3% edge over Standard before F-310, was still maintained, though the F-310 promotions succeeded in narrowing it to a 15% to 12% edge.

Note in Toronto that your past engine cleaner activity has produced a 29% to 13% lead for Esso over Shell, among buyers of all competitive brands. This contrast further

indicates the need for Imperial to expand and dramatize the multiple benefits in extra miles of smooth performance resulting from your engine cleaner, in order to take maximum advantage of your "cleaner engine" foothold, and to overcome the "better mileage" perception of Shell.

5. "USUALLY LEAD IN TRYING TO MEET PEOPLE'S NEEDS" -

Note that old Standard Favorers are even more positive than new Switch Tos on their general leadership expectations of Standard. Note again that those who have actually tried F-310 are less positive (only 4%) than those who have heard about F-310 and not yet tried it, 9% of whom still credit Standard with leading in trying to meet people's needs.

Note the before and after change on this factor from your previous 14% to 7% lead over Standard to a current 9% to 9% standoff.

Note the continuing reflection of the potential strength of leadership expectations for Imperial-Esso in Toronto, in your 28% to 9% lead over Shell among all buyers of Competitive brands.

6. "MORE PEOPLE SWITCHING TO LATELY" - On switching momentum, note that 4 to 5 out of 10 Favorers and Switch Tos attribute this switching momentum to Standard, compared to only 12% among Esso Favorers. Note that, on this factor, about 2 out of 10 Triers, as well as other Competitive Favorers, have the impression that more people in Vancouver have been switching to Standard lately, again a reversal of the previous 5% to 0% lead for Esso, into a 20% to 8% lead for Standard. Note the related standoff between Esso and Shell in Toronto at 12% to 12%.

7. "PERSONALLY TRY 1st IN A NEW NEIGHBORHOOD" - Note the contribution of the F-310 campaign to repeat purchase loyalty for Standard, reflected by more than 8 out of 10 of its Favorers, compared to slightly less than 8 out 10 Esso Favorers (86% to 78%.)

Note the contribution of the F-310 campaign to an increase in respect for the overall qualities, in the before and after shift among Competitive Favorers, from an 11% to 5% edge for Esso, to a 16% to 10% edge for Standard.

Note on this factor that 18% of those who have Tried Standard and Switched Away nevertheless are inclined to try Standard 1st, if they moved into a new neighborhood and broke their present patterns of dealer and station loyalty.

Note, in Toronto, the indicated about equal present potential appeal of Esso and Shell to about 1 out of 10 buyers of competitive brands.

II-B. SPECIFIC VISUAL vs VERBAL APPEALS
 that PENETRATED among KEY SEGMENTS -

	Switch <u>Tos</u>	<u>Favorers</u>	<u>Triers</u>	<u>Resisters</u>
<u>Specific</u> :- "New F310"	76	80	69	70
<u>Visual</u> :- "Clean vs Dirty, White vs Black Balloons"-	48	47	40	37
"Cleaner exhaust, Less Pollution"	45	33	29	24
"Keep Engine Clean, Burn Cleaner, Run Better, Less Carbon" -	34	22	13	10
<u>Verbal</u> :- " <u>Good... Better Mileage</u> "	28	19	22	4
Astronaut -	14	17	27	19
"After 6 Tankfuls" -	10	10	9	3
"Spontaneous Disbelief" -	11	9	13	17

B. SPECIFIC VISUAL vs. VERBAL APPEALS
THAT PENETRATED AMONG KEY SEGMENTS

We report, on the opposite page, what we found as we tabulated which of the F-310 appeals penetrated, and stayed in the mind, of key segments in the Vancouver market.

1. Our most significant finding is that the specific and the visual appeals represented the most effective communication, particularly the unusually high visibility of the contrast between the "clean vs. dirty", the "white vs. black" balloons, and the believability of the specific new "F-310," as a "genuinely new ingredient," despite some questions about what it may do.

This basic finding confirms the pattern of penetration and believable response reported in previous Studies for Imperial Oil, about the effectiveness of Shell's employment of the visual "white vs. black cars", with the rationale of the specific "Platformate," and the visual promise of "the white car with Shell goes further" communicating Shell's desired promise of "mileage."

