



Short Communication

Reaching consumers: How the tobacco industry uses email marketing

Betsy Brock^{a,*}, Samantha C. Carlson^a, Molly Moilanen^b, Barbara A. Schillo^b^a Association for Nonsmokers-Minnesota, 2395 University Avenue West, Suite 310, Saint Paul, MN 55114, USA^b ClearWay MinnesotaSM, Two Appletree Square, 8011 34th Ave, Suite 400, Minneapolis, MN 55425, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 February 2016

Received in revised form 9 May 2016

Accepted 29 May 2016

Available online 31 May 2016

Keywords:

Tobacco industry

Marketing

Tobacco

Smoking

Menthol

ABSTRACT

Tobacco companies are restricted from engaging in many traditional forms of marketing. Direct marketing is one way tobacco companies can reach consumers while complying with regulation and avoiding negative public perception. There is little research on this type of opt-in marketing, which includes mail marketing, email marketing, web marketing, and mobile marketing, and its impact is not well understood. This study examined 6990 tobacco company emails received by individuals living in the state of Minnesota, US between January 2010 and May 2015 to determine email frequency by brand. These emails were gathered as part of ongoing surveillance of tobacco industry direct marketing. A subset of these emails received between October 2014 and May 2015 ($n = 1646$) were content analyzed to identify the purpose of the email communication along with type of product promoted. Tobacco companies use email to communicate with consumers on a regular basis. This communication was observed to be as frequent as nine times per month. Emails are most commonly used to promote contests (54.1%), content on tobacco company websites (39.1%), and tobacco coupons (15.7%). Email promotion of menthol-flavored tobacco products was common and was associated with promotion of coupons. Emails promoting menthol had a 1.9 times higher prevalence of also promoting coupons (95% CI: 1.52–2.37). Little is known about tobacco company email marketing and this study fills an identified research gap. A deeper understanding of this type of marketing is needed in order to counter tobacco industry messaging and advance tobacco control.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Since the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement, the US tobacco industry has been restricted from engaging in many traditional forms of marketing, including billboards and branded merchandise. Direct marketing to consumers enables tobacco companies to market their products while complying with regulations (Lewis and Ling, 2015). Through direct marketing, consumers are reached through mail, web, email, and mobile marketing platforms. These types of marketing are opt-in, meaning consumers elect to receive marketing directly from companies. Tobacco companies use direct marketing to build relationships with consumers who receive regular coupons and free giveaways (Brock et al., 2015). Tobacco companies began direct marketing in the 1970s when it was determined that these tactics were an efficient way to reach existing consumers, recruit new customers, and inspire brand loyalty. These approaches allow tobacco companies to target specific segments of the market with tailored messages (Lewis and Ling, 2015; Lewis et al., 2004a). There is evidence that tobacco companies use direct marketing to target women, people of low socioeconomic status, young adult smokers, and menthol smokers (Brown-Johnson et al.,

2014; Richardson et al., 2014; Lewis et al., 2015). This type of targeted marketing is concerning given its potential to exacerbate smoking-related health disparities. For example, by using direct marketing to reach menthol smokers tobacco companies also target African Americans, who use menthol cigarettes at disproportionately high rates (Caraballo and Asman, 2011).

In 2013, US cigarette and smokeless tobacco companies spent a total of US\$68.8 million on direct mail and web marketing (Federal Trade Commission, 2016a, 2016b). Companies spent an additional US\$281.1 million on coupons and US\$41.5 million on non-branded specialty items, both of which are often distributed through direct marketing channels (Federal Trade Commission, 2016a, 2016b). These resources help tobacco companies maintain and expand their direct marketing reach. Studies estimate between 35.2% and 49.9% of current smokers receive direct marketing through the mail (Lewis et al., 2004b; Choi et al., 2013). A recent study found that 12% of 15–17-year-olds and 26% of 18–23-year-olds are exposed to direct marketing and this type of marketing is associated with smoking behavior (Soneji et al., 2013). Further, 49% of young adult smokers report receiving emails from tobacco companies and 58% report visiting tobacco company websites (Lewis et al., 2015).

Tobacco company direct marketing is recognized as an area needing additional research (Cruz, 2009). Most studies that examine direct marketing use a cross sectional or cohort design to quantify participation levels among adults and adolescents (Lewis et al., 2015; Lewis et al.,

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: betsy@ansrmn.org (B. Brock), sam@ansrmn.org (S.C. Carlson), [moilanen@clearwaymn.org](mailto:mmoilanen@clearwaymn.org) (M. Moilanen), bschillo@clearwaymn.org (B.A. Schillo).

2004b; Choi et al., 2013; Soneji et al., 2013). Of these, only one examines tobacco email marketing (Lewis et al., 2015). Others analyze tobacco company documents about direct marketing (Lewis and Ling, 2015; Lewis et al., 2004a; Brown-Johnson et al., 2014; Richardson et al., 2014). Few analyze content of direct marketing materials (Brock et al., 2015), and none that we are aware of examine tobacco company email content. The purpose of this study is to examine tobacco company direct email marketing to assess frequency and intended purpose. Understanding how tobacco companies use email marketing is essential to countering these promotions.

