

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search http://ageconsearch.umn.edu aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

RESEARCH PAPER: 1998-2

GENERIC ADVERTISING IMPACTS ON DEMANDS FOR ORANGE JUICE IN FIFTY NIELSEN METROPOLITAN REGIONS

BY Mark G. Brown, Sr. Research Economist Stephen R. Irwin, Economic Research Associate

> FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CITRUS Economic and Market Research Department P.O. Box 110249 Gainesville, Florida 32611-2049 USA Phone: 352-392-1874 Fax: 352-392-8634 Email: mgbrown@ufl.edu

www.floridajuice.com

Generic Advertising Impacts on Demands for Orange Juice In Fifty Nielsen Metropolitan Regions

Introduction

In this study, impacts of Florida Department of Citrus (FDOC) generic orange juice (OJ) advertising on retail OJ demands in fifty metropolitan regions or cities are analyzed. The analysis is based on estimated (city) demand equations that relate retail OJ gallon sales to FDOC generic OJ advertising, brand OJ advertising and the price of OJ. The equations were estimated using Nielsen sales and advertising data for grocery stores doing at least \$2 million annual business. In addition, generic advertising expenditure data from the advertiser for the FDOC, the Richard's Group, were analyzed.

The Nielsen sales data are on a weekly basis and include OJ dollar and gallon sales. OJ prices were derived by dividing dollar sales by gallon sales. U.S. Department of Commerce data on the consumer price index (CPI) were used to deflate the OJ price data. The gallon and dollar data were complete for the period from August 5, 1995 through October 25, 1997 (117 weekly observations).

The Nielsen advertising data are TV gross rating points (GRPs) for OJ. The GRP data are monthly and were combined with the Nielsen weekly sales data by equally allocating monthly GRPs across weeks. The GRP data allowed construction of an additional 43 weekly observations from October 29, 1994 through October 25, 1997 (160 observations). These additional observations on

GRPs were used in estimating the lagged effects of advertising.

The Richard's Group advertising expenditure data were on TV and radio advertising for the period from July 1, 1996 through July 21, 1997; the expenditures are for specific flight time periods and were allocated to the Nielsen weeks according to the fraction of time that the Nielsen period accounted for the flight period.

Income and population may also affect demand but were treated as constant given the relatively short time period studied.

Model

For each city, a double log OJ demand equation was estimated. Formally, the model can be written as

(1)
$$\log q_{t} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1} \log p_{t} + \beta_{2} \log a_{1t} + \beta_{3} \sum_{j} w_{j} \log a_{1,t-j} + \beta_{2} \log a_{2,t-j} + \beta_{2} \log a_{2t} + \beta_{3} \sum_{j} w_{j} \log a_{2,t-j} + \beta_{4} \log a_{3t} + \beta_{5} \sum_{j} w_{j} \log a_{3,t-j} + \beta_{6} \log a_{4t} + \beta_{7} \sum_{j} w_{j} \log a_{4,t-j}; \quad \mathcal{B}_{FOC} \rightarrow \beta_{2}$$

where subscript t stands for time (week); q_t is OJ gallon sales; p_t is the CPI deflated OJ price; $a_{t,t}$, a_{2t} , a_{3t} , and a_{4t} are Nielsen generic TV GRPs for OJ, Richard's Group generic TV advertising expenditures on OJ, Richard's Group generic radio advertising expenditures on OJ, and Nielsen brand TV GRPs for OJ, respectively; (lag) subscript j runs from 1 to 43; and w_j 's are weights

declining linearly in value as lag length j increases ($w_1=43/44$, ..., $w_{43}=1/44$). The parameters to be estimated are the β s Preliminary analysis indicated effects of TV GRPs and TV advertising expenditures were statistically the same (β_2 and β_3). Present advertising was not included in the lag structure (w_i 's) for past advertising to allow immediate impulse buying

To account for seasonality, equation (1) was 52 nd differenced (for the 52 weeks in a year), i.e.,

(2)
$$d \log q_{t} = \beta_{1} d \log p_{t} + \beta_{2} d \log a_{1t} + \beta_{3} \sum_{j} w_{j} d \log a_{1, t-j} + \beta_{2} d \log a_{2t} + \beta_{3} \sum_{j} w_{j} d \log a_{2, t-j} + \beta_{4} d \log a_{3t} + \beta_{5} \sum_{j} w_{j} d \log a_{3, t-j} + \beta_{6} d \log a_{4t} + \beta_{7} \sum_{j} w_{j} d \log a_{4, t-j};$$

where, for variable x in general, $dx_t = x_t - x_{t-52}$.

Results

Equation (2) was estimated by ordinary least squares. The results are shown in shown in Tables 1 (parameter estimates), 2 (corresponding t statistics) and 3 (corresponding probabilities greater than the absolute values of the t statistics). Negative generic advertising parameter estimates were restricted to zero. The R2's ranged from .21 to.85. All the price parameter estimates were negative and statistically significant at the α =.10 level, i.e., statistically different from zero with a type I error of 10%. Many of the present and lagged or past brand advertising parameter estimates

were negative and many of these were not statistically significant. About a quarter (51) of the generic advertising parameters were statistically significant at α =.10; about a third (63) were statistically significant at α =.20.

1?

The parameter estimates in Table 2 were used to estimate the impact of advertising over the 65 week period from August 8, 1996 through October 25, 1997 (the 52 weeks prior to this period were lost due to differencing of the data). Table 4 shows city-by-city estimated OJ gallon sales generated by generic TV advertising, corresponding GRPs, and average gallons generated per GRP. The cities are ranked by gallons generated per GRP. Using this criteria, generic TV advertising was most affective in San Diego, Buffalo, Sacramento, etc.

Table 5 shows, city-by-city estimated OJ gallon sales generated by generic radio advertising, corresponding radio advertising expenditures, and average gallons generated per dollar expenditure. Ranking the cities by gallons generated per dollar radio advertising expenditure, generic radio advertising was most affective in Philadelphia, Omaha, Baltimore, etc.

Table 6 shows, city-by-city estimated OJ gallon sales generated by generic TV and radio advertising together and the percentage increase in OJ gallon sales or demand due to the generic advertising. Ranking the cities by the latter advertising-induced increase in OJ demand, generic advertising was most affective in San Diego, Charlotte, Portland, etc.

The present analysis suggests two ways to increase U.S. OJ sales. First, increase the

4

effectiveness of advertising in cities where advertising appears to perform relatively poorly. Across the 50 cities, generic advertising is estimated to increase OJ demand by 3.1% (Table 6). As shown in Table 7, if the effectiveness of advertising were increased in cities with presently below average estimated effectiveness, the increase in the aggregate-fifty-city OJ demand as a result of advertising would be 4.0% or .9% over the fifty city average.

