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While concept testing is a mainstay of the new product development process, there is little empirical evidence on the variation in consumer responses due to alternative concept formulations, particularly for those tests undertaken early in the product development process. The present study addressed this gap in the literature by using a split sample mail survey to compare stripped, embellished, and visual concept formulations for five heterogeneous product concepts. It was found that respondents’ answers to attitude and purchase intention questions showed only minor variation with different formulations of the concept test statement. It also was found that the ranking of the concepts showed no substantial changes across the different formulations. Therefore, the type of concept statement formulation may not be that important, at least for early ranking tasks performed before experiential prototypes are available. Early concept tests therefore may be carried out using stripped concept statements. This may reduce costs, allowing organizations to undertake early concept testing more frequently across a wider range of products.

Introduction

Organizations often have a range of concepts under consideration, but with limited research and development funding only a few can be developed. Therefore, research that provides early screening and ranking of new product concepts obviously is helpful to decision-making. A popular way of achieving this is through concept testing, which Page and Rosenbaum (1992) define as “... a variety of marketing research-based approaches employed to assess the marketability of a product or service idea prior to its actual development. Its purpose is to provide early feedback from the market about the perceived attractiveness of a proposed new product before its development has even begun” (p. 269). Concept testing also should be fast and cheap and should take place early in the new product development process. Crawford and Di Benedetto (2000) note that the key purposes of concept testing are (1) to eliminate the poor concept; (2) to generate a crude estimate of the sales or trial rate; and (3) to develop further the original idea.

But how should the concept statements for these early screening and ranking tests be formulated? There are substantial differences of opinion on this point. Many practitioners apply stripped concept statements that consist of a brief, nonemotive, factual description. This has the advantages of ease of use and an enhanced ability to test many concepts. For example, Crawford and Di Benedetto (2000) report movie studio executives making major investment decisions on the basis of a stripped concept statement read out over the phone. However, there is a common counterview that for respondents to be able to evaluate realistically a concept, it must be presented in an embellished form with an accompanying visual, such as a line drawing or a mock advertisement.

There has been little research that empirically tests the effect of different concept formulations on consumer responses. The few results in the literature...
generally are taken to suggest that different formulations of concept statements (e.g., stripped versus full concept statements, or words versus words plus visuals) lead to different evaluations. This suggests that practitioners cannot compare test results from differing concept formats or know whether the concept format they have chosen is appropriate. In general, it makes it more difficult to interpret concept test scores.

Therefore, the purpose of this research was to quantify the effect of alternative formulations of concept statements on consumers’ reactions. The present study proceeds by reviewing the literature and prior research, by setting out the method, and by reporting the results of a split sample mail survey that tested consumer reactions to three formulations of five product concepts.

Prior Research on Concept Formulation

Concepts can be presented in many varied ways, from a simple factual statement giving a minimum of attributes to a commercialized concept statement with persuasive claims or even to a full mock advertisement. None of these is the concept itself, which is ultimately an idea resting in people’s minds. All concept tests measure are reactions to a particular version of that idea—the concept statement.

The distinction between the concept and the execution of the concept long has been recognized as an important issue. For example, early on, Tauber (1972) asked the question: What is measured by concept testing? Lewis (1984) questions whether concept scores measure the message or the method? The answers to these questions have a major impact on the conduct and interpretation of concept testing.

Conventional wisdom has developed rules of thumb for the formulation of concept statements. For example, Moore (1982) suggests that relatively bland or stripped concept statements should be used when a large number of concepts are evaluated, as the tests will be quicker and cheaper. He also says that bland or stripped concept statements also should be used when the concept is radically new, as any positioning may limit its appeal. However, Moore (1982) does recommend promotional concept statements when a concept is going into an existing product class—a position also supported by Marder (1997).