2. Our second most significant finding was the lesser effectiveness of F-310's verbal promise, "turns dirty exhaust into good clean mileage", which penetrated and stayed in the minds of only about half as many motorists or less, compared to the specific and visual appeals.
3. Note that the more immediate translation of the clean vs. dirty balloons, was a fairly high spontaneous reference to the promise of "cleaner exhaust...cleaner air...less pollution" among 2 to 4 out of 10 respondents, highest as expected among 45% of Switch Tos.
4. Note that the hope that the "clean balloon" indicates that new F-310 will help "keep engine clean...burn cleaner...run better...less carbon" were the translations expressed by more than 3 out of 10 Switch Tos, 2 out of 10 Favorers, but only by 10% to 13% of Resisters and Triers.
5. We note that references to the Astronaut, interestingly, were more frequent among Triers and Resisters, but less frequent among the Switch Tos, who were more intent on those appeals that reflected what new F-310 might do for them and their car.

6. Note about 1 out of 10 remembered the references to "after 6 tankfuls", and that about 1 out of 10, going up to 17% among Resisters, spontaneously expressed skeptical disbelief as they talked about what they remembered. In relation to this, we note that this extent of spontaneous disbelief in Vancouver was substantially lower than the extent and intensity of disbelief we found in the California market, reflecting the lower degree of controversy, and the lesser extent of polarization in Vancouver.

III. CONFLICTING HOPES vs. FEARS

EVOKED BY "LEAD FREE" GAS

III - "LEAD FREE" GAS vs
"DE-CARBONIZING ENGINE CLEANER" -

WHICH "MORE HELPFUL" for
"CLEANER AIR" vs "SMOOTHER ENGINE PERFORMANCE" -

	<u>TORONTO</u>	<u>VANCOUVER</u>
For " <u>CLEANER AIR</u> " -		
- "Lead Free"	48	55
- "De-Carbonizing Engine Cleaner"	26	27
For " <u>SMOOTHER PERFORMANCE</u> " -		
- "Lead Free"	16	21
- "De-Carbonizing Engine Cleaner"	61	58
All Esso -	70	
All Males -	67	
29 & Under -	75	

III. CONFLICTING HOPES vs. FEARSEVOKED BY "LEAD FREE" GAS

Our last sequence of probes with each respondent investigated the range of their positive, or any negative feelings about "lead free" gas, and searched specifically for comparative impressions about a "lead free" gas vs. a "de-carbonizing engine cleaner" in terms of their perceived effects on "cleaner air" and then their perceived effects on "smoother performance." We report our detailed findings in III, - "LEAD FREE" GAS vs. "DE-CARBONIZING ENGINE CLEANER" - WHICH "MORE HELPFUL" FOR "CLEANER AIR" vs. "SMOOTHER ENGINE PERFORMANCE". (see opposite page)

1. Note that in both Toronto and Vancouver about half revealed the impression that a "lead free" gas would be more helpful for "cleaner air." It is interesting to note that about half, a similar 26% to 27% in both cities, felt that a "de-carbonizing engine cleaner" might even be more helpful for "cleaner air." The remaining respondents insisted that they "just don't know" and "couldn't guess."

2. The most significant finding was the trend reversal in response to which would be more helpful for "smoother performance." Note that again in both Toronto and Vancouver, about 3 times as many, 61% to 58% of our respondents expressed the impression that a de-carbonizing engine cleaner would be more useful and more effective for smoother performance, vs. 16% to 21% for "lead free", a sharp underscoring of widespread prevailing fears and uneasiness about possible harmful effects of a "lead free" gas on "smoother performance", fears which were revealed and expressed specifically in our spontaneous depth data, to be reported below.

3. Note that the positive expectation of "smoother performance" from a "de-carbonizing engine cleaner" was significantly higher even than the 6 out of 10 in the total sample, reaching 70% among all Esso Favorers, reflecting their even more positive response to the "engine cleaner", to 67% among all males, who are more car knowledgeable, and to 75% among all younger motorists 29 and under, also tending to reflect greater car knowledge.

Analysis of the spontaneous response to our Depth probes revealed these additional, detailed findings about conflicting hopes vs. fears about lead free gas:-

1. Among those aware of "lead free", its effects on "cleaner air" are not surrounded by controversy or frequent skepticism as we found for F-310. Rather, it seems to be instantly, and almost unanimously accepted, as a step that is "probably good for cleaner air."

The sources of this instant and widespread positive response appear to be a combination of almost totally positive news references about "lead free" as a forward step, - reports of government experts in the United States and Canada stressing "lead free" as a next step, - overheard reports that car makers were developing new 1971 engines for "lead free" gas, - and a resulting impression that "I guess one of these days all the gasoline brands will have some kind of a lead free gas."

2. However, the most interesting, and potentially useful results, for Imperial, emerged when we probed intensively at the end of each interview, for any further positive or negative impressions about the effects of lead free gas on various aspects of engine

and car performance. We found close to 5 out of 10 respondents spontaneously expressing various specific fears and misgivings about the effects of lead free gas on their car, its engine, its smooth performance, its power, or its mileage. We noted that these fears were more frequently expressed by car knowledgeable male and younger motorists.