Another way to increase the overall performance of advertising in the U.S. is to allocate advertising across cities in a more optimal fashion. For example, GRPs might be taken out of cities where they have little effect and put in cities where they are most effective. In the present analysis, the impact of advertising on gallon sales in a city depends on the magnitude of the estimated advertising parameter estimates in Table 1 and the size of the city. The advertising parameter estimates indicate percentage changes in gallon sales for a percentage change in advertising. Estimates of changes in gallon sales per unit changes in GRPs or advertising expenditures can be obtained by multiplying the estimated elasticities by the total gallon sales in the city and dividing the result by the city GRP or advertising expenditure level. Table 8 shows the long-run impact of advertising (GRPs) on a weekly average basis. The long-run impact of GRPs on OJ demand is the present effect of GRPs plus all the lagged GRP effects. For example, allocation of a weekly average 27.6 GRPs to Los Angeles would increase OJ sales by 672,672 gallons in the long-run (the present week plus 43 future weeks). Similar GRP allocations across the other cities would result in a fifty city long-run increase OJ demand of 4.7%. Note that the marginal effect of one GRP in Los Angeles is 439 gallons for the above allocation. Also note that the cities in Table 8 have been ranked according to their marginal effects and that the marginal effects are much greater for the cities on the top of Table 8 (Los Angeles, San Diego, etc.) compared to the marginal effects for cities on the

bottom of the table. If the given fifty-city GRP level of 1479 per week were reallocated across cities to maximize OJ sales in the long-run, OJ demand would increase by 5.3% or .6% over result for the non-optimal allocation.

Concluding Comments.

The empirical analysis shows that in the last 65 weeks the effectiveness of generic OJ advertising varied from city to city. On average, generic advertising was estimated to increase OJ demand by 3.1%. However, the effect in some cities was much greater than in other cities, with the shifts in OJ demand across cities ranging from zero to 10.5%.

Advertising performance might be increased in two ways. First, cities where advertising does not work well might be given special attention in developing advertising programs that are more effective. If the relatively poor advertising performing cities were brought up to the average, the shift in fifty city OJ demand would be 4%. Alternatively, cities where advertising performs relatively well (poorly) might be given more (less) GRPs.

6

| | GKP Impact W. Sum | | 0.021 | 0.000 | 0.028 | 0.004 | 0.032 | 0.035 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0,003 0,003 | 0.025 | 0.019 | 0.024 | 0.021 | 0.016 | 0.000 | 0.03 | 0.018 | 0.011 | 0.006 | 0.018 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.004 | 0.022 | 0.024 | 100.0 | 0000 | 0.011 | 0000 | 0.018 | 0.000 | 0.027 | 0.006 | 0.031 | 0.000 | 0.048 | 0.022 | 0.001 | 0.028 | 0.078 | 0.030 | 0.038 | 0.010 0.007 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|----------|------------|---------|-----------|---------|------------|-----------|----------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|----------|------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|----------|-----------------|
| | Log Past TV | | 0.001 | | 0.001 | | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.000 | | 0.001 | 0.007 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 100 0 | | 0.001 | 0.000 | | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | | 0.000 | | 0.000 | | 0.001 | | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 000.0 | 0.002 | 0.001 | | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| | Log Present TV | 600.0 | | | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.014 | | | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0000 | 0.001 | 0.013 | 0.006 | | 0.005 | | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.006 | | 0.007 | | | 0.006 | | - | | 0.006 | | | | 0.010 | | 0.003 | 0000 | | | 0.001 | 0 005 | | | 0.015 | 0.002 |
| | L. Past Brand TV (B7) | -0.0014 | 0.0002 | 0.0009 | -0.0024 | 0.0001 | -0.0004 | 1100.0- | 67.00.0- | 0.000 | -0.0015 | -0.0021 | -0.0004 | -0.0039 | -0.0032 | -0.0014 | -0.0008 | | -0.0005 | 0.0007 | -0.0018 | -0.0034 | -0.0017 | -0.0022 | 0100.0- | 0.0006 | -0.0010 | -0.0011 | -0.0011 | -0.0020 | -0.0003 | -0.0003 | 0.0010 | -0.0091 | 0.0023 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | -0.0031 | -0.0045 | 0.0014 | -0.0010 | -0.0064 | -0.0037 | -0 0028 | -0.0007 |
| | Log Past Radio L. Present Brand TV L. Past Brand TV (B5) (B6) (B7) | -0.0113 | -0.0004 | -0.0075 | 0.0048 | -0.0093 | 0.0034 | 0.0030 | | -0.0055 | -0.0093 | 0.0073 | -0.0045 | -0.0044 | 0.0011 | -0.0061 | -0.0200 | -0.0050 | -0.0025 | -0.0057 | -0,0090 | 0.0028 | -0.0109 | 0000.0- | G100.0- | 0.0089 | -0.0075 | -0.0007 | 0.0045 | -0.0076 | 0.0024 | -0.0065 | -0.0064 | 0.0012 | -0.008/ | -0.0039 | -0 0038 | 0.0043 | -0 0037 | 0.0016 | 0.0053 | 0.0092 | 0.0073 | -0.0011 | 0.0001-0-0.0061 |
| Estimates* | o Log Past Radio 1 (B5) | 0.0012 | | 0.0029 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | | 0.001 | | 0.0008 | 0,000 | 0.0006 | 0.0013 | | 0.0002 | | 0 0005 | 00000 | | | | 0.0005 | 0.0010 | | | | 0 0006 | | 0.0003 | | 0.0070 | 0.000 | 0.0019 | 0.0007 | | | 0.0020 | | | | | 0.0012 | - | | 0.0006 |
| Coefficient Estimates* | Log Present Radio (B4) | | 0.0010 | 0.0020 | 0.0088 | 0.0014 | 0.0015 | | 7600'0 | 0 0055 | 0.0047 | 0.0066 | | | 0.0058 | | 0.008 | | | | 0.0083 | 0.0009 | 0.0000 | | 0.0000 | 0 0045 | 0.000 | 0.0050 | 0.0020 | | 0.0071 | | 0.0059 | | 70000 | 0.0030 | | | | | 0.0061 | 0.0030 | | | 0.0019 |
| FDOC | Log Past TV (B3) | | 0.0010 | | 0.0013 | | 0.0008 | | | | 0.0008 | 0.0016 | 0.0008 | 0.0005 | 1000.0 | 0.0007 | 0 0012 | 0.0008 | 0.0010 | 0.0003 | | 0.0008 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | | 0.0011 | 0.001 | 0.0002 | | 0.0002 | | 0.0008 | | 8000.0 | 0.0003 | | 0.0003 | 0.0022 | 0.0010 | | 0.0010 | 0 0006 | 0.0014 | 0.0011 | 0.0003 |
| | Log Present TV (B2) | 0.0090 | | | 0.0001 | 0.0041 | 0.0141 | | | 0.0032 | 0.0058 | | 0.0006 | 0.0126 | 0.0062 | | 0.0051 | 0.0015 | 0.0014 | 0.0038 | 0.0062 | | 0.0071 | | 0,0050 | SCOO.O | • | | | 0.0065 | | | | 0.0098 | | 0.0011 | 0.0039 | | | 0.0012 | 0.0053 | | | 0.0146 | 0.0011 |
| | Log OJ Price (B1) | -1.1867 | -0.9076 | -1.2905 | -1.15/0 | -0./235 | -1.6333 | | -1 0001- | -1.0752 | -1.6035 | -1.5122 | -1.2004 | -0.8554 | 0/27.1- | -1056.1- | -1.1382 | -1.2652 | -0.9131 | -1.3320 | -1.2466 | -1.0925 | -1.3191 | -1.4018 | 1 7086 | -11403 | -0.9577 | -1.4745 | -1.1940 | -1.2040 | -0.97.10 | -0.9198 | -1.0136 | 1040.1- | -1-4004 | 10403 | -0.9619 | -1.3337 | -1.5276 | -1.7007 | -1.285/ 1216 | -0.9278 | -1.3586 | -1.4418 | -1.3102 |
| cient Estimates | R-Square | 0.50 | 0.55 | 0.60 | 80.0 | 17.0 | 0.45 | 25.0 | 0.75 | 0.56 | 0.85 | 0.58 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 0.63 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 0.53 | 0.85 | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.57 | 0.33 | 0.67 | 0.40 | 0.56 | 0.51 | 0.75 | 0.56 | 0.03 | | 0.55 | 0.42 | 0.65 | 0.69 | 0.76 | 0.58 | 0.42 | 0.70 | 064 | 0.59 |
| ladie 1. Model Coefficient Estimates | CITY | ALBANY | ATLANTA | BALIMORE | BIRMINGHAM | BUREALO | CHARLOTTE | CHICAGO | CINCINNATI | CLEVELAND | COLUMBUS | DALLAS | DENVER | DES MOINES | | | HOUSTON | INDIANAPOLIS | JACKSONVILLE | KANSAS CITY | LITTLE ROCK | LOS ANGELES | LUUISVILLE | MIAMI | MI WALKEE | MINNEAPOLIS | NASHVILLE | NEW ORLEANS | NEW YORK | OKLAHOMA CITY | OMAHA | | | DITTSRIPCH | PORTI AND | RALEIGH | RICHMOND | SACRAMENTO | ST. LOUIS | SALT LAKE CITY | SAN AN IONIO | SAN FRANCISCO | SEATTLE | SYRACUSE | WASHINGTON D.C |