Dolan (1993) identifies the major executional considerations in concept testing to be the communication method and the consumer response measure. The first issue, according to Dolan, is whether the communication methods are presented in a factual or stripped manner without emotion or without using the persuasive techniques found in a normal market situation. Dolan (1993) believes there is no general rule as to which is better but that a move from factual to persuasive tone would increase purchase intent score—the consumer response measure. Similarly, Dolan (1993) expects words plus visual concepts generally would produce purchase intent scores greater than words or a visual on their own. These positions are supported by both Marder (1997) and Crawford and Di Benedetto (2000), who contend that the embellished or commercialized format will produce “more realistic evaluations (that is, greater acceptance)” (p. 182).

Why should a persuasive tone or the inclusion of visuals increase consumer interest? The conventional wisdom largely is unsupported by detailed theoretical reasoning. However, some authors have claimed that differences may arise because verbal and visual information is processed differently (Holbrooke and Moore, 1981; Vriens et al., 1998). For example, Paivio (1978) suggests that words are processed sequentially in a ‘verbal system,’ while images are dealt with simultaneously in an independent ‘imagery system,’ and that these differing processes well could lead to differing responses. Pick and Saltzman (1978) make a similar point: the left brain may dominate in verbal processing and the right brain in visual processing. On the other hand, Rossiter and Percy (1980) suggest that verbal information may be “translated” into pictures, reducing the differences between the two stimuli. One implication of Rossiter and Percy’s (1980) point is that the use of adjectives in persuasive concept statements may create stronger mental imagery than is achieved from bland factual statements; thus,
persuasive concept statements may generate responses closer to those achieved from visual stimuli.

However, however, he empirical evidence on the effects of different stimuli is relatively sparse, and it is not at all clear cut. Increased ratings for visual stimuli have been found by Tauber (1972), who compares factual descriptions of three food concepts with print advertisements including color photographs; by Holbrooke and Moore (1981), who compare consumer reactions to written versus visual presentations of sweater designs; and by Vriens et al. (1998), who find images generated higher ratings than factual verbal descriptions in two out of three cases. Similarly, more realistic stimuli are found to generate greater positive interest by Lewis (1984), who finds that providing an actual test product increased positive interest over concept tests for a personal care product; and by Dahan and Srinivasan (2000), who find that virtual and actual prototypes of bicycle pumps yield much higher market-share predictions than attribute-only descriptions. Yet these results are contradicted by those of Armstrong and Overton (1971), who find no significant difference between a factual concept statement and exposure to a prototype for a mini-car leasing system; by Domzal and Unger (1985), who replicate Holbrooke and Moore’s study and find no effect; and by Dickinson and Wilby (1997), who find no significant difference between concept statements and product trial for toothpaste.

A possible explanation of these differences can be found in Schoormans et al. (1995). They note that if consumers develop different meanings from different concept formulations, this likely will result in different evaluations. However, they also point out that differences in stimuli need not result in differences in meaning. They assert that meanings would vary only (1) if there are substantive differences in the information provided; and (2) if respondents’ prior knowledge does not allow them to infer the missing information. Thus, the increases in interest found by some researchers may be due to substantial additional information being provided by a product placement, prototype, or mock advertisement, rather than differences in concept formulation or information processing.

Also, previous research has failed to test the effect of a persuasive tone in a controlled fashion. This is demonstrated in Figure 1, which classifies previous empirical studies into the taxonomy of concept testing stimuli developed by Dolan (1993), namely the use of a factual or persuasive tone on one axis, and the use of words, visuals, or words plus visuals on the other axis.

As most prior research involved multiple treatments with varying combinations of stimuli, the majority of studies are present in more than one cell of Figure 1. However, Lewis (1984) is not included in Figure 1, as he does not make clear the concept formulation used. Research involving product placements and prototypes also is not included, as these typically occur later in the new product development process than concept testing.

Figure 1 highlights the contribution of the present study. At a basic level, this research is adding to the relatively sparse literature on the effects of differing concept formulations. More importantly, this study is assessing the effect of a persuasive tone and the addition of visual stimuli in a controlled fashion; it is the first to assess the effects of a persuasive tone without confounding the test through the simultaneous addition of visual stimuli. Thus, the present work explicitly evaluates two propositions reflecting assertions made in the previous literature.