We found these conflicting feelings about these feared negative effects were voiced by this close to half of our respondents, despite their acknowledgement of "probable benefits for cleaner air," producing some underlying conflicts about "good for me and my car" vs. "may be good for cleaner air." These fears about lead free gas clustered around these main perceived possible disadvantages:-

a. Anxiety that the engine might run "rough...noisy...ping...knock," based on impressions that "some lead" may be needed for present engines for smooth, purring, knock-free performance, clearly indicating some special potential opportunities for a new "low-lead" vs. "a lead free" gas.

b. Second in frequency were concerns that lead free "could definitely decrease power," fears that performance, winter starts, pickup, might be sluggish, that lead is "needed" with higher octane, that lead free "may work in some new 1971 cars, but not for my car, not for any high compression engine," indicating special opportunities in the Canadian market for Imperial Esso, with its past promotion emphasis on its fast winter starts, and performance, and its association over many years with "Tiger Power."

c. Concerns that a noisy and sluggish engine will result in "less efficient" gas mileage.

3. Carbon Buildup Perceived as Key Villain for Both Engine and Pollution Problems.

One of our specific probes on the perceived effects of "engine tune-ups" previously referred to, revealed a most important and deeper source, for the widespread positive response to some form of "de-carbonizing engine cleaner" compared to these noted fears about lead free.

Tune-ups were seen as helping to remove carbon deposits or carbon buildup, and this carbon buildup was widely visualized as the key villain for "clogging the carburetor..

for noisy misfiring...for wasted gasoline that goes up in smoke...for the gas not burning cleanly...efficiently... completely..." thereby "reducing power and mileage... resulting in slow starts...increasing smoky exhaust emission that pollutes the air." The underlying potential hope revealed among this substantial number of Canadian motorists is that some form of specific, improved "de-carbonizing engine cleaner" is believably visualized as helping to prevent this kind of carbon buildup, and to lessen or prevent these kinds of carbon deposits, thereby coming closer to the visualized ideal of a gas that burns cleaner and more completely and efficiently, and an engine that runs cleaner, producing the desired end-results of extra miles of smoother performance, as well as less smoky exhaust emission to pollute the air.

These combined patterns of field results on conflicting hopes vs. fears about "lead free" gas, and the latent widespread hopes about "new de-carbonizing engine cleaning ingredients," clearly indicates special potential opportunities for Imperial Oil in Canada, with its pre-empted association with the present "Engine Cleaner," with its past positive associations with "fast winter starts," "Tiger Power", and "performance", in some new formulation of reduced lead, plus Esso's Tiger Power, plus some improved form of "de-carbonizing engine cleaning" formulation.

APPENDIX

ASSIGNMENT, METHOD, SAMPLE

APPENDIX - ASSIGNMENT, METHOD, SAMPLE

- A. ASSIGNMENT - This field investigation was focused on investigating the level, and the intensity, of spontaneous concerns about air pollution, in Toronto and Vancouver; and then on specific investigation of the factors motivating change and response to Standard's F-310, based upon a wave of field interviews conducted before, and a wave of field interviews conducted after F-310 was introduced and promoted for 6 to 8 weeks.
- B. METHOD - We employed a specially designed Sequence of Focused Depth Probes, investigating the range of respondent attitudes and feelings about the environment, air pollution, water pollution, and possible causes, and expectations of improvement, - and then specific probes on gasoline brands, gasoline advertising, the association of various desired gas attributes with Standard vs. Esso vs. Other Competitors, and finally specially focused probes on the present level of positive or negative expectations about "lead free" gas.

C. SAMPLE - These findings are based upon field interviews with a total of 551 respondents, 163 in Toronto, 190 in the Before wave in Vancouver, and 198 in the After wave in Vancouver.

In the Final Wave of "After F-310" interviews, we systematically represented the following segments:-

	<u>%</u>
Standard Switch <u>Tos</u>	15
Standard <u>Favorers</u>	22
Standard <u>Triers</u>	23
Standard <u>Resisters</u>	40

The Toronto sample represented these main Brand Favorers:-

Imperial Esso	27
Shell	26
Gulf, Texaco and all	
Other Competitors	47

The combined Vancouver Before and After waves represented these Brand Favorers:-

Imperial Esso	22
Standard	32
Gulf, Texaco and all	
Other Competitors	46

SEX -

Male	74
Female	26

TYPE OF GAS

Regular Grade	58
Premium	42

AGES -

29 and Under	29
30-39	23
40-49	26
50 and Over	20