Table 1. Model Coefficient Estimates

.....

•

* Model:

Levels Model:

 $\log Q(t) = B0 + B1^{1}\log P(t) + B2^{1}\log A1(t) + ... + B7^{1}\log A6(t)$.

Differenced Model:

Dlog Q(t) = B1*Dlog P(t) + B2*Dlog A1(t) + ... + B7*Dlog A6(t). **Definitions:**

DX(t) = X(t) - X(t-52) for Variable X in general.

Q(t)= Nielsen-\$2-Million-Plus OJ Gallons for week t.

P(t)= OJ Price/CPI for week t.

A1(t)= Present (for week t) FDOC TV Advertising----log A1= log GRP's+ log Local Expenditures.

A2(t)= Past FDOC TV Advertising: log A2(t) = (43/44)* log A1(t-1)+ (42/44)*log A1(t-2)+...+ (1/44)*log A1(t-43)

A3(t)= Present (for week t) FDOC Radio Advertising-----Local Expenditures.

A4(t)= Past FDOC Radio Advertising: log A4(t) = (43/44)* log A3(t-1)+ (42/44)*log A3(t-2)+...+ (1/44)* log A3(t-43). A5(t)= Present (for week t) Brand Advertising-----GRP's.

A6(t)= Past FDOC Radio Advertising: log A6(t) = (43/44)*log A5(t-1)+ (42/44)*log A5(t-2)+...+ (1/44)* log A5(t-43). Complete data from 8-03-96 ... 10-25-97 (65 weeks)