**P1:** Moving from a factual to a persuasive tone increases consumer interest.

**P2:** Moving from words to words plus visual stimuli increases consumer interest.

This will demonstrate whether additional stimuli have an effect when there are no substantive changes in information content. Any differences in visual versus verbal processing should be detected by tests of P2, while any effect from richer verbal imagery should be detected by tests of P1. Quantifying the changes due to tone and visual stimuli also will give a baseline against which more sophisticated stimuli, such as mock advertisements or virtual prototypes, may be evaluated in the future.
Research Design

We investigated consumer evaluations for three types of concept formulations. The first is termed for this study stripped. This refers to concept statements with simple, factual, nonemotional written descriptions of the idea being tested. Such concept statements have been described previously with a variety of terms including brief (Armstrong and Overton, 1971; Page and Rosenbaum, 1992), factual (Dolan, 1993; Tauber, 1972), nonemotional (Dolan, 1993), bland (Moore, 1982), and objective (Page and Rosenbaum, 1992). As an example, Crawford and Di Benedetto (2000) offer “. . . a low calorie form of diet peanut butter that can be used in most diets” (p. 182).

The second is termed for this study embellished. This refers to concept statements written in a commercialized manner with a persuasive tone. Such statements previously have been described as a comprehensive description (Armstrong and Overton, 1971), advertising format (Tauber, 1972), embellished, selling format, promotional (Moore, 1982), persuasive (Dolan, 1993; Marder, 1997; Page and Rosenbaum, 1992), full description, and commercialized (Crawford and Di Benedetto, 2000). An example offered by Crawford and Di Benedetto (2000) is that “. . . a marvelous new way to chase the blahs from your diet has been discovered by General Mills scientists—a low-calorie version of the ever popular peanut butter. As tasty as ever and produced by a natural process, our new Light Peanut Butter will fit every weight-controlled diet in use today virtually without restriction” (p. 182).

The third type of concept formulation is called for this study visual. This refers to concept statements that take the text of an embellished concept statement and supplement it with a line drawing of the product concept. These have been described previously as pictures (Holbrooke and Moore, 1981), paper-and-pencil concepts, rough artwork sketches (Page and Rosenbaum, 1992), storyboards, line drawings (Dickinson and Wilby, 1997), and visual depictions (Dahan and Srinivasan, 2000). The present study’s line drawings were similar to those reported by Page and Rosenbaum (1992) and Dickinson and Wilby (1997).

In practice, visual concept statements always include embellished written descriptions. The only researchers to use visuals with no accompanying text (as shown in Figure 1) are academic researchers studying aspects of consumer psychology. The present authors do not know of any practitioners who undertake such tests and so did not include visual-only concept formulations in this research. Thus, this study’s visual concept statement consists of a line drawing plus embellished statement.

Method and Sample

A split-sample mail survey with random assignment was conducted, in which the three types of concept formulations were the treatments. Within each treatment, five heterogeneous product concepts provided the stimuli for repeated measures of consumer reactions. The consumer reaction measures were those identified by Dolan (1993) as the most commonly used diagnostic questions in concept testing.

A mail survey was used, as it allowed visual concept statements to be shown, was cost effective, and allowed for a representative sampling frame; also it was recognized that by following procedures similar to those in Dillman (2000) a good response rate could be generated. For the study’s sampling frame, local voting registers in New Zealand were used, which are an excellent proxy for the local adult population.

With a postage-paid return envelope and a cover letter were sent out 900 questionnaires, requesting participation to support a university research project on how people evaluate new products. Two reminder letters were sent—the second with a replacement questionnaire and postage-paid return envelope. There were 399 completed surveys returned and 155 returned as “Gone—No Address” for an effective response rate of 54%. However, 38 surveys were unusable, and the final sample size was 361; this was distributed approximately equally across the three treatments. This compares well with the response rates and sample sizes reported in earlier studies. Also, the present study’s sample was of the general adult population, whereas some prior research has relied on student populations.