2. Methods

Emails were collected between January 2010 and May 2015 as ongoing surveillance of tobacco industry direct marketing for the following tobacco and e-cigarette brands: American Spirit, Black & Mild, Blu, Camel, Copenhagen, General Snus, Grizzly, Longhorn, MarkTen, Marlboro, Newport, Redman, Skoal, Swisher, USA Gold, and Vuse. These brands were chosen based on market share, and they account for more than 65% of the US cigarette market, almost 90% of the smokeless market, over 80% of the cigar market, and over 60% of the e-cigarette market (Maxwell, 2015; Maxwell, 2013; Reynolds American, 2012; Altria Group, 2012; Lorillard, 2012; Swedish Match, 2012; Convenience Store News, 2015). Emails were received by participants who live in the state of Minnesota. Participants were selected as a convenience sample with emphasis on selecting for geography, younger age (below 35), and gender breakdown. Participants registered to receive direct marketing materials from selected brands by going to brand websites, signing up, and going through age verification process. Participants were instructed to forward on all marketing materials received.

There were a total of 85 registrations for the selected tobacco brands, with each brand having between one and 14 registrations. Most registrations were completed in 2010. Additional registrations were added in 2014. Analyses were conducted per registration to account for this. A total of 6990 emails were received all of which were automated marketing emails from the selected tobacco companies or affiliated brands.

The following variables were coded for all emails received during the five-year period ($n = 6990$): date received, tobacco brand promoted, and email subject line. For a more recent subset of emails received between October, 2014 and May, 2015 ($n = 1646$), we coded the following additional variables: purpose(s) of email, if the email promoted menthol-flavored tobacco, and type(s) of tobacco product being promoted.

Coding was completed by a single trained coder who used a pre-determined set of codes for all variables. When coding email purpose, those emails that did not fit into pre-determined codes were initially coded as “other.” Later, those emails were re-examined and additional codes were created where themes were identified. Email purpose was determined by examining the email subject and body.

Analysis included calculation of descriptive statistics and proportions for categorical variables. Statistical differences in proportions were assessed using chi-square tests. Prevalence ratios (PR) were calculated to assess relationships between menthol promotion and email purposes using the GENMOD procedure for regression in SAS v9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

3. Results

3.1. Email marketing frequency

For the 6990 emails received during the full study period, the largest share came from Marlboro followed by Newport, Black & Mild, and Camel. Marlboro sent the most emails per month per registration; Grizzly was second most frequent. Because these emails were received by multiple participants, there were duplicates. Marlboro sent the most

unique emails per month on average followed by Blu and Camel (Table 1).

For the subset of emails received October 2014 to May 2015 ($n = 1646$) the largest share came from Marlboro ($n = 1078$, 65.5%) followed by Skoal ($n = 107$, 6.5%), Black & Mild ($n = 102$, 6.2%), Newport ($n = 79$, 4.8%), Copenhagen ($n = 64$, 3.9%), Grizzly ($n = 64$, 3.9%), Camel ($n = 47$, 2.9%) and Blu ($n = 32$, 1.9%). Marlboro and Grizzly were top in terms of communication frequency. Marlboro sent an average of 9.6 emails per month per registration and Grizzly sent 8.0. Copenhagen and Blu followed, with an average of 2.0 emails per registration per month. Marlboro (18.9), Grizzly (6.0), Skoal (2.6), and Blu (2.6) sent the most unique emails per month, on average.

3.2. Promoting affiliated brands and causes

Sixty-five (0.01%) emails promoted brands no one registered for but are affiliated with selected tobacco brands. For example, emails were received from Zonnice (nicotine gum manufactured by the company that makes Camel). The largest share ($n = 56$) came from Citizens for Tobacco Rights, an advocacy arm of the Altria Company.

3.3. Email marketing purpose

The most common email purpose was promotion of a contest or sweepstakes (54.1%). These contests offer participants the opportunity to win prizes by logging in to tobacco company websites and playing games or completing other activities (e.g. watching a video or commenting on message board). Promotion of content on the company's website, such as blogs, recipes, and music downloads, was the second most common email purpose (39.1%). The third most common was promotion of tobacco coupons (15.7%); in order to receive these coupons, consumers must login to the tobacco website. Promotion of a new tobacco product or brand extension (7.0%), a birthday or holiday greeting (4.3%), promotion of tobacco company sponsored event or “bar night” (4.2%), and notification that free gift was shipped (1.9%) were also commonly identified purposes. Only 53 (3.2%) of emails promoted a purpose defined as “other” and some promoted multiple purposes (24.7%).

Table 1

Emails received and number of registrations by brand January 2010–May 2015, Minnesota, US ($n = 6990$).

| Brand | # of emails received (%) | Avg. # of emails per registration | Avg. # of emails per registration per month | Avg. # of unique emails per month |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Cigarette brands</i> | | | | |
| Marlboro | 4354 (62.3) | 311.0 | 5.5 | 11.8 |
| Newport | 905 (12.3) | 64.6 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| USA Gold | 57 (0.8) | 57.0 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| Camel | 373 (5.3) | 28.7 | 0.6 | 2.4 |
| American Spirit | 4 (0.1) | 2.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| <i>Smokeless tobacco and snus brands</i> | | | | |
| Grizzly | 98 (1.4) | 98.0 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| General Snus | 61 (0.9) | 61.0 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| Copenhagen | 163 (2.3) | 40.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| Longhorn | 23 (0.3) | 23.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Skoal | 235 (3.4) | 18.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| Red Man | 7 (0.1) | 7.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| <i>Cigar brands</i> | | | | |
| Black & Mild | 572 (8.2) | 44.0 | 0.8 | 1.8 |
| Swisher Sweets | 12 (0.2) | 12.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| <i>Electronic cigarette brands</i> | | | | |
| Blu | 40 (0.6) | 20.0 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
| MarkTen | 9 (0.1) | 4.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Vuse | 12 (0.2) | 6.0 | 0.5 | 0.6 |

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4202250>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4202250>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)