i able 2. t Statistics for Coefficient Estimates

-

----- t Statistics------

| | | | ŏ | -FDOC Advertising | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------|
| CIIY | Log OJ Price | Log Present TV | Log Past TV | Log Present Radio | Log Past Radio | L. Present Brand TV | L. Past Brand TV |
| ALBANY | -7.43 | 1.48 | | | 0 00 | -2.24 | 1 17 |
| ATLANTA | -7.91 | | 5.37 | 0.47 | 00.0 | 12.2 | 00.0 |
| BALTIMORE | -6.85 | | 5 | 0.35 | 4.6 | 21.0- 20.02 | 07.0 |
| BIRMINGHAM | -4.57 | 0.03 | 1.79 | 1.87 | 0.59 | 16-0- 17 U | 00 C |
| BOSTON | -3.05 | 0.73 | | 0.49 | 1 43 | -1.45 | 0.05 |
| BUFFALO | -11.25 | 1.89 | 1.76 | 0.25 | - | 35.0 | 50.0 90.0 |
| CHARLOTTE | -4.39 | | 4.2 | 0.33 | 1 44 | 0.48 | -0.20 0.78 |
| CHICAGO | -5.1 | | 0.17 | 1.62 | | 62 U | -1.5 |
| CINCINNATI | -11.22 | 0.19 | | | 4.79 | 22.0- | -0.04 |
| CLEVELAND | -7.9 | 0.59 | | 1.81 | 2.7 | -0.86 | 0.56 |
| COLUMBUS | -10.76 | 1.86 | 1.84 | 2.26 | 3.49 | -2.71 | 0.0 |
| DALLAS | -6.17 | • | 3.42 | 2.69 | 2.54 | 1 73 | - 1.5 - 12 |
| DENVER | -11.31 | 0.15 | 1.34 | | 2.68 | -0.74 | -2.12 |
| DES MOINES | -11.74 | 2.94 | 2.48 | |) i | -122 | 5.69 72.0- |
| DETROIT | -6.88 | 1.94 | 1.89 | 1.25 | 0.18 | 0.21 | -173 |
| GRAND RAPIDS | -15.31 | | 2.74 | | | -1.2 | |
| HARTFORD | -3.49 | | | | | -2.17 | -0.34 |
| HOUSTON | -5.09 | 1.35 | 3.43 | 1.26 | 1.72 | -0.47 | -1.07 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | -14.68 | 0.32 | 2.99 | | 0.03 | -1.12 | -2.73 |
| JACKSONVILLE | -8.28 | 0.43 | 4.97 | | | -0.59 | -0.74 |
| KANSAS CITY | -9.79 | 0.57 | 0.7 | | | -0.84 | 0.68 |
| LITTLE ROCK | -9.87 | 0.95 | | 1.39 | | -1.33 | -1.34 |
| LOS ANGELES | -6.62 | | 2.22 | 0.41 | 2.37 | 0.66 | -2.63 |
| LOUISVILLE | -16.35 | 1.79 | 0.27 | 0 | 2.62 | -2.73 | -2.39 |
| MEMPHIS | -11.97 | · | 0.44 | • | | -0.01 | -1.8 |
| MIAMI | -6.13 | | 0.52 | 0.01 | | -0.2 | -0.54 |
| MILVAUKEE | -8.74 | 0.84 | 1.82 | | | 1.2 | 0.42 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | -7.28 | | 3.49 | 1.29 | | -1.45 | -1.25 |
| | -3.48 | - | 0.2 | | 1.78 | -0.42 | -2.17 |
| | -1.67 | • | 0.89 | 1.48 | | -0.24 | -1.42 |
| NEW TURK | -5.98 | - | | 0.93 | 1.63 | 0.89 | -0.86 |
| | -8.01 | 1.06 | 0.61 | | | -1.23 | -1.77 |
| UMAHA | -4.58 | • | | 0.46 | 1.14 | 0.29 | -0.15 |
| UKLANDU | -8.42 | • | 2.9 | | 0.04 | -1.6 | -0.21 |
| | -6.68 | | | 1.77 | 4.87 | -1.54 | 0.95 |
| PHUENIA | -13.6 | 2.5 | 2.29 | | 0.88 | 0.19 | -6.18 |
| | -13.39 | | 0.72 | 1.05 | | -1.32 | 1.46 |
| | -15.19 | 0.72 | 6.05 | 0.99 | | -0.7 | 0 |
| RALEIGH | -7.14 | 0.22 | 3.55 | 0.43 | | -0.83 | -0.83 |
| | -4.74 | 1.25 | 1,11 | | 2.69 | -1.07 | 0.61 |
| SACRAMENIO | -9.16 | | 8.15 | | | 0.91 | -2.25 |
| SI. LOUIS SALT LAKE CITV | -10.31 | | 3.62 | • | | -0.77 | -3.49 |
| SALI LAKE ULI T | -12.89 | 0.37 | | • ! | | 0.34 | 1.57 |
| SAN ANI UNIO SAN DIEGO | -6.02 | 0.73 | 3.27 | 1.8 | | 0.89 | -1.09 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 18.8- | | 7.14 | 000 | • | 0.17 | -0.94 |
| SEATTI F | -4.42 | | 1.45 | 0.96 | 3.11 | 1.7 | -3.43 |
| SYRACHISE | 10.01- | 1 05 | 7'C | | | 1.44 | -3.05 |
| TAMPA | - 5. C | 0 S. I | 20.2 | | . [| -0.17 | -3.82 |
| WASHINGTON D.C. | -0.04 | 0.0 | 0.82 0.61 | · | 1.47 | 0.1 | -2.08 |
| | 00.1- | 0.17 | 10'N | 0.51 | 1.26 | -0.88 | -0.46 |

, ---

•

rable 3. Probability > [t]

| | | | | Pro | Proh > III | | |
|-------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|--|---------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | Log OJ Price | Log Present TV | Log Past TV | FDOC Advertising TV Log Present Radio | C Advertising | Present Brand TV | / L. Past Brand TV |
| ALBANY | c | 0.45 | | | | | |
| ATI ANTA | | 0.13 | · | | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.25 |
| BALTIMORE | | | D | 0.04 | · | 0.9 | 0.78 |
| BIPMINCHAM | | | | U./3 | 0 | 0.34 | 0.67 |
| BOSTON | | 0.98 | 0.08 | 70.0 200 | 0.56 | 0.46 | 0.04 |
| BUEFEAL O | | 14.0 | | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.96 |
| CHARLOTTE | - c | 00.0 | 0.08 | 0.81 | | 0.73 | 0.8 |
| CHICAGO | - - | | U D BG | 0.75 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.44 |
| CINCINNATI | 0 | 0.85 | 0.0 | - | Ċ | 0.15 | 0.07 |
| CLEVELAND | | 0.56 | | 0 UR | 200 | 0.40 | 0.97 |
| COLUMBUS | • - | 0.07 | . 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.09 | 90.0 |
| DALLAS | • - | 0.0 | | 0.0 100 | 100 | | 0.2 |
| DENVER | • c | 0.88 | 0 19 | | 100 | 0.09 | 0.04 |
| DES MOINES |) C | 0.0 | 0.0 | • | 0.0 | 04.0 | 0.03 |
| DETROIT | 0 | 0.06 | 0.06 | . 0 | D. R.G. | 0.83 | |
| GRAND RAPIDS | 0 | | 0.01 | | 0 | 0.24 | 60.0 C U |
| HARTFORD | 0 | | | | | 0.03 | 0.73 |
| HOUSTON | 0 | 0.18 | 0 | 0.21 | 60.0 | 0.64 | 0.79 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | | 0.98 | 0.27 | 0.01 |
| JACKSONVILLE | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | | | 0.56 | 0.46 |
| KANSAS CITY | 0 | 0.57 | 0.48 | | | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| LITTLE ROCK | 0 | 0.35 | | 0.17 | | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| LOS ANGELES | 0 | | 0.03 | 0.68 | 0.02 | 0.52 | 0.01 |
| LOUISVILLE | 0 | 0.08 | 0.79 | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| MEMPHIS | 0 | | 0.66 | | | 0.99 | 0.08 |
| | 0 | | 0.6 | 0.99 | | 0.84 | 0.59 |
| MILVAURE | 5 0 | 0.4 | 0.07 | · (| | 0.24 | 0.68 |
| | 5 0 | | 0 0 | 0.2 | | 0.15 | 0.22 |
| | | | C9.0 | . 15 | 0.08 | 0.68 | 0.03 |
| NEW YORK | | | 0.30 | CI.U | | 0.81 | 0.16 |
| OKLAHOMA CITY | | 0.29 | 0 54 | 0.0 | 0.11 | | 0.39 |
| OMAHA | | 0.0 | 5 | 0 65 | 0 26 | 0.77 | 00.0 |
| ORLANDO | 0 | | 0.01 |) .) | 0.97 | 0.12 | 0.84 |
| PHILADELPHIA | 0 | | | 0.08 | 0 | 0.13 | 0.35 |
| PHOENIX | 0 | 0.02 | 0.03 | | 0.38 | 0.85 | 0 |
| PITTSBURGH | 0 | | 0.47 | 0.3 | | 0.19 | 0.15 |
| PORTLAND | 0 | 0.48 | 0 | 0.33 | | 0.49 | |
| | 0 0 | 0.82 | 0 | 0.67 | | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| SACRAMENTO | | 0.22 | 0.27 | | 0.01 | 0.29 | 0.55 |
| | | | 5 0 | | | 0.37 | 0.03 |
| SALT LAKE CITY | | 0.71 | Ð | | | 0.44 | 0 |
| SAN ANTONIO | 0 | 0.47 | 0 | 0.08 | - | 0.38 | 0.12 0.28 |
| SAN DIEGO | 0 | | 0 | | | 0.86 | 0.35 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 0 | | 0.15 | 0.34 | 0 | 0.09 | 0 |
| SEATILE | 0 0 | | 0 | | | 0.16 | 0 |
| 31KACUSE TAMBA | 0 0 | 0.06 | 0.01 | | • | 0.86 | 0 |
| MASHINGTON D.C | - - | 0.55 | 0.41 | | 0.15 | 0.92 | 0.04 |
| | 5 | 10.0 | 6C.U | 10.0 | 0.21 | 0.38 | 0.65 |