Age, gender, and household income of respondents was compared with census data. In most cases, there were no significant differences between the proportion of respondents in different demographic groups and the corresponding census data. The exceptions were for one income category (NZ$40k to NZ$100k) and three age categories (20–29, 50–59, and 60–69). Although significant, these differences ranged from 5 up to a maximum of 9 percentage points. Thus, our sample is regarded as adequately representative.
Development of the Test Concepts

The variation in concepts within existing studies is quite limited. Often there will be only one or two categories in a study. This limits both statistical power and the generalizability of results. To address this limitation, a heterogeneous range of five test concepts were selected that included durable and consumable products, high price and low price products, and highly innovative products and line extensions. The concepts are outlined as follows.

A spray-on hand cleanser. This represented a completely new product. The concept statement was similar to an example used by Crawford and Di Benedetto (2000).

- A mint-flavored baking soda toothpaste. This represented a simple flavor variant of an existing product. The base product was used by Dickinson and Wilby (1997).

A spin fryer. This represented a completely new product. The concept statement was similar to an example used by Page and Rosenbaum (1992).

A disposable cell phone. This represented a new product form and was based on emergent and planned products identified in other markets with an Internet search.

- A digital video disc (DVD) recorder. This had some limited commercial availability to the sampling frame, but as diffusion was still in the pre-take-off stage it was regarded it as eligible for concept testing.

The present authors’ knowledge of the local markets suggested that these concepts would be recognizable easily and relevant to most consumers, and this was confirmed during pretesting. With the exception of the DVD recorder, none of the concepts were available to the respondents in the sampling frame.

Development of the Concept Statements

The authors of this study wrote the concept statements, as they had commercial experience in this area. Nonetheless, as shown earlier, prior examples were drawn upon wherever possible. To control for copywriting effects, the stripped concept statements were written first, and then positive adjectives and clauses were added with minor subsidiary information to produce the embellished concept statements. Thus, each stripped concept statement was a subset of the corresponding embellished concept statement. Both the stripped and embellished statements were refined through pretesting. Then a graphic artist was commissioned to produce the line drawings for the visual concept statements.

Sometimes concept statements include a price as a reference point. A price was included, based on the cost of similar or competing products in the marketplace. Brand names were omitted in all concepts.

While a standard monadic test format (i.e., no competitive concepts) was used, it was believed for this study that there was an implied comparison with existing products serving similar well-established needs. There is some evidence for this: Miller et al. (1987) finds that inclusion of competitive-set information did not significantly change purchase intention for the purchase of dog-snack products ($n = 1,922$ dog owners).

Evaluation of Consumer Reactions

For each concept, attitudinal questions were asked about problem-solving ability, believability, and uniqueness, as well as a purchase intent question. According to Page and Rosenbaum (1992) and Dolan (1993), these are the key dimensions to be measured in concept testing. The present study’s questions closely followed the standard wording used in the concept testing literature, for example as reported in Page and Rosenbaum (1992).

A seven-point response scale was used with the choices ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). For purchase intent, a five-point scale was used from “I would definitely buy it” (5) to “I would definitely not buy it” (1).

The dimensions measured and questions used are both well established in the literature. Rossiter (2002) demonstrates that under these circumstances, single-item scales are appropriate. In any event, single-item scales are widespread in concept testing. There does remain a question of precision compared to multi-item scales; however, the present study’s results do show adequate precision as measured by, for example, relatively small standard errors.

Results

Overall Concept Evaluations

Table 1 shows the average concept evaluations across all three treatments, allowing for examination of the
variability among the concepts and the face validity of the results. Clearly there is adequate variation among the concepts. Two concepts were seen as, on average, being effective in solving relevant problems, while three were not (the midpoint of the scale was 4.0). The claims made about the concepts were seen as believable, confirming that the concept executions were all adequate; this is particularly important given that Trebbi and Flesch (1983) find variations in performance confidence (i.e., believability) could confound purchase intention comparisons over repeated concept tests. All concepts except the basic line extension (toothpaste) were seen as unique. The average purchase intent varied from a low of 1.65 to a high of 2.83, with top-two box purchase intent varying from 3% to 27%.