| Table 4. | National & Local TV FDOC Advertising Impact, By City. | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |

,

•

| | 65 Weeks · | 8-03-96 10-2 | 25-97 |
|------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| | GRP-Generated | | Gallons/ |
| City | Gallons | GRP's | GRP |
| · | | | |
| SAN DIEGO | 722106 | 1402 | 515.1 |
| BUFFALO | 915456 | 2038 | 449.2 |
| SACRAMENTO | 602829 | 1401 | 430.3 |
| RALEIGH | 452976 | 1080 | 419.4 |
| LOS ANGELES | 674126 | 1793 | 376.0 |
| DALLAS | 693253 | 2260 | 306.7 |
| HOUSTON | 521318 | 1702 | 306.3 |
| PORTLAND | 862702 | 2882 | 299.3 |
| SEATTLE | 721063 | 2446 | 294.8 |
| DETROIT | 816508 | 2887 | 282.8 |
| BIRMINGHAM | 350145 | 1249 | 280.3 |
| CHARLOTTE | 526864 | 1951 | 270.0 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | 574919 | 2168 | 265.2 |
| ATLANTA | 587441 | 2404 | 244.4 |
| SYRACUSE | 387651 | 1640 | 236.4 |
| SAN ANTONIO | 420203 | 1817 | 231.3 |
| PHOENIX | 676115 | 2945 | 229.6 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 349350 | 1527 | 228.8 |
| DENVER | 456394 | 2022 | 225.7 |
| JACKSONVILLE | 253579 | 1559 | 162.7 |
| GRAND RAPIDS | 249349 | 1613 | 154.6 |
| ST. LOUIS | 434337 | 2812 | 154.5 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | 289847 | 1926 | 150.5 |
| ORLANDO | 401759 | 2796 | 143.7 |
| MILWAUKEE | 252060 | 1910 | 132.0 |
| COLUMBUS | 250132 | 1990 | 125.7 |
| RICHMOND | 193511 | 1664 | 116.3 |
| | 200661 | 2125 | 94.4 |
| DES MOINES | 108717 | 1259 | 86.4 |
| | 165428 | 2100 | 78.8 |
| WASHINGTON D.C | 150949 | 2074 1905 | 72.8 59.0 |
| | 112358 | | 59.0 54.3 |
| | 90276 | 1664 1922 | 48.5 |
| OKLAHOMA CITY | 93210 66801 | 1805 | 37.0 |
| ALBANY | 63808 | 1803 | 35.4 |
| CHICAGO KANSAS CITY | 58612 | 1777 | 33.0 |
| LOUISVILLE | 50890 | 1586 | 32.1 |
| BOSTON | 48534 | 2018 | 24.1 |
| MEMPHIS | 26068 | 1724 | 15.1 |
| LITTLE ROCK | 21529 | 1668 | 12.9 |
| NASHVILLE | 15808 | 1595 | 9.9 |
| CLEVELAND | 18965 | 2397 | 7.9 |
| SALT LAKE CITY | 15779 | 2052 | 7.7 |
| CINCINNATI | 4592 | 1609 | 2.9 |
| BALTIMORE | 0 | 1930 | 0.0 |
| HARTFORD | õ | 1496 | 0.0 |
| NEWYORK | õ | 2104 | 0.0 |
| OMAHA | Õ | 1412 | 0.0 |
| PHILADELPHIA | Õ | 2212 | 0.0 |
| | ÷ | | |
| 50 City Total | 14948980 | 96120 | 155.5 |
| - | | | |

| | OE Maske | | . 07 |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | | 8-03-96 10-25 | -97 Gallons/ |
| Otto | Radio-Generated | C Evenenituree | |
| City | Gallons | \$ Expenitures | \$ Expend. |
| PHILADELPHIA | 1430824 | 44646 | 32.0 |
| OMAHA | 64178 | 2091 | 30.7 |
| BALTIMORE | 692823 | 23962 | 28.9 |
| CINCINNATI | 274187 | 10633 | 25.8 |
| ALBANY | 61002 | 2992 | 20.4 |
| CLEVELAND | 378148 | 21667 | 17.5 |
| RICHMOND | 134289 | 8698 | 15.4 |
| DENVER | 611069 | 39806 | 15.4 |
| BIRMINGHAM | 93498 | 6749 | 13.9 |
| CHARLOTTE | 111454 | 9588 | 11.6 |
| TAMPA | 307025 | 26758 | 11.5 |
| LOUISVILLE | 88375 | 9085 | 9.7 |
| PHOENIX | 137620 | 14995 | 9.2 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 480672 | 60223 | 8.0 |
| COLUMBUS | 176447 | 22737 | 7.8 |
| WASHINGTON D.C | 324462 | 49904 | 6.5 |
| DETROIT | 115163 | 20077 | 5.7 |
| LITTLE ROCK | 21298 | 4021 | 5.3 |
| DALLAS | 353256 | 70864 | 5.0 |
| HOUSTON | 286311 | 61043 | 4.7 |
| PITTSBURGH | 92254 | 20570 | 4.5 |
| NASHVILLE | 66557 | 16189 | 4.1 |
| NEW YORK | 1356455 | 333565 | 4.1 |
| BOSTON | 573122 | 143943 | 4.0 |
| NEW ORLEANS | 32338 | 8208 | 3.9 |
| SAN ANTONIO | 56631 | 15969 | 3.5 |
| CHICAGO | 351226 | 130063 | 2.7 |
| LOS ANGELES | 562151 | 228676 | 2.5 |
| PORTLAND | 37775 | 19295 | 2.0 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | 79223 | 44676 | 1.8 |
| RALEIGH | 7815 | 5874 | 1.3 |
| BUFFALO | 22471 | 22942 | 1.0 |
| ATLANTA | 18392 | 41735 | 0.4 |
| ORLANDO | 6427 | 29966 | 0.2 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | 1661 | 14820 | 0.1 |
| MIAMI | 578 | 43864 | 0.0 |
| JACKSONVILLE | 0 | 11607 | 0.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 0 | 46039 | 0.0 |
| SEATTLE | 0 | 43724 | 0.0 |
| ST. LOUIS | 0 | 28696 | 0.0 |
| MILWAUKEE | 0 | 8279 | 0.0 |
| MEMPHIS | 0 | 11335 | 0.0 |
| SALT LAKE CITY | 0 | 16142 | 0.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | 0 | 0 | |
| SYRACUSE | 0 | 0 | |
| GRAND RAPIDS | 0 | 0 | |
| DES MOINES | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 · | 0 | |
| KANSAS CITY | 0 | 0 | |
| HARTFORD | 0 | 0 | |
| 50 City Total | 9407176 | 1796714 | 5.2 |
| | 3-0/1/0 | 1730714 | 5.2 |

Table 5. Local Radio FDOC Advertising Impact, By City.

•

-

| | 65 Weeks | : 8-03-96 10-2 | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| | | E a time a tra al | FDOC Advert | • |
| | Actual | Estimated | Generated | % Increase |
| City | Gallons | Gallons | Gallons | 70 mclease |
| | 7635895 | 7602177 | 722106 | 10.5 |
| SAN DIEGO | 8083464 | 8029338 | 632530 | 8.6 |
| | 11587647 | 11510817 | 896757 | 8.4 |
| | 15313860 | 15283181 | 1048761 | 7.4 |
| DENVER SACRAMENTO | 9140848 | 9087442 | 602829 | 7.1 |
| BUFFALO | 14122085 | 14133548 | 935671 | 7.1 |
| DALLAS | 16602757 | 16511216 | 1041868 | 6.7 |
| SEATTLE | 13538728 | 13463493 | 721063 | 5.7 |
| PHOENIX | 15091868 | 15077280 | 806095 | 5.6 |
| BALTIMORE | 12582386 | 12959602 | 692823 | 5.6 |
| COLUMBUS | 8130938 | 8125439 | 423189 | 5.5 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | 13627850 | 13525999 | 650629 | 5.1 |
| HOUSTON | 17430788 | 17401204 | 803270 | 4.8 |
| SAN ANTONIO | 10542863 | 10552299 | 475150 | 4.7 |
| SYRACUSE | 8829499 | 8760823 | 387651 | 4.6 |
| BIRMINGHAM | 10378182 | 10410708 | 441616 | 4.4 |
| JACKSONVILLE | 6312992 | 6295387 | 253579 | 4.2 |
| DETROIT | 23336607 | 23397284 | 926662 | 4.1 |
| PHILADELPHIA | 36662555 | 36567492 | 1430824 | 4.1 |
| | 11527365 | 11479718 | 434337 | 3.9 |
| ST. LOUIS | 11354150 | 11341864 | 408010 | 3.7 |
| | 13294311 | 13282905 | 460553 | 3.6 |
| | 24681786 | 24480565 | 827153 | 3.5 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 18049901 | 17978398 | 605361 | 3.5 |
| | 8122091 | 8120558 | 249349 | 3.2 |
| | 8579670 | 8638932 | 252060 | 3.0 |
| | 42734994 | 42423527 | 1234202 | 3.0 |
| LOS ANGELES RICHMOND | 11547931 | 11561854 | 326558 | 2.9 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | 10780931 | 10767329 | 291485 | 2.8 |
| TAMPA | 19061304 | 19038520 | 505387 | 2.7 |
| CINCINNATI | 11895013 | 11843687 | 278714 | 2.4 |
| CLEVELAND | 16900535 | 16908175 | 396596 | 2.4 |
| DES MOINES | 4644561 | 4666425 | 108717 | 2.4 |
| WASHINGTON D.C | 26371854 | 26454115 | 474342 | 1.8 |
| LOUISVILLE | 8132373 | 8145096 | 139263 | 1.7 |
| NEW YORK | 80987649 | 82104672 | 1356455 | 1.7 |
| ALBANY | 8260272 | 8317462 | 127733 | 1.6 |
| PITTSBURGH | 16738941 | 16778265 | 256731 | 1.6 |
| BOSTON | 41750552 | 41906096 | 621445 | 1.5 |
| OMAHA | 4646569 | 4676995 | 64178 | 1.4 |
| | 7853156 | 7875482 | 93210 | 1.2 |
| CHICAGO | 37186128 | 37768009 | 414653 | 1.1 |
| NASHVILLE | 8304581 | 8299326 | 82331 | 1.0 |
| LITTLE ROCK | 4735425 | 4813741 | 42815 | 0.9 |
| NEW ORLEANS | 13947970 | 13956512 | 122295 | 0.9 |
| KANSAS CITY | 7004594 | 7066092 | 58612 | 0.8 |
| MIAMI | 25772470 | 25722410 | 112934 | 0.4 |
| MEMPHIS | 6666794 | 6683608 | 26068 | 0.4 |
| SALT LAKE CITY | 10809201 | 10945129 | 15779 | 0.1 |
| HARTFORD | 14645118 | 14753719 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | | | - |
| 50 City Total | 795940002 | 797493921 | 24280397 | 3.1 |
| | | | | |

Table 6. National & Local TV and Local Radio FDOC Advertising Radio Impact, By City.

ted City. Table

| e 7. | Increased National & Local TV and Local Radio FDOC Advertising | Radio Impacts f | for Selecte |
|------|--|-----------------|-------------|
| | 65 Weeks : 8-03-96 10-25-97- | | |

·

• • •

.