From this it can be concluded that the concept statements are executed adequately and have reasonable between-concept variation in both problemsolving ability and purchase intent. There was also reasonable variation around the means shown in Table 1. For the seven-point scales the standard deviations ranged from 1.2 to 1.7 across the five concepts. For the five-point purchase intent scale, they ranged from 0.9 to 1.1.

Differences among Concept Statement Formulations

Table 2 shows a comparison of means for each question across the three treatments. These are calculated as the average over all five concepts within a treatment. Standard errors are recorded in parentheses. Examination of Table 2 reveals two key points. First, for each treatment, the averages vary considerably among the different questions. This, together with the standard errors, shows that the measures employed are sufficiently precise to detect differences in respondent opinion. Second, between treatments, the averages show hardly any variation at all. The comparison of stripped and embellished shows no support for P1, while the comparison of embellished and visual shows no support for P2. This is surprising. It suggests that, contrary to prior belief, different concept formulations do not result in different concept evaluation scores.

This study formally tested the differences for each concept evaluation question using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVAs). This enabled for a simultaneous testing of the differences between concepts (a within-subjects effect), differences between treatments (a between-subjects effect), and interactions between concept and treatment. Table 3 reports the results.

Differences between concepts are statistically significant for solve, unique, and purchase, indicating that the five concepts were in fact perceived differently. There was no statistically significant difference for believe (p = .11), showing that believability (and thus concept execution) was consistently high across all concepts and all treatments.

Differences between treatments were all non-significant. That is, the use of stripped, embellished,
or visual formulations had no detectable effect. Strong interactions between concept and treatment might undermine this finding, as the choice of concept then would confound the measurement of treatment effects. However, Table 3 also shows the interaction effects to be nonsignificant.

As a further check on differences between treatments at the individual concept level, this study undertook ANOVAs for each concept on each question. One difference was found to be significant at the 5% level (p = .045) and one to be significant at the 10% level (p = .078). However, as 20 ANOVAs were involved, this is exactly the frequency of significant results expected from chance alone. It therefore is concluded that there are no differences between treatments at the individual concept level. This confirms the surprising finding that different concept formulations do not result in detectably different concept evaluation scores. Neither P1 nor P2 is supported.

### Preservation of Concept Rankings

The ranking of the concepts for each formulation also were examined. Although differences between concept evaluations were small, they still could have serious managerial consequences if they caused changes in ranking, as this could lead to different decisions about the investment of research and development funds. To generate an overall concept ranking, consumer concept evaluations were used. Each concept was ranked four times—once on each question. Then the average of these four ranks were taken to yield an overall average rank for each concept. This process was repeated for each treatment to allow between treatment comparisons. The results are reported in Table 4.

### Discussion

Prior literature asserts that a persuasive tone and visual stimuli both increase concept ratings and that persuasive concept statements are more accurate. The present study found no significant differences from the addition of a persuasive tone or the subsequent addition of visual stimuli.

This is at variance with the increases in consumer ratings found by Tauber (1972) and the increased number of effects found by Holbrook and Moore (1981). However, the present study involved a standard line drawing, while Tauber (1972) and Vriens et al.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>DVD Recorder</th>
<th>Spray-On Cleanser</th>
<th>Spin Fryer</th>
<th>Mint Baking Soda</th>
<th>Toothpaste</th>
<th>Disposable Cell Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stripped</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embellished</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the average ranks were preserved across treatments. This also was true for the individual ranks on each concept-testing question (not shown in Table 4). Changes in individual ranks were rare and never were more than a single rank. In the case of purchase intent, arguably the most important of the measures, there were no changes in ranks between treatments. Thus, rankings of the five concepts showed considerable stability across the three different concept statement formulations. Again, this shows no support for either P1 or P2.
(1998) used photographs. Also, the visual stimuli in the present study were combined with verbal descriptions, while Holbrook and Moore’s (1981) pictures have no corresponding verbal descriptions. These methodological variations may be the cause of the differences in consumer evaluations. Thus, this study’s conclusions should be restricted properly to the comparison of concept statements with and without line drawings. It is also wise to be cautious in the application of these results to food products, fashion clothing, and automobile accessories, which are the categories used by Tauber (1972), Holbrook and Moore (1981) and Vriens et al. (1998), respectively. Given these caveats, this study’s results suggest that early screening can be done with stripped concept statements just as well as it can with embellished or visual concept statements using line drawings. This is an important confirmation of a widespread industry practice (Crawford and Di Benedetto, 2000; Page and Rosenbaum, 1992).