-

| | | 65 | Weeks : 8-03 | -96 10-25 | -97 | |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|
| | | | | | -Minimum A | Adv. Impact |
| | Estimated | Estimated | FDOC Adv | | FDOC Adv | |
| | Without Adv | | Generated | | Generated | |
| City | Gallons | Gallons | Gallons | % Increase | | % increase |
| Oity | Gallond | Galionio | Calions | /0 11/0/0400 | Calions | |
| SAN DIEGO | 6880071 | 7602177 | 722106 | 10.5 | 722106 | 10.5 |
| | | | | | | |
| CHARLOTTE | 7396807 | 8029338 | 632530 | 8.6 | 632530 | 8.6 |
| PORTLAND | 10614060 | 11510817 | 896757 | 8.4 | 896757 | 8.4 |
| DENVER | 14234420 | 15283181 | 1048761 | 7.4 | 1048761 | 7.4 |
| SACRAMENTO | 8484614 | 9087442 | 602829 | 7.1 | 602829 | 7.1 |
| BUFFALO | 13197877 | 14133548 | 935671 | 7.1 | 935671 | 7.1 |
| DALLAS | 15469348 | 16511216 | 1041868 | 6.7 | 1041868 | 6.7 |
| SEATTLE | 12742430 | 13463493 | 721063 | 5.7 | 721063 | 5.7 |
| PHOENIX | 14271185 | 15077280 | 806095 | 5.6 | 806095 | 5.6 |
| BALTIMORE | 12266779 | 12959602 | 692823 | 5.6 | 692823 | 5.6 |
| COLUMBUS | 7702250 | 8125439 | 423189 | 5.5 | 423189 | 5.5 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | 12875370 | 13525999 | 650629 | 5.1 | 650629 | 5.1 |
| | | 17401204 | | | | |
| HOUSTON | 16597935 | | 803270 | 4.8 | 803270 | 4.8 |
| SAN ANTONIO | 10077149 | 10552299 | 475150 | 4.7 | 475150 | 4.7 |
| SYRACUSE | 8373172 | 8760823 | 387651 | 4.6 | 387651 | 4.6 |
| BIRMINGHAM | 9969093 | 10410708 | 441616 | 4.4 | 441616 | 4.4 |
| JACKSONVILLE | 6041808 | 6295387 | 253579 | 4.2 | 253579 | 4.2 |
| DETROIT | 22470622 | 23397284 | 926662 | 4.1 | 926662 | 4.1 |
| PHILADELPHIA | 35136669 | 36567492 | 1430824 | 4.1 | 1430824 | 4.1 |
| ST. LOUIS | 11045380 | 11479718 | 434337 | 3.9 | 434337 | 3.9 |
| ORLANDO | 10933854 | 11341864 | 408010 | 3.7 | 408010 | 3.7 |
| RALEIGH | 12822353 | 13282905 | 460553 | 3.6 | 460553 | 3.6 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 23653411 | 24480565 | 827153 | 3.5 | 827153 | 3.5 |
| ATLANTA | 17373037 | 17978398 | 605361 | 3.5 | 605361 | 3.5 |
| GRAND RAPIDS | 7871209 | 8120558 | 249349 | 3.2 | 249349 | |
| | | | | | | 3.2 |
| MILWAUKEE | 8386872 | 8638932 | 252060 | 3.0 | 263364 | 3.1 |
| LOS ANGELES | 41189326 | 42423527 | 1234202 | 3.0 | 1293424 | 3.1 |
| RICHMOND | 11235296 | 11561854 | 326558 | 2.9 | 352810 | 3.1 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | 10475845 | 10767329 | 291485 | 2.8 | 328962 | 3.1 |
| TAMPA | 18533134 | 19038520 | 505387 | 2.7 | 581976 | 3.1 |
| CINCINNATI | 11564972 | 11843687 | 278714 | 2.4 | 363162 | 3.1 |
| CLEVELAND | 16511579 | 16908175 | 396596 | 2.4 | 518495 | 3.1 |
| DES MOINES | 4557708 | 4666425 | 108717 | 2.4 | 143121 | 3.1 |
| WASHINGTON D.C | 25979773 | 26454115 | 474342 | 1.8 | 815815 | 3.1 |
| LOUISVILLE | 8005833 | 8145096 | 139263 | 1.7 | 251399 | 3.1 |
| NEW YORK | 80748217 | 82104672 | 1356455 | 1.7 | 2535650 | 3.1 |
| ALBANY | 8189729 | 8317462 | 127733 | 1.6 | 257173 | 3.1 |
| PITTSBURGH | 16521535 | 16778265 | 256731 | 1.6 | 518808 | 3.1 |
| BOSTON | | 41906096 | | 1.5 | | |
| | 41284652 | | 621445 | | 1296418 | 3.1 |
| OMAHA | 4612817 | 4676995 | 64178 | 1.4 | 144851 | 3.1 |
| OKLAHOMA CITY | 7782272 | 7875482 | 93210 | 1.2 | 244378 | 3.1 |
| CHICAGO | 37353357 | 37768009 | 414653 | 1.1 | 1172967 | 3.1 |
| NASHVILLE | 8216995 | 8299326 | 82331 | 1.0 | 258030 | 3.1 |
| LITTLE ROCK | 4770926 | 4813741 | 42815 | 0.9 | 149816 | 3.1 |
| NEW ORLEANS | 13834217 | 13956512 | 122295 | 0.9 | 434421 | 3.1 |
| KANSAS CITY | 7007480 | 7066092 | 58612 | 0.8 | 220048 | 3.1 |
| MIAMI | 25609476 | 25722410 | 112934 | 0.4 | 804187 | 3.1 |
| MEMPHIS | 6657540 | 6683608 | 26068 | 0.4 | 209060 | 3.1 |
| SALT LAKE CITY | 10929350 | 10945129 | 15779 | 0.1 | 343203 | 3.1 |
| HARTFORD | 14753719 | 14753719 | 0 | 0.0 | 463295 | 3.1 |
| | 1-100119 | 17130110 | U | 0.0 | -00200 | 0.1 |
| 50 City Total | 773213523 | 797493921 | 24280397 | 2.1 | 30842670 | 4.0 |
| | 115215525 | 19173921 | 2-200397 | 5.1 | 500-2070 | 4.0 |
| | | | | | | |