This study’s second major finding was that there were no important changes in the ranking of the five concepts when different concept statement formulations were used. This has two implications. First, it provides some support for the practice of using stripped concept statements to rank new product opportunities. Second, it suggests that this ranking process is robust to changes in concept statement formulation, an encouraging indicator of external validity. These results are consistent with Haley and Gatty (1971) in that there were no significant differences among well-formulated concept statements; with Armstrong and Overton (1971) in that reaction to basic descriptions were similar to reactions to more elaborate formulations; and with Lewis (1984) and Dahan and Srinivasan (2000) in that the relative ranking of the concepts was preserved.

The question of external validity of concept tests is a controversial issue, and a full discussion is beyond the scope of this article. In general, early concept tests are not expected to yield accurate forecasts of trial rates, as they do not include the marketing mix elements that play a major role in determining trial. However, the robustness of both the scores and ranks across different treatments is an encouraging indicator of external validity. Also, there is a stream of research that has shown purchase intent to be related at least monotonically to trial rates (Jamieson and Bass, 1989). Thus, although early concept tests cannot yield forecasts of trial rates of sales figures, they should be adequate to perform the screening and ranking functions to which they usually are assigned.

Future work could expand on this study’s results in a number of ways. An obvious extension would be examination of concepts in other product categories, such as food or services. Also, it may be that consumer interest mediates the impact of additional stimuli. As with most of the prior literature, the present authors did not have concepts that yielded extremely high-purchase interest scores. However, this is unlikely to be of practical importance, as differences in formulation appear unlikely to lead to the rejection of really strong concepts; this nonetheless remains an interesting area for future research. A further point is the precision of the single-item scales commonly used in this area. Although this study has shown sufficient precision for practical applications, the use of multi-item scales could refine these findings, helping to determine whether the proposed effects are completely absent, or just very small.

It also would be helpful to study explicitly the impact of more sophisticated stimuli such as print advertisements and virtual prototypes. The reasons why Tauber (1972) obtain higher ratings for a mock advertisement than for a stripped concept are unclear. The present work suggests it was not due solely to the adoption of a persuasive tone or visual stimuli. It may be that the use of color had an impact or, alternatively, that Tauber (1972) inadvertently may have included substantial new information in his advertisement. Future research could attempt to confirm Tauber’s (1972) finding while controlling for information content.

There is also considerable scope to undertake work on the visual stimuli used in virtual prototypes. Dahan and Srinivasan (2000) find that virtual prototypes give similar results to actual prototypes but give higher scores than attribute-only descriptions. It would be helpful to understand exactly what is driving these differences in scores, as this would lead to more theoretically informed guidelines for development of virtual prototypes. The present work contributes to this by ruling out the addition of simple visual stimuli (or a persuasive tone) as the sole explanations for these changes. If simultaneous processing of visual imagery does enhance consumer interest, then the black-and-white line drawings widely used in concept testing are insufficient to trigger this effect.

Overall, this study’s results have shown that the form of concept statement may not be that relevant for early concept rankings where brief descriptions
and line drawings are used. The addition of a persuasive tone or visual stimuli are not enough, on their own, to give a detectable increase in consumer interest. Thus, early concept tests do not need to be undertaken with a visual depiction of the product. This could reduce the costs involved in each test significantly, allowing organizations to test a wider range of products and to undertake early concept tests more frequently.
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Appendix. Concept Statements

Spray On Hand Cleanser

The Spray On Hand Cleanser completely eliminates odours that come from handling fish, onions, garlic and furniture polish. Spray directly on to your hands, rub in for a few seconds and then rinse off. The Spray On Hand Cleanser comes in half-litre cans priced at $5.99 (including GST) each.