| | Without Advert. | Actual | Allocation | OT GKPS | 00 | umai Aliocatio | DI OI GRPS | Long-Kun |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| | Est. Sales | Est. Sales | Allocation | Marginal GRP | | | Marginal GRP | Demand |
| CITY | Gallons | Gallons | GRP's | impact:Ga. | Gallons | GRP's | impact:Ga. | Elasticity*** |
| O ITT | Canono | | - | | | | · | - |
| LOS ANGELES | 633,682 | 672,672 | 27.6 | 439 | 689,070 | 105.1 | 118 | 0.018 |
| SAN DIEGO | 105,847 | 134,499 | 21.6 | 486 | 151,623 | 100.3 | 118 | 0.078 |
| DALLAS | 237,990 | 269,464 | 34.8 | 271 | 277,726 | 82.4 | 118 | 0.035 |
| HOUSTON | 255,353 | 282,553 | 26.2 | 335 | 292,134 | 76.8 | 118 | 0.031 |
| DETROIT | 345,702 | 374,369 | 44.4 | 177 | 377,642 | 67.2 | 118 | 0.021 |
| SACRAMENTO | 130,533 | 151,262 | 21.6 | 337 | 159,480 | 64.9 | 118 | 0.048 |
| BUFFALO | 203,044 | 226,710 | 31.4 | 231 | 231,816 | 62.9 | 118 | 0.032 |
| SEATTLE | 196,037 | 218,577 | 37.6 | 174 | 221,230 | 56.3 | 118 | 0.030 |
| PHOENIX | 219,557 | 243,368 | 45.3 | 145 | 244,767 | 56.0 | 118 | 0.027 |
| ATLANTA | 267,277 | 288,330 | 37.0 | 164 | 290,364 | 51.7 | 118 | 0.021 |
| PORTLAND | 163,293 | 183,661 | 44.3 | 128 | 184,161 | 48.4 | 118 | 0.031 |
| SYRACUSE | 128,818 | 145,630 | 25.2 | 219 | 149,242 | 48.1 | 118 | 0.038 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | 198,083 | 215,478 | 33.4 | 155 | 216,931 | 44.1 | 118 | 0.024 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 363,899 | 379,143 | 23.5 | 210 | 382,029 | 42.1 | 118 | 0.013 |
| RALEIGH | 197,267 | 210,439 | 16.6 | 291 | 214,965 | 41.9 | 118 | 0.023 |
| SAN ANTONIO | 155,033 | 170,186 | 28.0 | 170 | 172,001 | 40.8 | 118 | 0.028 |
| BIRMINGHAM | 153,371 | 166,604 | 19.2 | 243 | 170,104 | 40.4 | 118 | 0.028 |
| CHARLOTTE | 113,797 | 128,185 | 30.0 | 149 | 129,291 | 38.4 | 118 | 0.035 |
| DENVER | 218.991 | 233,771 | 31.1 | 143 | 234.637 | 37.8 | 118 | 0.019 |
| ST. LOUIS | 169,929 | 184,613 | 43.3 | 94 | 183.667 | 34.3 | 118 | 0.022 |
| ORLANDO | 168,213 | 179,997 | 43.0 | 75 | 178,523 | 27.2 | 118 | 0.018 |
| INDIANAPOLIS | 161,167 | 171,304 | 29.6 | 104 | 170,911 | 26.1 | 118 | 0.018 |
| MILWAUKEE | 129,029 | 138,991 | 29.4 | 104 | 138,599 | 25.8 | 118 | 0.022 |
| TAMPA | 285,125 | 295,243 | 32.7 | 90 | 294,448 | 25.0 | 118 | 0.010 |
| - WASHINGTON D.C | 399,689 | 409,496 | 31.9 | 90 | 408,710 | 24.3 | 118 | 0.007 |
| COLUMBUS | 118,496 | 127,760 | 30.6 | 92 | 127,041 | 23.7 | 118 | 0.022 |
| | 635,148 | 643,936 | 31.0 | 83 | 643,027 | 21.8 | 118 | 0.004 |
| BOSTON JACKSONVILLE | 92,951 | 99,998 | 24.0 | 96 | 99,512 | 19.4 | 118 | 0.023 |
| GRAND RAPIDS | 121,096 | 127,481 | 24.8 | 82 | 126,734 | 17.2 | 118 | 0.016 |
| DES MOINES | 70,119 | 75,288 | 19.4 | 93 | 74,855 | 15.2 | 118 | 0.024 |
| RICHMOND | 172.851 | 177,970 | 25.6 | 63 | 176,948 | 13.5 | 118 | 0.009 |
| MIAMI | 393,992 | 399,352 | 29.3 | 55 | 398,115 | 13.5 | 118 | 0.004 |
| PITTSBURGH | 254,177 | 259,532 | 32.3 | 48 | 258,134 | 13.1 | 118 | 0.006 |
| OKLAHOMA CITY | 119,727 | 124,271 | 29.6 | 46 | 122,983 | 11.5 | 118 | 0.011 |
| | 107,807 | 111,802 | 27.3 | 45 | 110,610 | 10.3 | 118 | 0.011 |
| KANSAS CITY | 125,996 | 129,822 | 27.8 | 42 | 128,612 | 9.8 | 118 | 0.009 |
| ALBANY | 574,667 | 578,498 | 27.0 | 42 | 577,295 | 9.8 | 118 | 0.002 |
| | | 126,355 | 24.4 | 41 | 125,293 | 8.5 | 118 | 0.008 |
| | 123,167 | 215,613 | 24.4 | 34 | 214,530 | 7.3 | 118 | 0.000 0.004 |
| NEW ORLEANS | 212,834 | | 36.9 | 21 | 255,454 | 6.5 | 118 | 0.003 |
| | 254,024 | 256,788 74,842 | 25.7 | 17 | 73,985 | 3.8 | 118 | 0.006 |
| | 73,399 | | 25.7 | 8 | 102,537 | 1.7 | 118 | 0.002 |
| MEMPHIS | 102,424 | 103,098 178,495 | 20.5 | 7 | 177,996 | 1.5 | 118 | 0.001 |
| | 177,923 | | | 5 | 168,204 | 1.4 | 118 | 0.001 |
| SALT LAKE CITY | 168,144 | 168,725 | 31.6 | 5 | 126,424 | 1.4 | 118 | 0.001 |
| | 126,415 | 126,820 | 24.5 | 5 | 126,424 | 1.1 | 10 | 0.001 |
| BALTIMORE | 188,720 | 188,720 | 29.7 | 0 | 226,980 | | | |
| HARTFORD | 226,980 | 226,980 | 23.0 | 0 | 1,242,280 | | | |
| NEW YORK | 1,242,280 | 1,242,280 | 32.4 | | | | | |
| | 70,966 | 70,966 | 21.7 | 0 | 70,966 | | | |
| PHILADELPHIA | 540,564 | 540,564 | 34.0 | U | 540,564 | | | |
| Total | 11005502 | 12450503.1 | 1478.769 | | 12521871 | 1478.768 | | |
| Total Persontana Inercanal | 11895593 | 12450503.1 4.7% | 14/0./09 | | 5.3% | 14/0./00 | | |
| Percentage Increase | | 4.770 | | | 5.576 | | | |

* 65 Weeks : 8-03-96 ... 10-25-97. * Over estimated sales without advertising. *** Present advertising coefficient plus 43 lagged advertising coefficients.