Spray On Hand Cleanser

The Spray On Hand Cleanser is a hand cleanser concentrate that completely eliminates those lingering odours that come from handling fish, onions, garlic and furniture polish. Not just a covering odour, it actually removes those nasty smells! Just press the button and spray directly on to your hands, rub in for a few seconds, and rinse off. It’s goodbye to odours and stains. The Spray On Hand Cleanser comes in a convenient half-litre can priced at $5.99 (including GST) each.

Mint Flavoured Baking Soda Toothpaste

Mint Flavoured Baking Soda Toothpaste combines the whitening effect of baking soda with the taste of mint. It is priced at $3.49 (including GST) a tube.

Mint Flavoured Baking Soda Toothpaste

For a minty smooth clean, the Mint Flavoured Baking Soda Toothpaste combines the whitening effect of baking soda with the taste of mint. It leaves your mouth feeling fresher and teeth whiter and brighter. Brush regularly with Mint Flavoured Baking Soda Toothpaste and you’ll feel and taste the difference. It’s priced at only $3.49 (including GST) a tube.
Appendix. (Cont’d.)

**The Spin Fryer**

The Spin Fryer fries up to 30% faster than a deep fryer. It uses two to three tablespoons of oil and leaves 20% less fat in the food. The Spin Fryer circulates hot air and oil mist around the food, avoiding burning and overcooking. It can also be used as a steamer or slow cooker. Shaped similarly to a large pot, the Spin Fryer is priced at $299 (including GST).

**The Spin Fryer**

Conveniently try your favourite food up to 30% faster than a deep fryer using the Spin Fryer. It uses only 2 to 3 teaspoons of oil and has 20% less fat in the food, meaning healthier eating than a regular deep fryer. The Spin Fryer works by circulating hot air and oil mist around the food, and provides a controlled cooking environment to avoid burning or over cooking. The Spin Fryer is so versatile it can even be used as a steamer or slow cooker. Shaped similarly to a large pot, the Spin Fryer is an ideal addition to any kitchen. Priced at $199 (including GST).

**Disposable Cellphones**

The Disposable Cellphone is a no-frills recyclable phone for prepaid calling, which comes with 50 minutes of talk time. While additional time can be bought, the phone may also be simply thrown away when the talk time or batteries expire. The Disposable Cellphone is slightly smaller than a pack of playing cards. Talking and listening is through a microphone/earpiece connected by a thin wire. Priced from $89 (including GST).

**Disposable Cellphones**

The Disposable Cellphone is a convenient no-frills recyclable phone for prepaid calling, which comes with 60 minutes of talk time. While additional time can be bought in increments of 50, 30 or 120 minutes, the phone may be simply thrown away when the talk time or batteries expire. The Disposable Cellphone is made of an attractive durable plastic, and is even smaller than a pack of playing cards. Talking and listening is simple with an easy to use microphone/earpiece connected by a thin wire. A cheap, convenient mobile phone, for when you want it, but without the need for expensive contracts. Priced from $89 (including GST).
Appendix. (Cont’d.)

**Digital Video Disk Recorders**

The Digital Video Disk (DVD) Recorder allows you to record a TV programme while at the same time watching a previously recorded programme, or the start of a programme you are still recording. You can skip material, or copy it to create your own selections. The DVD Recorder can record up to 12 hours of material per disk. The same size as a normal video recorder, it is priced at $1,499 (including GST).

**Digital Video Disk Recorders**

The Digital Video Disk (DVD) Recorder allows you to conveniently record a TV programme onto a disk, while at the same time watching a previously recorded programme. You can also skip back to watch the start of a programme while it is still being recorded, no longer will you have a frustrating wait for the whole recording to finish before you can start watching. You can also skip unwanted material, or easily copy scenes to create your own favourite selections. The DVD Recorder records up to 12 hours of programmes per disk. The same size as a normal video recorder, it is the ultimate solution for home viewing. Priced at $1,499 (including GST).
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